

Legislature of Ontario Debates and Supply Committees

Fourth Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, March 29 — Friday, April 29, 1977

Index

CONTENTS

Legislature of Ontario Debates 1-1108

Social Development Committee
Estimates, Social Development Policy ..... S-1 - S-92

Resources Development Committee
Estimates, Housing ..... R-1 - R-84

Combined index of Debates and Supply Committees is included at the back of this volume.



No. 1

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, March 29, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

CONTENTS

An alphabetical list of members of the Legislature of Ontario, together with lists of members of the executive council and parliamentary assistants, appears as an appendix at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. (Phone 965-2159)

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, March 29, 1977, being the first day of the fourth session of the 30th Parliament of the province of Ontario for the dispatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Hon. P. M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House and being seated upon the throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. P. M. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly:

Monsieur le président, mesdames et messieurs les membres de l'assemblée législative:

I welcome you to the fourth session of the 30th Parliament of Ontario, in this the Silver Jubilee Year of our beloved sovereign.

Les vingt-cinq années depuis l'accession au trône de la Reine Elizabeth II ont été marqués par de nombreux changements en technologie de même que dans le développement économique et social. Au Canada, comme en Ontario, ces changements ont transformé notre mode et notre rythme de vie.

The faith and optimism which Ontarians share with respect to Canadian Confederation emerge from a deep conviction about Canada and about Ontario's place and role within Canada. It is not enough, however, for Canadians to face the challenges posed by Confederation simply with faith and hope. There must be a concrete programme in place which sustains national identity, broadens national dialogue and cements the ties of nationhood.

By sponsoring a forum on Canadian destiny in June, the government of Ontario will provide Canadians from all corners of our country an opportunity for constructive interchange and dialogue which, if pursued, should lead to greater understanding and sharing among regions and language groups.

The government will also take steps to increase the number of student and teacher exchanges that now take place between Ontario and the other provinces of this country. We feel that this type of person-to-person contact and communication has tremendous value in furthering understanding. We shall therefore seek the co-operation of industry and organized labour to develop similar exchanges for people in other walks of Canadian life.

At the same time, my ministers will continue to co-operate with the federal government and with the other provinces in every way to ensure that no needless division separates us in seeking the common goal of national unity and reconciliation.

A citizen's faith in, and commitment to, his or her community and country remain the most important elements in building a nation. They are qualities that can make a national crisis manageable and temporary. But faith and commitment, if they are to be sustained, require that there be equitable distribution of economic opportunity.

It remains the government's conviction that, in light of the level of unemployment across the country and the presence of a strong provincial government in Quebec that is committed to the partition of our country, all federalists who hold fiscal responsibilities must do what they can to keep our economy on a path of honest and strong growth. Economic arguments may not dissuade the hard-core romantics of separatism but economic results are vital to the survival of this country.

Unfair concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, and denial of opportunity to some, through no fault of their own, represent a potential danger to the people of Ontario and to national unity. It is a threat against which the government must be prepared to act if the fundamental fairness that binds our nation together is to remain part of the self-view of all Canadians.

In this respect, it is important that Ontario should hold out to Canada and Canadians an example of the stability and fairness that typify the best of democratic society. We must offer an example of a province where personal success is attainable by all who are willing to make a fair contribution. We must

ensure, as the province of opportunity, that each citizen can participate fully in all aspects of life in Ontario, because we recognize equality of opportunity as the springboard to significant achievement.

[3:15]

This government firmly believes that the national anti-inflation programme should continue until the federal government and the provinces have developed a clear strategy to moderate inflation after the controls are lifted. Toward this goal, Ontario will set in motion a series of steps that will build upon the initiative begun with the recent Partnership for Prosperity conference. This exercise, so crucial to our future well-being, will involve extensive consultation with and the full co-operation of industry, labour and all segments of Ontario society—an example now also being pursued by the federal government.

Joint government-private sector relations cannot go very far, however, if our 11 senior governments are going off in as many different directions. Thus, we must re-establish a sense of shared national purpose, for without common national goals there cannot be confidence, and without confidence there cannot be growth.

Ontario's commitment to the AIB is also coupled with a commitment to ensure basic protections from unacceptable high costs for the citizens of our province. The rent control programme, initiated in 1975, will be continued until the scheduled end of the anti-inflation programme, and legislation to this effect will be presented to the House. Further, the government will present various policy options for continuing protection for tenants, to be implemented after the termination of the anti-inflation programme.

It is clear, however, that beyond the positive protection that it offers for tenants, rent control acts as a negative force in the drive to create new rental units in significant numbers. Only when more rental accommodation is available can market forces again take over and rent controls be eliminated. The Ministry of Housing will therefore introduce a specific programme to stimulate rental construction in areas of low vacancy. It is the government's belief that this incentive will markedly increase rental supply, thereby easing the pressure on rents in the future.

Further, working in close co-operation with federal and municipal governments, my government will continue to increase the amount of rental housing for senior citizens and families of low income. Such efforts in the rental field will complement the recently announced federal-provincial AHOP-HOME programme, which now places home ownership within the reach of families of very moderate income.

As well, a series of legislative measures will be introduced to improve and secure the rights of condominium owners, both as purchasers and as residents.

To ensure full opportunity and a bright future for our people we need to expand the job-creating sectors of the Ontario and national economies. Concerted and intensive efforts must be made to reverse current high levels of unemployment.

To this end, it is hoped that significant assistance will be furnished through the federal budget to be presented on March 31. In turn, Ontario will complement federal actions intended to create employment, and develop our own fiscal policy to stimulate the economy and expand the province's work force.

An additional stimulus to the provision of employment expansion opportunities is the continuing success of this province in restraining government spending. This limits government demand on private capital which can be directed toward the generation of jobs and growth.

The particular unfairness of national unemployment, to young people especially, and to our population as a whole, requires a specific government response.

Special funding to create jobs in both the private and public sectors will be a feature of the new Ontario budget. This initiative will place particular emphasis on the needs of young people who bear an unbalanced proportion of overall unemployment in Canada.

In its commitment to equality of economic opportunity for all Ontarians, the government will focus special attention on northern and eastern areas of the province.

Legislation will be presented to confirm the establishment of the new Ministry of Northern Affairs which will deal with the economic and social development of Ontario's northern regions.

The fundamental aim of the government's overall northern programme is to continue to increase the standard of living of northern residents. This government opposes any view that would commit the people of northern Ontario to economic disadvantage through an unreasonable and unthinking rejection of economic development. My government believes accommodations can and must be made to protect our recreational and natural heritage without condemning part of our population to economic inequality.

In this vein, the government will present amendments to The Environmental Assessment Act, as recommended by Mr. Justice Hartt, to assist in his examination into the feasibility of a major forest development in northwestern Ontario. This review will pay particular attention to native, environmental and social considerations. At the same time, steps will be taken by my government to examine and report on such development potential as might reasonably and responsibly be explored to the benefit not only of the people of the north, but of all of Ontario.

Increased efforts to reforest Crown lands, wherever licensed harvesting is permitted, will ensure the perpetual availability of renewable timber resources and continued economic prosperity in the north.

The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission will assume a new role in the development of tourism in northern Ontario. ONTC and the Ministry of Industry and Tourism will plan and promote new recreational attractions in conjunction with those of established tourism interests, local councils and local business. The commission's acquisition of four modern unit trains and delivery of a seventh aircraft to norOntair this spring are expected to figure largely in these efforts.

The impetus for effective economic development east of Metropolitan Toronto and in eastern Ontario will be provided by locating significant government operations in selected areas. Details will be presented to the House early in the session.

In recent years, my government has undertaken various measures to establish a more open and responsive relationship with the people of Ontario. In accepting the recommendations of the select committee of the Legislature on the Camp commission, the government has paved the way for the most open and balanced legislative forum in Canada. It is a forum whose expanded workload and openness require particular co-operation from all sides of the House. Sittings of the assembly are already televised and filmed by the media. The Ombudsman's access to documentation on behalf of the citizens of our province is an example of openness unprecedented in Canadian parliamentary institutions.

In order that further progress might be made in broadening the processes of government and information-sharing and in order that this progress might be pursued with a proper concern for personal privacy, a commission on freedom of information and individual privacy will be named to study and recommend to the Legislature during this session appropriate means of ensuring both.

As further evidence of the government's intention to follow this direction, a new Audit Act will be introduced giving the Provincial Auditor extensive new powers in serving the public interest through greater scrutiny of government expenditures and by ensuring internal efficiency and economy. The recommendations of a committee on customer service, which have already been made public, will be acted on through a special task force of senior government officials and the appointment of a new customer service co-ordinator. The major objectives of this programme are the simplification of government procedures and the improvement of public service sensitivity to the citizens of Ontario.

As citizens have a right to open and responsive government, they have also a right to due process of law and effective administration of justice. The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) will present The Courts Administration Act to initiate a new approach to judicial administration. The Act will give appropriate recognition to the fundamental principles of judicial independence and ministerial accountability to the public. Family law legislation brought forward initially during the last session will be reintroduced.

You will be asked to consider amendments to The Police Act. This step follows considerable consultation with police commissions, police forces and representatives of various groups, and is intended to establish a code of behaviour and complaint procedures that will protect both the general citizenry and members of our police forces.

The Ministry of Education will launch three significant initiatives related to language instruction. The first will improve opportunities for young people to learn French as a second language. To achieve this, school boards will be offered increased financial incentives to encourage them to improve and extend French language instruction programmes in elementary schools across Ontario.

Ontario's French language education system now serves, in 369 French language schools, 106,000 students whose first language is French. The government reaffirms its commitment to this system, and will introduce special legislation to guarantee establishment of a French language secondary school in Essex county.

Increased emphasis on language opportunities will be reflected in innovations that

recognize the multicultural nature of our population. More resources will be available for intensive English language instruction for children of recent immigrants.

At the same time, while recognizing that French and English are the languages of instruction in Ontario's schools, a heritage language programme will be supported, as a continuing education offering, to help Ontario's many ethnic groups retain a knowledge of their mother tongues and continuing appreciation of their cultural backgrounds. The government accepts and values the multicultural character of our province, and believes that encouraging children to understand the language and culture of their parents contributes to the quality of both education and family life.

In the past decade, Ontario has seen a rapid growth of special services for children and youth. This province stands second to none in the number, variety and quality of services that now exist.

The government intends to unify these programmes so that the needs of individual children will be better served. More effective co-ordination will be achieved through legislation to consolidate provincial services for children with special needs within a single, integrated organization in the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Special education services will continue to be provided by the Ministry of Education and school boards.

In addition, provision will be made for common licensing requirements, operating standards, and funding arrangements for group homes, youth residences, children's institutions and related services.

My government reaffirms that it is a primary responsibility of parents to care for their children, who should remain in their own homes wherever possible. To this end, the new children's division will encourage the development of family support services. It thus follows that the responsibility for developing appropriate services for the care of children with special needs should rest with local communities. Accordingly, legislation will be introduced to give local governments the authority and resources to ensure the provision of special services for their own children.

The health and safety of working men and women in Ontario remain important priorities for my government. New legislation will be introduced, incorporating all occupational health and safety matters in one statute. The Ministry of Labour will hold consultations with interested parties with the aim of accommodating in the legislation the needs and concerns of the entire community.

[3:30]

The aspect of prevention in other health and safety programmes cannot be overstated. Our seatbelt and speed limit regulations have saved many lives, prevented thousands of serious injuries and saved society much grief and millions of dollars in lost work and hospitalization. Avoiding death and carnage on the highways is a continuing concern of the government and one which all Ontarians share.

During the session legislation will be introduced to establish a probationary period for new drivers, regardless of age. Further changes will await the report of the select committee on highway safety.

Because the evidence is clear that the most effective health programmes are those that place their emphasis on prevention, my government will take steps, through the Ministry of Culture and Recreation, to introduce a province-wide physical fitness programme designed to encourage Ontarians to care about their health and well-being and to avoid, through that care, unnecessary hospitalization, illness and hardship.

My government's continuing commitment to clean air and water and a healthy environment will be advanced through amendments to The Environmental Protection Act, The Ontario Water Resources Act and The Pesticides Act.

A central unit will be established for monitoring, research and control of hazardous chemicals, such as PCBs, mercury and lead.

An inventory of all abandoned or inactive mine operations which are sources of contamination will be compiled, and responsibility for cleanup will be determined and pursued. Where ownership or responsibility cannot be established, provincial funds will be used for the cleanup.

The government will provide assistance with respect to the increasing cost of municipal services to meet environmental needs. A particular priority, concurrent with my government's commitment to the east and the north, will be afforded through servicing assistance to these areas. Amendments to legislation will provide municipalities with provincial financing and assistance for alternatives to traditional treatment systems, particularly in smaller communities.

Ontarians can take pride and satisfaction from the development of nuclear power in our province, a source on which we will be increasingly dependent in the short term. The

Pickering generating station is one of the safest, most efficient and cost-effective energy producing facilities in the world. The Bruce generating plant, now under construction, is among the additional nuclear projects already contributing to our energy supply.

However, it is clear that in the long term it will be increasingly difficult to rely solely on nuclear energy or fossil fuels for our total energy requirements. A planning process is needed now for the transition to other energy sources. A report will be placed before the House indicating the types of changes envisioned. Greater emphasis will be placed on research, development and demonstration of renewable forms of energy.

The government is committed to a war on waste at every level of energy utilization, from large scale activities such as those related to transportation, industrial and community use, to daily use by the individual home or apartment dweller. The ability to provide improved standards of living for an expanding population will depend on the degree to which the people of Ontario share in this commitment.

While my government has shown an ongoing interest in the growth and prosperity of small businesses, it is recognized that further special efforts are required. For this reason, an Ontario advisory committee on small business will be established to serve as a forum for small business interests and to make recommendations on improving their management, financial and marketing capabilities.

In addition, the government will launch a small business management development programme, and will work with universities involved in the small business assistance programme to offer consulting help on a year-round basis.

[The Ontario Development Corporation will expand its assistance to small business firms by lowering its lending rate to up to two per cent below the basic rate for loans up to $200,000, and by raising the current loan limits.

Protections for franchise holders, which will help encourage investment in small business will form part of a new Franchise Act.

A new Securities Act will simplify securities regulations and provide better information and more protection for public investors.

The Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations will undertake a major educational programme. This will include the establishment of a consumer education resource centre, a series of consumer information programmes through the facilities of TV Ontario, and increased emphasis on consumer information material.]

Tourism, a major earner of foreign currency for Canada, employs over 200,000 people in Ontario's hospitality industry. To help redress the national tourism balance of payments deficit that has recently developed, greater emphasis will be placed on promotional activities for vacations in Ontario.

The government will determine the feasibility of a hospitality institute which would seek to improve standards, level of services and management within the 15,000 small businesses in Ontario's tourism industry.

Economic growth and industrial stability are interdependent. The Ministry of Labour will promote new initiatives in labour-management co-operation, including improvements in conciliation and mediation services, and the appointment of a representative committee to advise on collective bargaining matters and other issues of common concern.

The real guarantee of economic security and advancement for the unionized and other working men and women of Ontario remains in the vitality and dynamism of a well functioning free enterprise economy, stimulated by investment, confidence and faith in the stability and fairness of Ontario's society and institutions.

Legislation will be reintroduced for province-wide, single-trade bargaining in certain sectors of the construction industry. This reform, which will reduce the number of bargaining situations from over 200 to about 20, should do much to promote stability in this vital sector of the economy.

A financial review of the operations of the Workmen's Compensation Board and an analysis of the benefit levels are currently in progress. Once they are completed, the government will introduce legislation to adjust benefits to meet inflationary stresses and the legitimate needs of disabled workmen and others who benefit now from one of the most generous and comprehensive compensation schemes in the free world.

The land we live on is a fundamental and finite resource, a fact that makes the responsibility of government to protect and husband its use a matter of paramount importance. Measures will, therefore, be taken to provide a clear focus and strong co-ordinating function for the development of land use policies,

[Editor's note: Copy within brackets was not read but is contained in the formal Throne Speech.]

including the protection of our agricultural food lands.

The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle) will be given a strengthened mandate to co-ordinate the land use policies of ministries and to expedite the resolution of land use issues. Administrative responsibilities will remain with respective ministries and with municipalities but central assessment and co-ordination at the provincial level will assure the best uses for our land through an overview of individual, community and provincial interests which will be implemented through the process of official plan approvals.

In particular, the government will resist pressures to prejudice the land equity of the farming community. Within the context of the food land guidelines brought down by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, which serve to protect, by definition, the food land needs of Ontario, farmers cannot be singled out as the target of any unfair land freeze schemes. My government firmly believes that the present and future needs for food lands can be met in Ontario without inequitably prejudicing the farming community.

In this session, the government will reinforce its programmes to increase agricultural productivity with legislation to limit topsoil removal from prime agricultural lands, and with plans to return significant acreages to full production.

The maintenance of valuable food lands in agricultural production merits an accompanying and increased consumer loyalty toward Ontario food products. Marketing strategies and a promotional campaign for Ontario foods will be pursued in both domestic and export markets to stimulate purchases of high quality Ontario agricultural produce.

Ontario has enjoyed massive increases in per acre production over the last 10 years—increases which have produced a greater security of food supply than has ever been achieved in such a highly urbanized society. Initiatives under the Young Farmer programme, Venture Capital programme and others will enhance the profitability of farming in Ontario and underline the government's endorsement of the role of free enterprise, sound management and personal initiative in the economic structure of family farming in Ontario.

Many current concerns about future economic security centre on private and public pension plans, their administration and the use being made of these resources.

The government will appoint a royal commission on pension plans to make an in-depth review and assessment of pension plan administration throughout Ontario. This step will be taken with a view to necessary changes or other approaches to ensure that contributors receive fair benefit and protection.

The question of pensions is but one aspect of the concern of our society for citizens in their retirement years. My ministry will continue to give high priority to the needs of the aging population and will increase the number of assessment and placement services to ensure that senior citizens receive care appropriate to their needs.

In particular, more funds will be designated for home care and home support services so that more of our senior citizens may remain in their own homes and avoid unnecessary institutionalization. Efforts will be made to link these funds to involvement by young people in senior service programme initiatives, thus providing them with employment and service opportunities while adding to the security and well-being of older members of our society.

In all, the wide-ranging programme placed before this assembly is directed at building a sense of promise and of national pride in Ontarians stemming from a fair and balanced society and from the opportunities we have within that society. It is a programme of confidence in the future of our province and nation. It seeks economic stability and the protection of our natural and human resources. It is geared toward achieving growth and generating employment. It is a programme aimed at distributing economic opportunity fairly throughout Ontario. With dependable legislative co-operation, it can be achieved by this assembly by the end of this present year.

My government's programme provides for every Ontarian the opportunity to live in freedom, work in peace and attain self-fulfillment and satisfaction. It assures our people that their Ontario, our Ontario, affords them the capacity to shape their own particular and unique part of the Canadian dream in confidence, security and freedom.

Honourable members, I now leave you to the discharge of your duties. May Divine Providence guide you in your deliberations.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

[3:45]

Mr. Speaker: To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of Her Honour's speech, which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

TRUSTEE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved first reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

Motion agreed to.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Welch moved first reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to.

NATURAL DEATH ACT

Mr. Maeck moved first reading of Bill 3, An Act respecting the Withholding or Withdrawal of Treatment where Death is Inevitable.

Motion agreed to.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. Lawlor moved first reading of Bill 4, An Act to provide for Freedom of Information.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide members of the public with access to government information. The bill is designed to allow maximum accessibility to government documents while, at the same time, recognizing that it is in the public interest that certain types of information not be disclosed. Where a disagreement arises as to whether or not certain information should be disclosed, the bill provides a mechanism for resolving the dispute and as an addendum it is a spur to this spurious commission that the government has appointed.

MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration on Friday next.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that tomorrow, Wednesday, the House will not sit in the chamber but will sit on Wednesday, April 6; and that on succeeding Wednesdays, subject to further order, the House will not sit in the chamber.

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS TO HM QUEEN ELIZABETH II

Hon. Mr. Davis moved that an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, the Queen, in the following words:

"To the Queen's most Excellent Majesty:

"Most Gracious Sovereign:

"We, Your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, now in session, beg to extend to Your Majesty, on the completion of the 25th year of your reign, our most sincere congratulations, and reaffirm to Your Majesty the continuing warm respect and affection in which you are held by your subjects in Ontario.

"A l'occasion des visites de Votre Majesté et des autres membres de la famille royale, nous avons eu l'insigne privilège de vous souhaiter la bienvenue dans votre province de l'Ontario et n'avons jamais manqué de bénéficier de vos gracieux conseils et du charme de votre présence.

"May Divine Providence sustain Your Majesty in health and happiness during a long and glorious reign to the benefit of your people."

That the said address be engrossed and presented by Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the assembly, to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor for transmission to Her Majesty.

Mr. Lewis: Je me lève avec grand plaisir pour seconder cette déclaration de loyauté et respect envers Sa Majesté la Reine.

I do so with particular enthusiasm because it gives those of us on this side of the House the opportunity to affirm that exquisite phrase Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

I will readily admit that those of us in the New Democratic Party are not so widely recognized as extroverted monarchists, but we do have deep and abiding loyalties, with some history as well. I thought I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House that we probably have in this caucus the only sitting member of the assembly who was indeed present at the place of the coronation some 25 years ago. Our honourable colleague, the member for Peterborough (Ms. Sandeman), then a young girl at school in London, was there on the sidewalk of the processional route in

the driving rain for 18 hours, huddled under her sleeping bag, waiting to catch a glimpse of the procession and the ultimate coronation.

I simply bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that for more than a quarter of a century there has been this inextinguishable bond between socialism and royalty. I therefore second the address with great enthusiasm.

Mr. S. Smith: Monsieur l'orateur, je veux prendre l'occasion moi aussi pour parler de la part de mes collègues ici dans notre parti pour donner notre appui à cette résolution.

I would like to say as well on this occasion that, although he was not there as a school girl or as a school boy, our young member, the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton), while mayor of Guelph was present at that same happy occasion. Whether he was indeed huddled on a blanket or a sleeping bag is not recorded, at least in the annals in Guelph, but he did find himself on the sidewalk in one form or another.

[4:00]

On a more serious note, Mr. Speaker, I think that at a time when our country is beset with regional interests, with people beginning to draw inward and wonder about the dedication that exists in the country—a dedication that I think all of us in Ontario are very confident about; a dedication to a great country from sea to sea—surely we must realize that the monarchy is, indeed, one of the genuine unifying influences that this country has. I think that in wartime and in peace, both the institution of the monarchy and the person of the Sovereign have been a great inspiration to all of us and may they long continue to be.

We are very happy to join with both other parties in giving our support to this excellent motion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker then led the House in singing God Save the Queen.

Mr. Speaker: I have made arrangements to be received by the Lieutenant Governor tomorrow morning to present this address to Her Honour for transmission to Her Majesty the Queen. Her Honour has asked me to extend to all members and their spouses, and the media, a welcome to this brief ceremony which will be held in the music room of the Lieutenant Governor's suite at 11 a.m.

I have asked that the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) and the member for Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) accompany me, since they are the only members in the House who were members at the time of Her Majesty's accession to the Throne.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Davis, the House adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

(125 members)

Fourth Session of the 30th Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Russell Daniel Rowe **Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC**

Member	Constituency	Party
Angus, I.	Fort William	NDP
Auld, Hon. J. A. C.	Leeds	PC
Bain, R.	Timiskaming	NDP
Belanger, J. A.	Prescott and Russell	PC
Bennett, Hon. C.	Ottawa South	PC
Bernier, Hon. L.	Kenora	PC
Birch, Hon. M.	Scarborough East	PC
Bounsall, E. J.	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP
Breaugh, M.	Oshawa	NDP
Breithaupt, J. R.	Kitchener	L
Brunelle, Hon. R.	Cochrane North	PC
Bullbrook, J. E.	Sarnia	L
Burr, F. A.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP
Bryden, M.	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP
Campbell, M.	St. George	L
Cassidy, M.	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Conway, S.	Renfrew North	L
Cunningham, E.	Wentworth North	L
Davidson, M.	Cambridge	NDP
Davis, Hon. W. G.	Brampton	PC
Davison, M.	Hamilton Centre	NDP
Deans, I.	Wentworth	NDP
di Santo, O.	Downsview	NDP
Drea, F.	Scarborough Centre	PC
Dukszta, J.	Parkdale	NDP
Eakins, J.	Victoria-Haliburton	L
Eaton, R. G.	Middlesex	PC
Edighoffer, H.	Perth	L
Evans, D. A.	Simcoe Centre	PC
Ferrier, W.	Cochrane South	NDP
Ferris, J. P.	London South	L
Foulds, J. F.	Port Arthur	NDP
Gaunt, M.	Huron-Bruce	L
Germa, M. C.	Sudbury	NDP
Gigantes, E.	Carleton East	NDP
Givens, P. G.	Armourdale	L
Godfrey, C.	Durham West	NDP
Good, E.R.	Waterloo North	L
Grande, A.	Oakwood	NDP
Gregory, M. E. C.	Mississauga East	PC
Grossman, L.	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	PC
Haggerty, R.	Erie	L
Hall, R.	Lincoln	L
Handleman, Hon. S. B.	Carleton	PC

Member	Constituency	Party
Henderson, Hon. L. C.	Lambton	PC
Hodgson, W.	York North	PC
Irvine, D. R.	Carleton-Grenville	PC
Johnson, J.	Wellington-Dufferin-Peel	PC
Johnston, R. M.	St. Catharines	PC
Jones, T.	Mississauga North	PC
Kennedy, R. D.	Mississauga South	PC
Kerr, Hon. G. A.	Burlington South	PC
Kerrio, V.	Niagara Falls	L
Lane, J.	Algoma-Manitoulin	PC
Laughren, F.	Nickel Belt	NDP
Lawlor, P. D.	Lakeshore	NDP
Leluk, N.G.	York West	PC
Lewis, S.	Scarborough West	NDP
Lupusella, A.	Dovercourt	NDP
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.	Humber	PC
MacDonald, D. C.	York South	NDP
Mackenzie, R.	Hamilton East	NDP
Maeck, L.	Parry Sound	PC
Makarchuk, M.	Brantford	NDP
Mancini, R.	Essex South	L
Martel, E. W.	Sudbury East	NDP
McCague, G.	Dufferin-Simcoe	PC
McClellan, R.	Bellwoods	NDP
McEwen, J. E.	Frontenac-Addington	L
McKeough, Hon. W. D.	Chatham-Kent	PC
McKessock, R.	Grey	L
McMurtry, Hon. R.	Eglinton	PC
McNeil, R. K.	Elgin	PC
Meen, Hon. A. K.	York East	PC
Miller, Hon. F. S.	Muskoka	PC
Miller, G. I.	Haldimand-Norfolk	L
Moffatt, D.	Durham East	NDP
Morrow, D. H.	Ottawa West	PC
Newman, B.	Windsor-Walkerville	L
Newman, Hon. W.	Durham-York	PC
Nixon, R. F.	Brant-Oxford-Norfolk	L
Norton, Hon. K.	Kingston and the Islands	PC
O'Neil, H.	Quinte	L
Parrott, Hon. H. C.	Oxford	PC
Peterson, D.	London Centre	L
Philip, E.	Etobicoke	NDP
Reed, J.	Halton-Burlington	L
Reid, T. P.	Rainy River	L
Renwick, J. A.	Riverdale	NDP
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.	Sault Ste. Marie	PC
Riddell, J.	Huron-Middlesex	L
Rollins, C. T.	Hastings-Peterborough	PC
Rowe, Hon. R. D.	Northumberland	PC
Roy, A. J.	Ottawa East	L
Ruston, R. F.	Essex North	L
Samis, G.	Cornwall	NDP
Sandeman, G.	Peterborough	NDP

Member	Constituency	Party
Sargent, E.	Grey-Bruce	L
Scrivener, Hon. M.	St. David	PC
Shore, M.	London North	PC
Singer, V. M.	Wilson Heights	L
Smith, G. E.	Simcoe East	PC
Smith, Hon. J. R.	Hamilton Mountain	PC
Smith, R. S.	Nipissing	L
Smith, S.	Hamilton West	L
Snow, Hon. J. W.	Oakville	PC
Spence, J. P.	Kent-Elgin	L
Stephenson, Hon. B.	York Mills	PC
Stokes, J. E.	Lake Nipigon	NDP
Stong, A.	York Centre	L
Swart, M.	Welland-Thorold	NDP
Sweeney, J.	Kitchener-Wilmot	L
Taylor, Hon. J. A.	Prince Edward-Lennox	PC
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.	Don Mills	PC
Villeneuve, O. F.	Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry	PC
Warner, D.	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP
Welch, Hon. R.	Brock	PC
Wells, Hon. T. L.	Scarborough North	PC
Wildman, B.	Algoma	NDP
Williams, J.	Oriole	PC
Wiseman, D. J.	Lanark	PC
Worton, H.	Wellington South	L
Yakabuski, P. J	Renfrew South	PC
Young, F.	Yorkview	NDP
Ziemba, E.	High Park-Swansea	NDP

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon W. G. Davis	Premier
Hon. R. Welch	Minister of Culture and Recreation
Hon. J. A. C. Auld	Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet
Hon. R. Brunelle	Provincial Secretary for Resources Development
Hon. T. L. Wells	Minister of Education
Hon. G. A. Kerr	Minister of the Environment
Hon. L. Bernier	Minister of Northern Affairs
Hon. J. W. Snow	Minister of Transportation and Communications
Hon. M. Birch	Provincial Secretary for Social Development
Hon. C. Bennett	Minister of Industry and Tourism
Hon. W. D. McKeough	Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. A. K. Meen	Minister of Correctional Services
Hon. W. Newman	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Hon. S. B. Handleman	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hon. F. S. Miller	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. J. R. Rhodes	Minister of Housing
Hon. D. R. Timbrell	Minister of Health
Hon. J. P. MacBeth	Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General
Hon. J. R. Smith	Minister of Government Services
Hon. M. Scrivener	Minister of Revenue
Hon. H. C. Parrott	Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hon. J. A. Taylor	Minister of Energy
Hon. B. Stephenson	Minister of Labour
Hon. R. McMurtry	Attorney General
Hon. K. Norton	Minister of Community and Social Services
Hon. L. C. Henderson	Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. F. Drea	Assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Mr. R. G. Eaton	Assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Mr. L. Grossman	Assistant to the Attorney General
Mr. W. Hodgson	Assistant to the Minister of Housing
Mr. T. Jones	Assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development
Mr. R. D. Kennedy	Assistant to the Minister of Education
Mr. J. Lane	Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications
Mr. N. G. Leluk	Assistant to the Minister of Culture and Recreation
Mr. G. McCague	Assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. D. J. Wiseman	Assistant to the Minister of Health
Mr. P. J. Yakabuski	Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 29, 1977

Speech from the Throne, The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 3

Trustee Amendment Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading 9

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Welch, first reading 9

Natural Death Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading 9

Freedom of Information Act, Mr. Lawlor, first reading 9

Motions 9

Presentation of an address to HM Queen Elizabeth II 9

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to 10

Appendix: Alphabetical list of members of the Legislature and Executive Council of Ontario 11



No. 2

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, March 31, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand, P. M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1978, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, March 31, 1977.

Statements by the ministry.

ONTARIO FINANCES

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I'm tabling today—and I believe they are now being placed in the members' mailboxes—copies of a special issue of Ontario Finances, reporting on the fourth-quarter performance of the 1976 budget. It includes a comparison of the actual operating results for the first 11 months of this fiscal year, with those for the same period in 1975-76. These interim figures for 1976-77 will be the figures published in the 1977 budget; the final figures for 1976-77 will be reported as usual in the 1976 financial report.

Net cash requirements for 1976-77 are now projected at $1,388 million, or $158 million higher than the original budget. This increase in net cash requirements is entirely due to lower than anticipated revenues.

Some of the highlights of the report: Expenditures are $11 million below the original budget target of $12,576 million. In-year shifts in spending plans have been accomplished to finance $372 million of additional requirements for priority areas. Revenues are projected at $11,177 million, $169 million less than the original budget plan. The additional $158 million in net cash requirements will not necessitate public borrowing. In fact, during the 1976-77 fiscal year, treasury bills outstanding were reduced by $195 million.

The deterioration in the 1976 revenue performance is primarily attributable to a poorer economic performance than originally anticipated when the budget was formulated. The revenues most affected are personal income tax, retail sales tax and corporation income tax. These revenues exhibit the greatest sensitivity to fluctuations in the economy. Much of the deterioration has been offset by higher than forecast payments under the revenue guarantee and improvements in non-budgetary receipts and credits.

On the expenditure front, increased funding was allocated during the year to cover additional requirements for the operation of hospitals and senior citizens' facilities, for home renewal grants, firefighting and other programmes. However, these increases were entirely financed through expenditure savings from other areas.

For the 11 months ended February 28, 1977, budgetary revenue amounted to $8,880 million, or 14.3 per cent over the same period last fiscal year. On the other hand, budgetary expenditure was $10,179 million, for an increase of 11.7 per cent over the same period in 1975-76.

SPECIAL WARRANTS

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the new House rules, I have tabled the special warrants approved between the last and the current sessions.

At the same time copies of these special warrants were placed in the postal boxes of each member on Tuesday, March 29. A special warrant is an order under section 4 of The Management Board of Cabinet Act, signed by the Lieutenant Governor, authorizing expenditures of an urgent nature for which no appropriation exists and is permissible only when the Legislature is not in session. It differs from a Management Board order primarily in that an MBO may only increase the spending level of an appropriation which already exists, whereas a special warrant has the effect of creating a new appropriation.

The two special warrants which were approved were both of an urgent nature which

could not be delayed until the current session of this Legislature. For particulars concerning these special warrants I would suggest that questions be directed to the ministries concerned.

FAMILY LAW REFORM

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce today the four bills on family law reform which were before the House last session. I refer, of course, to The Family Law Reform Act, The Succession Law Reform Act, The Marriage Act, and The Children's Law Reform Act.

With the exception of The Children's Law Reform Act, which was given first reading on the last day of the session, all the bills were before the standing committee on justice when the House rose in December. Many people who wished to make presentations to the standing committee could not be accommodated in the time available last session. Accordingly, in order to continue the policy of full public consultation through the final steps of the legislative process, we chose to reintroduce the bills in this session and refer them back to the standing committee for further examination.

Much work has been done on the bills on the basis of both the comments we received in the standing committee last session and further submissions since that time. However, the improvements are largely matters of clarification, form and emphasis. What has been clear since the initial introduction of these reforms is the broad public support for the principles incorporated in the legislation. Our commitment to equality, fairness, individual freedom and personal responsibility in family law has therefore been confirmed.

The Family Law Reform Act continues to provide for equal sharing of family assets on marriage breakdown, support obligations based on need and contracts for private arrangements about property and support. In response to public concern two particular alterations will be made. First, no support obligation will arise between a childless common-law couple until they have lived together five years; the previous period was two years. Second, provision will be made for common-law spouses to make agreements similar to marriage contracts. Thus contracts could provide for the couple to share property or adjust their support obligations in the same way as legally married persons.

The Succession Law Reform Act equalizes the inheritance rights of children born within and outside marriage, and equalizes the rights of widows and widowers. It implements many principles recommended by the Ontario Law Reform Commission with respect to wills, intestate succession and dependant's relief.

The Marriage Act similarly implements some of the major recommendations of the Ontario Law Reform Commission report on marriage and clears up a number of administrative procedures.

The Children's Law Reform Act removes the legal stigma of illegitimacy and provides rules and procedures for facilitating proof of parentage. Later in the session I hope to expand The Children's Law Reform Act to deal with custody, guardianship and other related matters.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in this session I look forward to the culmination of a major part of the process of family law reform. I am confident that our intensive study and broad consultation has produced a package of reforms which is unmatched in any other jurisdiction.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a background paper entitled: Freedom of Information; the Right of Privacy and Government Information Practices.

This paper is a perspective document which outlines the development, in Canada and elsewhere, of the related concepts of freedom of information and information privacy as components of government information practices.

It identifies the dilemma faced by the policymaker as the result of the emergence of two schools of thought from the current debate in Canada over government information practices. One school is wedded to the concept of a legislative solution not unlike that adopted in the United States. The other school advocates a solution said to be more in keeping with our system of responsible government and parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Lawlor: We have the best of both.

[2:15]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Commentators are unanimously of the view that government information practices can be improved.

Mr. Cassidy: You are not going to act though.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The paper points out, however, that interest in these matters is a relatively recent phenomenon and that no

thorough assessment has been done of the probable effects on our system of government of the solutions proposed.

Mr. Lawlor: It has been around as long as the Tories.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The paper recommends a thorough study of government information practices in the light of both the needs of the people of Ontario and the exigencies of our system of government.

Mr. Cassidy: Never do today what you can study till tomorrow.

Mr. Reid: Study it to death.

Mr. Lawlor: A question—

Mr. Speaker: No, not at this time. The hon. member will be given an opportunity shortly.

Mr. Lewis: What are those exigencies the Attorney General is talking about?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Ruston: Rent control.

Mr. S. Smith: Minister of a mess.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne—

Mr. Peterson: Why did you steal the Premier's (Mr. Davis') rose?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister only has the floor.

Mr. Ruston: He needs a little encouragement.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

LCBO WAREHOUSE FOR DURHAM REGION

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll start over again. In the Speech from the Throne the government announced an initiative to foster economic development east of Metropolitan Toronto by locating significant government operations in selected areas.

I have the pleasure today of announcing the first of these projects, a $40-million bulk storage and distribution warehouse, which the Liquor Control Board of Ontario is to construct in the Durham region.

Mr. Peterson: There is industry for you.

Mr. Roy: Have you made a poll of that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: This 600,000 square foot facility, to be built in Whitby, will be the largest in the Liquor Board's chain of storage and distribution centres and will eventually employ more than 100 people, as well as the temporary employment created during construction.

Mr. Samis: Are those ballpark figures on that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: My colleague, the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes), has already announced that the province is providing a $1.7-million interest-free loan to the region to assist in servicing industrial land as part of a balanced programme of development.

Part of that money will be used by the regional government to provide the necessary access roads for this development. It is estimated that the improved traffic linkage between Ottawa and Whitby industrial areas will have considerable effect in accelerating industrial activity on about 1,000 acres of land in the area.

Mr. Moffatt: Any consultation?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Just keep waiting.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There will be time for questions in a moment. The hon. Minister of Labour.

Interjections.

PROVINCE-WIDE CONSTRUCTION BARGAINING

Hon. B. Stephenson: At the appropriate time today, I will introduce a bill to establish province-wide single-trade bargaining in the construction industry in the industrial, commercial and institutional sectors of that industry. Members will recall that a similar bill—Bill 176—was presented for their consideration in the last session of the Legislature but was not passed into law before the House prorogued in December.

As with Bill 176, this bill too embodies the main recommendations contained in the report of the construction industry bargaining commission which I tabled in the Legislature on June 4, 1976. I have today had 10 more copies of that report delivered to each caucus.

As I explained in December the bill is confined to the industrial, commercial and institutional sector of the construction industry and will result in the reduction of bargaining situations from 205 to approxi-

mately 25 as a result of the requirement that bargaining within that sector be conducted on a single-trade, province-wide basis.

As the members know, there are two important related factors. First, all collective agreements within this sector will be for two years and will be required to expire on a common date; and secondly, provision is made for the designation of a co-ordinating agency to enable employer bargaining agencies to exchange information and data and to engage in related co-ordinating activities.

The consolidation of bargaining structures along trade or craft lines in this important sector should eliminate disruptive intra-trade and intra-regional bargaining rivalries and allow the parties to adopt broader bargaining perspectives to the benefit of all those active in the industry, as well as to the province as a whole. The resulting concentrated nature of bargaining will also enable my ministry to provide even more effective and innovative mediation services. Therefore, the bill represents a significant improvement in the collective bargaining process.

As I have said, most of the provisions of the bill are similar or identical to those contained in Bill 176. However, some changes, most of them of a technical nature, have been made. The one significant change that does not fall into the technical category, and which should be emphasized, relates to the timing of mandatory province-wide single-trade bargaining.

It was originally assumed that the bill would be enacted last December, thus enabling the ministry to designate both employer and trade union provincial bargaining agencies well in advance of April 30, 1977 —the date upon which approximately 70 per cent of the affected collective agreements expire. However, it is now clear that even if the bill is enacted before April 30, there will be insufficient time to permit the affected parties to organize themselves and to obtain ministerial designation as provincial bargaining agencies for the 1977 round of bargaining. The designation process is likely to be time-consuming, and I am sure all members will agree that such a fundamental restructuring of collective bargaining should begin on the right foot with appropriate attention paid to all the important considerations involved.

Intensive consultation in the past several weeks with representatives of major unions and employers affected by the proposed legislation have confirmed that it would be unrealistic to attempt to have 1977 bargaining governed by the legislation. For these reasons the bill has been modified to provide that single-trade province-wide bargaining be mandatory only on or after April 30, 1978, and that in the meantime all agreements concluded after January 1, 1977, but before April 30, 1978, be deemed to expire on April 30, 1978, regardless of their stipulated expiry dates.

The other amendments are of a more technical nature. The designation procedure has been somewhat modified to provide for greater flexibility in devising designation orders and in resolving problems that may be encountered. The other technical change relates to the repeal of outstanding accreditation orders in the industrial, commercial and institutional sector of the construction industry as employer bargaining agencies are designated. This change is to guard against the possibility of conflicting bargaining rights and recognizes that the concept of the bill supersedes the pre-existing accreditation procedures of the Act for this sector.

I am pleased to report to the members of the House that the contents of the bill which I am introducing today have broad support from both labour and management in the industrial, commercial and institutional sector of the construction industry. The degree of bipartisan support and encouragement continues to be encouraging to us. However, all members will appreciate that this bill embodies a unique labour relations concept—a new departure in the structure of collective bargaining, if you will—and therefore, as I said in December, the government must carefully monitor the new process as it evolves.

As the monitoring proceeds I will not hesitate to recommend changes as circumstances may require. But having said that, I am optimistic that the bill will result in significant improvements to the collective bargaining process in this very important sector of the construction industry, and, I believe, will assist it to operate effectively and responsibly in the post-control economy which lies before us.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

JOBS FOR YOUTH

Mr. Lewis: A question if I may, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier: Given the breakdown of figures for youth unemployment, which has jumped 28 per cent over this time last year, up to 143,000 now, can the Premier indicate to us more specifically

the number of jobs he expects to be created through the initiatives his government is taking? Even more than that, given the exact reference in the Throne Speech to student employment related to services to the aged, how many jobs are we talking about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there was reference to this very important aspect in Her Honour's very excellent Throne Speech and—

Mr. Eakins: Cut out the games.

Mr. Breithaupt: Written by whom?

Mr. Roy: Is he out of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Breithaupt: If you had written it yourself, it couldn't have been better.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I've been here a relatively short period of time and I don't really recall Her Honour making a better Throne Speech than was delivered on Tuesday. I think she should be congratulated on it.

Mr. Lewis: It was Her Honour's swan song.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it was not Her Honour's swan song; I've got to tell you that it was not.

Mr. Ferrier: Now you're being provocative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm not being provocative. I resent any implication that by my stating what an excellent speech it was, delivered by Her Honour, I am being at all provocative.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: How many jobs are you creating?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In reply to the Leader of the Opposition—and it is an important subject—I would ask him to be patient in terms of these issues being dealt with when the equally excellent budget of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) of this province will be presented in, roughly, two and a half weeks.

Mr. Sargent: It's a big grab bag, that's all.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: There was a reference to the budget, there was also a specific reference to the programme to provide jobs in conjunction with services to the aged as part of a Throne Speech initiative; can the Premier indicate to us how many jobs in that designated category?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this will be contained in the budget.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: Is the Premier, as a government, prepared to allow the removal of the summer savings requirement from the Ontario student aid programme as at least one small way to make it possible for students to—

Mr. Singer: That's not a supplementary, that's one of the initial questions.

Mr. Lewis: It is supplementary to jobs—in order to provide the access since the jobs are not there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm not as familiar as I used to be with the student award programme and I will only go by recollection. The question really should be properly directed to the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Parrott). But as I recall it, there is included in the programme a recognition, or they can account for the fact that they have not been able to get summer employment, that it has been a part of the approach to it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener-Wilmot has a supplementary.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I think it's a supplementary to the first question.

Mr. Speaker: We'll hear it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I asked a supplementary, which you permitted. I presume, therefore, that it remains on the first question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener-Wilmot with his supplementary.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier. Given that there are 10 applications for each Experience '77 opening in the province right now, and we're a long way from this coming summer, does the government propose to expand that programme, obviously to provide more jobs for 10 times as many students who are applying?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I guess my answer would be the same as I gave to the Leader of the Opposition which was, perhaps, not understood—I'll phrase it that way—by the hon. member. The details related to this government's programmes for young people and other areas of our economy will be contained in the budget of the Treasurer.

Mr. Cassidy: How soon does the Premier intend that the government's programmes to help young workers, if there are any, will

start to take effect; that in view of the fact that six weeks ago, in the middle of February, one worker in every five of teen age and one worker in every eight of the age of 20 to 24, was out of a job in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the hon. member that we intend them to take effect, as they have in other years, related to the government's programme of employing young people internally within the government, or incentives or other approaches we may wish to discuss; they will relate to the same period of time they have in other years. I think the answer is really very obvious. If the hon. member wants me to restate it, I've restated it.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary from the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: This is really supplementary to the Leader of the Opposition's second question. Can the Premier assure the House that even if his programme, which will be announced by the budget, is not successful in giving employment to all of the young people, particularly university students who are looking for employment, that no student will be hindered from continuing education by reason of the fact that he or she could not earn, in the province of Ontario, the amount of money prescribed by the student award programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will restate for the hon. member the basic philosophy in the student award programme which—

Mr. Sargent: Give him the budget, if it will be in the budget.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, who knows about all of these issues of course, that there isn't a government in this country that has had, and still has, as comprehensive a programme for student assistance as does the government of the province of Ontario. There isn't one; there isn't one. It is not as good in Manitoba; it's not as good in Saskatchewan; it's not as good in Prince Edward Island. Name any other province—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order.

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't finished answering yet.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The basic philosophy behind the programme is very simple, and that is to assist those students who have legitimate needs so that a student can have access to our post-secondary institutions which is not predicated upon economic resource.

Mr. Nixon: So the government is waiving the minimum summer requirement; the minimum summer earning requirement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I announced that as a final supplementary. There was some question—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There was some question as to whether there were separate questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I ruled that there was one question; the second part, which some construed as a question, was related to the first one. The hon. Leader of the Opposition may now ask his second question.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the facts but I am sure the Premier is wrong, about those comparisons.

May I ask the Minister of Housing if I could, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. B. Stephenson: The facts have never bothered the member before.

Mr. Lewis: Well can't I work on faith?

Interjections.

HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Housing: I have here a list of the outline of the new home ownership programme, through land sales and private sector participation, applied to 20 or 30 communities across Ontario; the AHOP and non-AHOP sales intended, land and housing. Can I ask the minister: (a) why none of this, I think, has yet been made public, although you have tender calls intended for the immediate future; and (b) why has the minister not discussed this with the key municipalities involved, which should surely have some sense of what the government intends within their own perimeters?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I would have to ask the hon. member if he could let me see that material because I don't believe I have seen it, the material he's referring to. I quite frankly admit that I am not sure what it is.

Mr. Martel: You need a shredder, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I may have seen it and I may not relate it to his question. If he can send it to me, I would like to look at it, but I don't think I can answer him properly at this time.

Mr. Sargent: Are you running Liberal next time?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There won't be very many around, I'll tell the member that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it sounds fair that it should be difficult to answer if the minister hasn't seen it. May I ask him, therefore, by way of an anticipatory supplementary, that he explain when he answers how it is that the government has driven the land cost up to almost the maximum possible level, therefore increasing the cost of housing in and out of AHOP.

Can I send it over to the minister? I will send it over to him. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Speaker. you have to cut that nonsense off.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there is a supplementary to that we will hear it.

Mr. Singer: To the anticipatory supplementary question; is that what we are going to have?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, so I can hear.

Mr. Breaugh: The question is it might just simply be a question of the minister's memory. Is it true that this programme was announced, some six weeks before a public announcement was made at a private gathering at a place called La Scala on Bay Street, to some selected builders and developers? Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I would have to bow to the hon. member's regular visits to La Scala; I haven't been there for the last six weeks so it certainly wasn't made by me.

Mr. Breithaupt: Must have been a select committee day.

ONTARIO FINANCES

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a question to the Treasurer: In view, Mr. Speaker, of the special edition of Ontario Finances indicating "a poorer economic performance than originally anticipated in the province of Ontario"; is the Treasurer continuing to forecast, as he did previously, five per cent real growth in the Ontario economy in 1977?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I imagine that will be something which I will forecast again, in some form or another, in the budget.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the failure of the economy to live up to its previous forecast, to result in a shortfall of revenue of $169 million; in view of the Conference Board estimate, who have now downwardly revised their estimate to 2.9 per cent and that downward revision was only for Ontario and Quebec; how can the Treasurer continue to stick to his previous estimate of government expenditures, which he discussed with us in this House prior to the breakup of the last session?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I'm not clear on the question. Is the member advocating a higher rate of expenditure?

Mr. S. Smith: If I may just clarify the question, Mr. Speaker: Since the rate of expenditure is presumably linked to the anticipated growth in the economy and since the forecast the Treasurer gave was five per cent, in view of the fact that his previous estimate was overly optimistic and in view of the fact that the Conference Board in Canada, as one forecaster—a distinguished group—have now lowered their prediction to 2.9 per cent, how can he continue to be so optimistic in predicting a five per cent rate, having tied the expenditures, presumably, to that anticipated rate of growth?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the expenditures aren't necessarily linked to the rate of growth of the economy. In fact, some would argue that they should be countercyclical; I'm not making that argument. Presumably the rate of growth in revenues would be more closely linked to the rate of growth of the economy rather than to the expenditures in the short run. In the long run, of course, I think there's general feeling on this side of the House and, indeed, elsewhere that if government expenditure continues to climb ultimately it, too, affects the rate of growth of the economy.

Mr. Cassidy: Will the Treasurer agree that the statement he just gave to the House was dissembling to the degree that it dealt with cash requirements and not the budgetary statement? Will he agree that the budgetary deficit for the province of Ontario, which he forecast at being less than a billion dollars in his original budget, is now forecast to be $302 million higher; and that the budgetary revenue of the province of Ontario, which he was suggesting was down by $100 million or so, in effect will be down by $247 million? Isn't that misleading the House?

Mr. Lewis: My goodness, this is going to be a good session.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as members opposite continually treat net cash requirements as a deficit as opposed to cash requirements, we deal with cash requirements. The figures are there; interpret them as you wish.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton West?

Mr. Lewis: Come back with my material, John.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Sarnia with a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: May we presume from the Throne Speech and the Treasurer's continuation of the agreement with the federal government under the anti-inflation programme, that the Treasurer of Ontario still regards inflation as a more significant hazard to the economy of this province than the obvious downturn that's now taking place?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's somewhat removed. It's a good question but somewhat removed from the—

Mr. Bullbrook: It has nothing to do with La Scala, I realize that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: It isn't anticipatory either.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton West with his second question.

HOME BUYER GRANTS

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Minister of Revenue: Would the minister tell the House how much money, precisely, the government has now recovered of the close to $10 million in illegal first-time home buyer grants?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I cannot provide this information precisely at this time but I will do this in a few days.

Mr. Sargent: I bet you will!

Mr. Sweeney: Different ministry, same answer.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary: Can the minister tell us, Mr. Speaker, whether any money has been paid out in second instalments to persons already identified as ineligible recipients of these particular grants?

Mr. Sargent: Unfair question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I think, Mr. Speaker, that if such a situation had arisen it would be entirely as a result of error on our part, because such would not be our intent. However, I think there have been instances in which second cheques have gone out and their return has been asked.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary: Since the minister is aware, apparently, that some cheques have been returned, can she give us any estimate whatsoever of how much money has been recovered and whether any second instalments were sent out when the money should not have been, and have not been returned?

Mr. Sargent: Ask the former minister, he'll tell you.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I'll have to provide this in a reply in a few days, Mr. Speaker.

NUCLEAR WASTE

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy. I would like to ask the minister, now that he has made a statement in the press that the Madoc site is inappropriate for the disposal of nuclear waste materials, if he would care to share with the House his reasons for making that statement and what evidence he has to justify such an outburst?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Outburst?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I gather the hon. member is opposed to the position; although he's stated it incorrectly, as usual.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Does he want the short reply or the long reply?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the hon. minister answer the question that was asked, please? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I stated that I was categorically opposed to the proposed nuclear waste site in Madoc. I made that statement for a very simple reason, and that was that in my estimation there should be no Crown agency or government going into an area and telling the local people what its intentions are without consulting with those people.

Mr. Nixon: That's what you do with garbage dumps.

Mr. Cassidy: You get sillier all the time.

Mr. Breithaupt: What about the Hydro programme?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Regardless of what the potential merits may have been, once that course of action is taken, in my estimation it erases the potential for a site in that location.

Mr. Riddell: Take that story to the Bradley-Georgetown people.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Durham East.

Mr. Moffatt: Perhaps it is inappropriate to style the press release as a statement—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a supplementary, please?

Mr. Moffatt: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

Given that answer then, I would like to know if that is the same kind of response which municipalities like the town of Newcastle in the region of Durham will get when it comes to the placing of a nuclear power plant in Darlington?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Again, if the hon. member is opposed to a nuclear power plant in Darlington—is he opposed to that? All right.

Mr. Lewis: No, no.

Mr. Moffatt: Answer it.

Mr. Warner: Answer the question.

Mr. Breithaupt: We ask them, you answer them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can't hear the answer. Will the hon. minister answer the question that was asked?

Mr. Warner: He doesn't have an answer.

Mr. Riddell: You won't be any further ahead after.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, surely the member must appreciate that they are not parallel at all.

Mr. McClellan: What a limited principle that was.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member should know.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In the case of the Madoc site there was an agency of the federal government, AECL, that went in there in advance of government policy. I do not think that a Crown agency should be going into an area in advance of government policy which may fix the government's position.

Mr. Breithaupt: You wouldn't do that.

Mr. Sargent: Did the former Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell), tell you that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A final supplementary from the member for Renfrew North.

Mr. Conway: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, given your statements about Madoc and given the importance of the nuclear dump question, how do you feel about Chalk River becoming a dumping site for the nuclear waste products?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question had to do with Madoc and that's not Chalk River.

Mr. S. Smith: What is Darlington?

Mr. Singer: It is anticipatory.

RAILWAY LAND AT ERIEAU

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister aware that in the county of Kent the village of Erieau has 92 acres of land owned by the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company? Is he aware that 67 homes of citizens in that village are built on that property, and 24 of these homes are those of senior citizens, widows and widowers; and that this is creating a hardship to those people?

The price of these leases in the past was as low as $24 and now they have increased them to $727. Others were as low as $45 and they have now increased the leases to $1,302. The citizens of this village have tried to purchase these lots from the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, is there a question? I have difficulty hearing it.

Mr. Sargent: It is a good question.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a good question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Spence: The council of this municipality has tried to purchase these leases from the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, yet the railway says it will only sell the property—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You are making quite a speech. I haven't heard a question yet. Will the hon. member ask his question?

Mr. Spence: All right, I'll cut 'er down.

Mr. Sargent: Having said that—

[2:45]

Mr. Spence: This municipality can't deal with this Ohio railway, and I ask the government if it would enter in and deal with this problem of the citizens of the village of Erieau; because no municipality can deal with it, I ask the government to take action. Will the minister do this; will he act?

Mr. Roy: You got your two questions out.

Mr. Sargent: Get your shin pads on.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, if I wasn't aware, I am now; but I was aware. In fact, I know the hon. member realizes the people of that particular community know they were paying very low rent, because those figures he was quoting were per year on the properties.

Secondly, I'm sure he knows this ministry did try to purchase the property. There is a difference of over 100 per cent between our appraised value and the asking price. I think he has to realize that the purchase of that property by this government would not necessarily solve the problems of the people in the community, because they live on land that would be totally unacceptable for housing if this government owned it. The lots are overlapping, the deeds are confused, they are substandard sizes and there are sewage problems. The first thing that would have to happen is probably a clearance of that land for park purposes, and I don't see how that would solve the problems of the people at all—

Mr. Conway: It sounds like one of you would like to buy it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —because they're interested in tenure, they're not interested in us creating a park there; I'm sure he agrees with that.

Mr. Good: What are you going to do about it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: As a park it does not have a high priority, because this ministry has a number of requirements for park lands and I'm afraid that's somewhat down the list.

Mr. Spence: Supplementary: Is the minister going to let these citizens lose their homes in the village of Erieau? This is a serious matter to the council and the citizens of that village and the county of Kent.

Hon. F. S. Miller: What I've tried to point out to the hon. member is that the purchase of that land by the province would probably end their tenure much faster than an agreement with the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway.

Mr. Sargent: You are the bad guys.

SUDBURY-SAULT RAIL SERVICE

Mr. Wildman: I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the provincial government's recent offer, announced by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) in Sault Ste. Marie, to have the ONTC take over the CPR Budd car service between Sudbury and the Sault, and the statement in the House of Commons yesterday by the Hon. Otto Lang that he would be willing to facilitate negotiations between the ONR and the CPR, can the Minister of Transportation and Communications describe for the House what proposals he has made to the federal minister regarding arrangements for such a takeover?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I have made no proposals for such a takeover. As a matter of fact this is the first I've heard of it.

Mr. Angus: He doesn't know what you were talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a supplementary to that?

An hon. member: The minister should hang around La Scala a little more.

Mr. Wildman: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the member for Algoma have a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Maybe I should have a supplementary. As the hon. member I'm sure knows, I have been out of town for the last three days, just arriving back this morning, and there may be something in my mail that I'm not aware of.

An hon. member: The Minister of Housing can look after the shop for you.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I don't see how there could be a supplementary from a non-answer. I'm serious about that.

Mr. Reid: If you're serious about that, be consistent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think members should realize they don't have to ask that second question and call it a supplementary. If there isn't an answer given, if there's a promise to give an answer, well then, let's wait till that answer comes.

Mr. Sargent: He should know something, though.

Mr. Speaker: I don't see how there can possibly be a supplementary to that particular question so I will hear the member for Ottawa East—his question that is.

Mr. Reid: The hon. Leader of the Opposition did that, Mr. Speaker. All I'm looking for is consistency.

TRADUCTION DES STATUTS
TRANSLATION OF STATUTES

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just to keep up with the proceedings of Tuesday: j'ai une question pour le procureur général. Je veux demander au procureur général, Monsieur l'orateur, pourquoi vu l'établissement des cours en français en Ontario, celui-ci ou son gouvernement n'a pas accepté des subventions du gouvernement du Canada pour traduire les statuts de l'Ontario en français.

Did you get that?

Mr. Speaker, I will be kind. But I did want to emphasize the problem. I want to ask the Attorney General, in view of the fact that he is establishing French courts in Ontario, and in Ottawa specifically in July, can he explain why his government has refused grants from the federal government of $500,000 for the translation of Ontario statutes?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The cost of translating all of the Ontario statutes would be very considerable. The $500,000 that the member refers to would cover at very best a tiny fraction of the cost. While the proposal is a laudatory one, I think the appropriateness of this proposal is a question that might well be directed, for example, to the provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Peterson: Nice move.

Mr. Roy: Would the Treasurer like it?

Mr. Speaker: Order please, a supplementary now.

Mr. Roy: My supplementary to whichever minister, including the Premier, if he chooses to answer—

Mr. Speaker: The question was asked of the Attorney General.

Mr. Roy: —is, given the minister's answer that, having some statutes in French is a logical conclusion of pleading in the French-language courts, would the minister not have felt that it would be a good start to do like Manitoba and the province of New Brunswick and accept over the last five years $100,000 a year at least to start the translation of some of these statutes? And would the minister advise whether he would accept the grants for the year 1977 to start the translation of statutes?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Perhaps I may be ill-informed, but it has not been my understanding that there are any such grants available for translation, for example, of two or three statutes. I agree The Highway Traffic Act would be a good place to start, and we are looking at that.

My understanding is that these funds that the member refers to that are purportedly available from Ottawa are not available on a statute-by-statute basis.

Mr. Breithaupt: You should start there.

Mr. Peterson: To the Attorney General: Would it not be his legal opinion that it would be very difficult to have a French court operating with statutes in a different language? Does he not agree that that would make the legal technicalities for the judge and the various people involved very complicated, and that this programme should be undertaken post haste?

Mr. Roy: Just say yes.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Obviously it would be of assistance to have the sections that are generally used in relation to criminal prosecutions available in both languages, and we are endeavouring to do that.

Mr. Cassidy: You just said you were not.

ALLEGED OHIP FRAUDS

Mr. Dukszta: I have a question of the Minister of Health. In view of the decisions

reached in a divisional court of the Supreme Court of Ontario, firstly in the matter between Robert Louis Archambeault and the optometry review committee of the College of Optometry of Ontario; and secondly, in the matter between Dr. Joseph Y. Wakil and the medical review committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, where in both these cases the court held that there has been a denial of natural justice, my first question is what specific action is the minister contemplating to bring forcibly to the attention of professional governing bodies the need to adhere strictly to the principles of natural justice? Two, what action is the minister contemplating to amend immediately The Statutory Powers Procedure Act, The Health Disciplines Act and The Health Insurance Act? Or is the minister not interested in recovering the OHIP money which was alleged to have been overpaid?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I noticed a little dig at the end of the question, which was really unnecessary because he knows very well that my interest, the interest of my predecessor, and the interest of the government are very clear in recovering any funds that should not have been paid out. On the question relating to the court decisions—

Mr. Singer: Like in housing grants when you did it twice.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —I am reviewing this with the officials of my ministry and of OHIP to determine whether amendments to the legislation are necessary or whether it can be accommodated through administrative changes.

MAPLE LANDFILL PROJECT

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment with respect to the proposed Maple garbage dump.

In view of the fact that an industry which is three-quarters controlled by American interests has made a proposal to establish in Maple what is tantamount to being Canada's largest garbage dump on an overgrown garbage bag, with the resultant threat of contamination of the water supply for Maple and for the town of Richmond Hill, will the ministry intervene with the Environmental Assessment Board and direct that board to apply the available rules of procedure which would require the applicants to submit briefs on alternative proposals, both dealing with site and alternative methods of garbage disposal?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is not absolutely necessary for the applicant to provide alternative sites or alternative methods of disposing of waste. The applicant, of course, has to make its case out as far as the proposed site is concerned. That is something that could be asked for by intervenors, by people who are parties to that hearing. For example, anybody intervening could say that an alternative site within a few miles would be less environmentally dangerous than the proposed site. But that isn't required of the applicant.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the ministry has changed its mind already in these hearings—taking a stand against the applicants at the beginning and then in March, this month, 1977, changing its attitude towards these applicants—what is the attitude of the ministry with respect to what is virtually an American-owned monopoly in this situation? Again, I direct the minister's attention to the resultant threat of contamination of the water supplies.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The latter part of the hon. member's supplementary is what is important to us. The fact that it may be an American-controlled company is not at issue here; this is a question of whether or not this is a safe site. The Environmental Assessment Board is hearing the application at the present time. I am not aware that the ministry has changed its mind at all. I don't believe the ministry has given an official opinion on this site at all at this point. It has been asked for information and for technical evidence and material. The hearings have been adjourned to about mid-May to enable the ministry to provide that material. I am not aware that there has been any change of mind.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he is planning to hire consultants to assist him in the preparation of this supplementary submission that the board has asked for. I understand consultants were hired for the first brief which appears to have been now withdrawn by the ministry. Is he preparing, with the assistance of consultants, a further statement which will state whether the minister opposes this particular proposal?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is quite possible that we will require some outside help.

Mr. Reed: Do revelations of this nature and requests of this nature not indicate to the minister at long last that the recommendation that might be made by the ministry would be

the alternative recommendation of resource recovery?

An hon. member: Never.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, this is something we have made to many municipalities, most of the municipalities in Ontario; many of them have taken advantage of a very generous capital financing programme to do just that.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Samis: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Can the minister indicate to the House when we can expect some action in the field of French-language health services along the lines suggested by the Dubois report? Can he indicate what priority his ministry is giving to achieving these changes? Thirdly, can he tell us whether his attitude towards implementing the changes is very different from that of his predecessor as was widely reported in the press before Christmas?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. member and to the House that the matters covered by the "pas de problème" report are a very high priority with me and that I hope to bring recommendations to my colleagues in the cabinet within the next three to four weeks.

[3:00]

Mr. Samis: Supplementary: Can I ask if we can expect immediate action on one of the principal recommendations, namely the appointing of a director of French-language programmes within the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That is part of the review of the total report which we are making within the ministry. We have sought the comments of some of our sister ministries, which we would hope to have completed by this week, so that we can bring the whole matter, including the question of staffing, as a package to my colleagues.

BENEFITS RATES

Mr. R. S. Smith: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Community and Social Services, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister indicate to the House when he intends to adjust the family benefits rates, as well as those of GWA, both of which have not been adjusted for at least two years? Over that period, the inflation that has taken place has more than eaten up any increases that were given then.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I—

[Applause]

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Now the hon. minister.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I don't have them any longer; my staff took care of that.

Mr. Speaker, the question that's raised by the hon. member opposite is one that is under active consideration by the ministry at the present time—

Mr. Cassidy: That is, before you said it.

Some hon. members: Sit down.

Mr. Lewis: Show us your social conscience, Keith.

Mr. S. Smith: He is not the gingerbread man.

Mr. Nixon: You have learned well.

Mr. Cassidy: That is a recycled answer if I ever heard one.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we would like to hear the answer.

Hon. Mr. Norton: It was one of the first things to which I directed my interest when I assumed my present duties and it is something that had been initiated by my predecessor. I would hope that there will be an announcement in the very near future. You also understand of course that it's not a determination for me alone, but the whole of the cabinet, and I would expect an early decision on that.

Mr. Roy: Really?

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps the Treasurer?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that the last time we asked this question that his predecessor indicated that representations were then in the process of being made to cabinet and to Management Board and that was last fall? I wonder what happened to those representations and just how long it takes to process that type of representation?

Mrs. Campbell: Take it to cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I thought I had acknowledged that I realized my predecessor had

initiated this procedure to the policy field, I believe, at that point—

Mr. Sargent: He didn't either.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —and the matter is much further along the line now. That's why I suggest the members will probably be hearing a relatively early announcement.

Mr. Good: Are you against it?

Mr. Roy: Your former boss used to say "in the fullness of time."

Ms. Sandeman: Supplementary: When the minister is making his calculations and doing his surveys could he assure the House that the family benefits rates will be based on actual budgetary needs which take into account the actual cost of components of the benefits, such as the actual costs of hydro rates, the actual costs of fuel, and not some figure plucked out of the air?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I can assure the hon. member that in arriving at the new level full consideration will be given to the increased costs in the areas that she has cited—

Mr. Sargent: In the fullness of time.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —taking into consideration, of course, the resources that are at our disposal to meet those needs.

With respect to the question of fuel consumption though, I think there may be a misconception on the part of the hon. member, as there is on the part of many people, that in fact it is already possible under the existing programmes to meet the actual cost of fuel. There is a figure that is arrived at, an estimated cost which is payable on a monthly basis. At the end of the heating season if the recipient is in a position to present bills indicating that his costs for fuel have exceeded the amount allowable, he can be reimbursed for the full amount of the costs of his fuel.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: I wanted to ask the minister if he was considering setting into the FBA costs an energy supplement so that in the future the high cost of energy wouldn't have an adverse monthly effect on the individual; the individual wouldn't have to wait until the end of the winter season, or the cold season.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I have discussed with my staff various methods that we might introduce to try to compensate for the shortfall that people experience on a monthly basis. I realize that is a hardship for some people and it has caused some difficulty in people's relationship with their fuel supplier. We would like to find a remedy for that.

Mr. Deans: I have one supplementary. Even if it were true that they were able to be reimbursed for any over-expenditure incurred, where would the minister propose that they get the money during the winter months to pay for it as they require it?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I have indicated to the question that the shortfall creates a real problem for many people and I have also indicated in my response to the previous question that I have under discussion with my staff methods which we might introduce to try to counteract the problem people face on a month-to-month basis. I would hope, as soon as we have a solution, to announce it to the members of the House.

Mr. Deans: Did you ever think of just giving them more money?

INCOME TAX REBATES

Mr. Davison: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Will the minister inform the House as to when he intends to introduce legislation to control the practice of discounting income-tax rebates in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the hon. member's interest in this and the fact that he has written an open letter to me asking me to acquaint myself with the practices of other jurisdictions. We're fully aware of the practice in other jurisdictions. I'll be sending the hon. member a reply to his letter very shortly. The answer is that the other provinces have introduced legislation which is completely unconstitutional. They know it, but they're doing it and trying to pull a bluff.

Mr. Warner: You are trying to protect the consumer?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They're trying to pull a bluff on the tax rebaters. I don't see any purpose of bringing in legislation which could be successfully challenged in the courts.

Mr. Peterson: Oh, come on now. That's not a proposal.

Mr. Roy: You have enough court cases, right?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have asked the federal government, on a number of occasions—I have just written this week to the Minister of National Revenue, the Hon. Monique Bégin, asking her to make a simple amendment to The Income Tax Act which would put a stop to the practice on a national basis.

Mr. Davison: Surely what we're interested in is action—

Mr. Speaker: Question? This is not a debate. Have you a question, please?

Mr. Davison: Surely what we're interested in is action. The other provinces have got—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a further question?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is not a time for debate. It's a time for a question and answer.

Mr. Davison: Why can't this government do something to protect citizens who are being gouged? Let's have some action instead of talk.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, this government has never hesitated to act within its power.

Mr. Roy: Even without its power.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The question of interest is so clearly a federal jurisdiction that even in the province of Quebec has not challenged it.

Mr. Peterson: Hire McMurtry as a lawyer, then go ahead.

Mr. Renwick: Does the minister understand that the people who are being ripped off are the very people who obtained their rebate under the Ontario tax credit system implemented by this assembly? Is there not some way that this assembly can prohibit the cashing of those cheques by persons other than the payees?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, that question might properly be better addressed to the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener) who negotiates the agreement with the federal government. We have asked—

Mr. Renwick: Let me repeat it to the Minister of Revenue, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I just want to put forward what we have done from our ministry. We have asked the Minister of National Revenue to put in a simple amendment which would require the person receiving a tax rebate to receive it directly without being able to assign it. It's a simple matter.

Mr. Renwick: Meanwhile, you stop them.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, one supplementary: May I ask, to the minister's knowledge has any of the other legislation in any jurisdiction been successfully challenged in court?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, it hasn't been successfully challenged because—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, they are simply ignoring the legislation. The Minister of Consumer Services, the Hon. Kenneth Rafe Mair, who has just tabled legislation in British Columbia, has written to the Minister of National Revenue in Ottawa pointing out that he doesn't feel this legislation will stand up and will she please act.

UTDC FOREIGN CONTRACTS

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Will the minister tell the House whether the Urban Transportation Development Corporation still plans to hire foreign sales agents in co-operation with your ministry?

Mr. Sargent: He has been away. Don't ask him that.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not totally aware of what the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Cassidy: You are not aware of very much today, are you?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The urban transit—

Mr. Conway: Have you got Foley a nomination yet?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The interjections do not help.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Urban Transportation—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —Development Corporation, in conjunction with the Hawker Siddeley Company and through the co-operation of the federal Export Development Corp., did submit a bid on a foreign contract in

Venezuela, that being one of the contracts on the Caracas subway, and a consortium did use the services of a commercial agent in Venezuela.

Mr. Cunningham: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will we know who these agents are, how much they are being paid, what the basis of our arrangement with them was and the extent of their commission? Also given the fact that we have had some difficulties with the CANDU reactor sales with the federal government, would you not agree that we should discourage some kind of practice like that?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be prepared to give any information the hon. member wants. It is my understanding at this time that it is very unlikely that the Canadian bid will be successful. Consequently no funds will be paid to the agent.

HEALTH AND SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. Mackenzie: To the Minister of Labour: I ask how the minister expects the various national and international unions to notify their local unions to appear before the public inquiry hearings on the new omnibus safety and health legislation as she requested in her letter. The hearings started today, and her letter dated March 23 was only received on March 28 in many cases. How does she expect the local unions to appear before those hearings with only three days' or even two weeks' notice. Further, would she not extend the hearings to other areas of the province, particularly to the Sault and Kingston?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the specific groups involved in the hearings which are going on today in Sudbury had been informed at an earlier time, although they had not received the questionnaire until unfortunately Her Majesty's late mail delivered it to them. I am sorry that I have no control over Post Canada, but we did attempt to send through the mail the letters and the questionnaires to those groups who would be meeting early, at the earliest possible date. There were some that were sent out later because they were those meetings which are going to be held at the end of April, but we have attempted to provide them with the information as far before the meetings as possible. It was not possible however to take the mails into account.

Mr. Mackenzie: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister then not also consider, as requested by the steel workers, the draft legislation being submitted so that we can have some meaningful public dialogue on what we are trying to do with this important bill. You want this kind of input in Bill 176, why not in this bill that covers all of the workers?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, there is apparently some misinformation floating around that there is draft legislation. When we began the development—when we discussed Bill 139 in fact and I talked about the development of the omnibus bill—I promised personally that we would carry out as full consultative procedures as possible in the development of the omnibus bill. That is precisely what we are doing at this time.

These meetings are consultative meetings to hear the concerns and the opinions of both employers and employees throughout the full range and scope of industry in the province of Ontario. We are attempting to get as much information as we can from those people who are directly related to the concerns which will be contained within the omnibus bill. There is no draft legislation at this time. None.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate whether she is going to permit the media to take their pencils in, since she has denied them the other tools of their trade in covering these meetings?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that it seems to be difficult for the hon. member to read the newspapers but it was announced on radio and it was also published in the newspapers today that indeed they could take both their pads and their pencils into the meeting.

Mr. Lewis: And leave their recorders at the door.

Hon. B. Stephenson: These meetings, sir, are specifically intended to provide full information to the Ministry of Labour which is charged with the responsibility of developing this legislation. They are not intended for any other purpose and if there is any inhibitory effect produced by any external presence within those meetings, then it is not going to be of assistance to either the workers of this province or the people of this province. Therefore we have asked the press to function as efficiently and as responsibly as possible by not cluttering the meetings with extra paraphernalia.

MILK PRICES

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I would address this question to the Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. Lewis: Freedom of the press is a very new idea.

Mr. Kerrio: —but there may be some involvement with the Ministry of Consumer Affairs. Is the minister aware of the threat to the business of many small independent dairies because of the practice of large corporate corner-store owners selling milk as a loss-leader?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, yes, I am fully aware of what the member is talking about. We just finished a meeting about three weeks ago. The opposition critics sat through it with the various commodity boards, with the various retailers, with the various chain store groups, and discussed this whole matter. Not only that, I just finished releasing a report for the Ontario Milk Commission on the whole pricing of milk in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Roy: What are you going to do about it?

[3:15]

Mr. Kerrio: A supplementary: I have a copy of that report, and I would question this particular matter in regard to this report as a wholesale and retail pricing practice. My further concern has to do with the thousands of jobs that are in jeopardy for the deliverers to the home in this province. I think there are something like 8,000 or 10,000 delivery people involved. They can't compete with a loss-leader—

Mr. Speaker: The question?

Mr. Kerrio: The question is, are we going to follow up this particular report and get down to the retail level and some control, so that these thousands of jobs will not be lost to these workers who deliver milk to the door, if you keep a fair and equitable price between what they can deliver for and a loss-leader at the corner store?

Hon. W. Newman: I would like to point out to the hon. member that milk is formula priced as far as the farmers are concerned. It has been, in the past, sold as a loss-leader by some of the larger companies, but certainly that report is in and we are studying it at this point in time. I think the report does recommend that there be some monitoring done. Also, as a result of the other meeting which dealt with the overall picture, which we had about three weeks ago, we're looking at the total picture right now.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the government's food council has been studying the whole issue of loss-leaders since last July or August, what was the purpose of the meeting that the minister convened? How many cooks is he going to get in to stir this broth before he does something about the issue?

Hon. W. Newman: If I understand the member correctly, he'd like to legislate it out of business.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. W. Newman: Okay, you've made your position very clear.

Mr. Lewis: Always do.

Hon. W. Newman: We had a public, open meeting with the press there so they could hear the comments of all the people concerned. That's why I had the meeting, so everybody would know exactly what was happening. Our food council has also been—

Interjection.

Hon. W. Newman: You talk about—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, the member for Sudbury East. We will get to a new question at this time. The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Will the minister answer the letter—

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, the member for Sudbury East. There's been too much debate going on here.

The member for Sudbury East, finally.

INDUSTRIAL DEAFNESS

Mr. Martel: Will the new minister answer my letters to his predecessor of July 13, January 6 and January 12, concerning industrial deafness? These were letters which attempted to obtain from the minister agreements he had made in his office in July pertaining to the industrial deaf, namely,

that he would ask the health council in Sudbury to establish speech therapy and lip-reading courses and that he would ask his colleagues in cabinet to exclude new employers who are hiring men suffering industrial deafness from being charged any responsibility for damages suffered while working for another employer, thus encouraging the new employer to hire someone who is industrially deaf. Despite three efforts to get it in writing, will the minister now concede or write what the government intends to do with respect to these 800 men in the Sudbury basin?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I don't believe the hon. member has written to me since I assumed my responsibility. I must tell him I have not seen that correspondence from him to my predecessor. I will pull all of it from the files, review it, and write to him as to our position.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: Would the minister in his reply also tell me who is responsible for the testing of workers and the work place, and if the government is going to force those figures to be released to the workers so they would know as quickly as they started to suffer industrial deafness that they were in fact in jeopardy?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will review all that. It would be helpful if the member would put in a letter to me the full extent of his concern.

VOTING QUALIFICATIONS

Mr. Eakins: To the Treasurer: Now that the Citizenship Act has been proclaimed, does he anticipate that the voting qualifications for provincial elections and municipal elections would change?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would anticipate that that would happen. I think the first thing we would want to do is to look to our own statutes here in terms of provincial elections, and then we would move to The Municipal Act.

MAPLE LANDFILL PROJECT

Ms. Bryden: I have two new questions for the Minister of the Environment regarding the Maple landfill situation. The hearings have now gone on for 45 days. In view of the fact that hearings of this length obviously take up a great deal of time and make it very difficult for citizens' groups to appear, is the ministry considering funding any of the citizens' groups or individuals who are opposing the application? That's my first question.

My second one is, now that The Environmental Assessment Act section applying it to the private sector has been proclaimed as of January 1977, is the minister prepared to designate this particular operation under that Act so that the hearings can be held under The Environmental Assessment Act instead of The Environmental Protection Act where the requirements are more stringent and give more opportunity for participation by various parties?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We haven't any policy as far as funding private interveners is concerned. In some cases, in hearings under The Environmental Assessment Act we have indicated we may consider funding some groups. We are thinking of that, for example, in the Reed proposal. But as of now under this circumstance the answer would be no.

As to the second part, although the Act was proclaimed in January, we still would have to bring in regulations applying to a specific private undertaking. I indicated that that would not be done until some time in the latter part of this year, until the Act itself and the hearing procedures have had a little more experience.

As the hon. member said, we've had at least 45 days of hearings. I expect there will be at least that many more. To start now all over again under new legislation would really drive the people she is worried about up the wall.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

PETITIONS

Mr. Lawlor: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I have 977 signatures affecting the glassworkers of Ontario, particularly the United Glass and Ceramic Workers of America, Local 200, which is in my riding, with respect to the banning and the policy of the government with respect to non-returnable pop bottles. Since this isn't in precisely technical adequate form, I would ask that these documents be placed in the hands of the minister to carefully peruse the same.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If this is a petition to a ministry it is not proper to come

before the House at this particular time. You can go directly to the ministry.

Mr. Lawlor: I read the rules of this House with great particularity and found that I didn't fall quite under them. I would have the things directed to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I just point out that I have—

Mr. Sargent: It is in the wastepaper basket now.

Mr. Speaker: I believe it has already gone across to the minister. We'll have something more to say about petitions later.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of over 5,000 Timiskaming residents, I would like to present to the Lieutenant Governor and to the members of this assembly a petition opposed to the excessive Ontario Hydro rate increase. In addition to their names, the people have affixed their addresses and phone numbers to the petition. In keeping with standing order 83(b), I have also signed the petition.

The petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, are opposed to the unjustifiably high rate increase imposed by Ontario Hydro on the people of Timiskaming. We strongly believe that Ontario Hydro should be limited to an eight to 10 per cent increase, the same way the wages of working people are limited to an eight to 10 per cent increase."

In keeping with the recent changes in the standing orders, I look forward to the government's response. Hopefully the government will agree to roll back Ontario Hydro's rate increase this year to eight to 10 per cent. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: May I just say about petitions, we'll have something more to say about this tomorrow.

As the members of the House are aware, I think if they read both rule 83 and other parts of our standing orders, the provisional rules governing our proceedings lay particular stress on the proper use of petitions and the response thereto. For this reason it is essential that petitions presented to this House are completely in order as prescribed by the standing orders of the House. For this reason I will take these petitions which have been presented today under consideration—I think the latter one is addressed to the House, the first one I think was not; we'll have to study those—and advise the House tomorrow whether they're in order and may be properly received by the House. At that time I will endeavour to make a more comprehensive statement respecting the rules and precedents governing petitions. Thank you.

Presenting reports.

REPORT

Mr. Renwick presented the second report of the select committee on the Ombudsman, and in accordance with the terms of reference asked that it be placed on the order paper for discussion.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I didn't hear that report completely. Is it for adoption?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the terms of reference, it goes on to the order paper for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I wasn't sure exactly what the hon. member said. Thank you.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Motion No. 2.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Point of order? All right. Before the motion, does the hon. member have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Bain: Point of order regarding petitions: When the Speaker is studying the matter for his report next day, could he also comment on the fact that in the fall session of 1975, I believe, there was a change. The Liberals supported us in that change that the petition section should be interpreted in the broad sense and that if the petition did not meet with the old procedure that the Speaker would see that it was forwarded to the appropriate minister. I understand that that precedent was an effort to broaden the scope of petitions so genuine concerns of people could be presented to this House.

Mr. Speaker: All these matters will be, I think, elucidated somewhat tomorrow. We've had a meeting with a good discussion on such things. As I say, if you read the new set of temporary rules under which we're operating for this session, it's placing a great deal more responsibility on the petition than before, and I think they want to be treated quite accurately. Certainly we'll be as helpful as we

can to all hon. members, but we'll clarify this matter more thoroughly tomorrow.

Introduction of bills.

[3:30]

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CROWN AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Kennedy moved first reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend The Proceedings against the Crown Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to clarify the law with respect to the right to garnishee the wages of a Crown employee who is employed by a Crown agency and whose salary or wages are not paid from the consolidated revenue fund, by providing that a Crown agency is subject to garnishment proceedings.

FAMILY LAW REFORM ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved first reading of Bill 6, An Act to reform the Law respecting Property Rights and Support Obligations between Married Persons and in Other Family Relationships.

Motion agreed to.

MARRIAGE ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved first reading of Bill 7, The Marriage Act, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

SUCCESSION LAW REFORM ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved first reading of Bill 8, An Act to reform the Law respecting Succession to the Estates of Deceased Persons.

Motion agreed to.

CHILDREN'S LAW REFORM ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved first reading of Bill 9, An Act to reform the Law respecting the Status of Children.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTIONS FINANCES REFORM AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Johnson moved first reading of Bill 10 An Act to amend The Elections Finances Reform Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, this bill permits newspapers which are published weekly or less frequently to accept election advertisements when the regular publication day comes on the day before polling day. The amendment is substantially the same as the recommendation of the commission on election contributions and expenses, contained in its second annual report.

PERSONAL PROPERTY SECURITY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of Bill 11, An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, this amendment will allow interested parties to gain access to the personal property security system by a motor-vehicle serial number. Previously all searches had to be conducted through the owner's name. The bill further provides the effective date of the amendment is to be April 1, which is tomorrow, and we are ready to put the system into operation then.

CLASS ACTIONS ACT

Mr. Lawlor moved first reading of Bill 12, An Act to provide for Class Actions.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lawlor: The Class Actions Act, 1977—the purpose of this bill is to provide statutory procedure whereby one or more persons may sue a defendant in the form of a class action. The bill is designed to achieve this purpose by permitting a person who wishes to sue on behalf of a class to apply for a court order authorizing the class action. Once the order is obtained, the action proceeds as a class action and the final judgement finds for all members of the class except those who have been excluded as well as the parties to the action.

OCCUPIERS' LIABILITY ACT

Mr. Lawlor moved first reading of Bill 13, An Act respecting Occupier's Liability.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, the bill replaces the common law as to occupiers' duty of care, replacing the common-law distinctions between duties to invitees, licensees, trespassers, with one common duty of care applied

to the circumstances of each case. The bill is in the form recommended by the Uniform Law Conference of Canada.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. B. Stephenson moved first reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 2

Hon. Mr. Welch moved resolution No. 2.

Resolved: That standing committees of the House, for the remainder of the present Parliament, be as follows: social development; resources development; administration of justice; general government; public accounts; statutory instruments; procedural affairs, and members' services.

That the House recommends this committee structure to future Legislatures.

That wherever possible, matters be referred to standing committees, thereby minimizing the necessity for select committees.

That a Speaker's panel is hereby established to consist of Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and chairman of committees of the whole House, the deputy chairman of committees of the whole House, and the chairman of all standing and select committees.

That committees schedule for consideration all matters referred to them after discussion by the Speaker's panel, as desirable; such scheduling shall ensure as far as possible that there is no interference with the business in the House, giving particular attention to clause 31 of the order of December 16, 1976, and such committee consideration shall not conflict with time-scheduling agreements made by the parties in consultation.

That the statutory instruments committee above referred to, include the committee provided for by section 12 of The Regulations Act, and have the terms of reference as set out in that section, and that the said committee, in addition to those powers, shall review and consider:

1. The role of the committee with particular reference to the recommendations of the select committee on the fourth and fifth reports of the Ontario commission on the Legislature, and the practices of the Parliaments of Canada and the United Kingdom, and

2. The establishment of guidelines to be observed in the delegation by statute of power to make statutory instruments and the use made of such delegated power. The said committee to report its recommendations to the House and that in addition to the normal powers of standing committees it shall have power to employ counsel and such other staff as the committee considers necessary.

That the procedural affairs committee review and report to the House its observations and opinions on the operation of the standing and provisional orders of the House or by Mr. Speaker from time to time and that the committee also have power to review the operation of particular boards, agencies and commissions, for which annual reports have been tabled in the House and referred to it, and the committee may review the operation of these bodies as it selects with a view to reducing possible redundancy and overlapping.

That the eight points in the first paragraph on page 29 of the second interim report of the select committee on the fourth and fifth reports of the commission on the Legislature respecting proposed powers of committees, stand referred to the procedural affairs committee.

That there be referred to the procedural affairs committee the recommendation of the select committee for the enlargement of the committee staff of the Clerk's office so that clerks may be permanently assigned to specific committees.

That the procedural affairs committee be appointed for the full life of this Parliament with no substitution of members, but that substitution be permitted on all other standing committees provided that notice of substitution be given to the chairman of the committee prior to the commencement of the meeting.

That the members' services committee examine the services to members from time to time, and without interfering with the statutory responsibility of the Board of Internal Economy in such matters the committee be empowered to recommend to the consideration of the House matters it wishes to draw to the special attention of the board.

That all standing committees have the normal powers to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon with the usual power to send for persons, papers and things, as pro-

vided in section 35 of The Legislative Assembly Act.

Resolution concurred in.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 1

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved resolution No. 1.

Resolved: That the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing April 1, 1977, and ending September 30, 1977, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker—by the way, nothing that I have to say here is to be construed as being either obstructive or manipulative of the government.

Mr. Breithaupt: Or even wanting in confidence.

Mr. Singer: Is that the new line?

Mr. Breithaupt: Sunshine and fight.

Mr. Lewis: That's the new line. Did you notice the co-operation on resolution No. 2? Not a thing. If you want it you are going to have to contrive it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are going to—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Don't play chicken, Stephen.

Mr. Conway: With that crowd across the floor it wouldn't be difficult.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, we considered this motion at some length in the caucus of the New Democratic Party. I would like to say that we are in support of the motion. We gave some consideration to the date which the Treasurer has chosen to insert in it, and we like it for two reasons: it's applicable whether there is an election and it's applicable whether there is not an election.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very cogent.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is almost prescient, isn't it?

Mr. Renwick: It also achieves something that we in this party wanted for some considerable time, and that is that the fall session of the assembly would start in September rather than at some later date. With that in mind, we're quite prepared in this caucus to expedite the business of the House by granting supply for the payment of salaries and the payment of other necessary amounts for the period commencing on April 1 and ending on September 30 of this year.

Mr. Nixon: In somewhat the same vein, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We can do without all of the side conversations. Will you conduct your private business outside?

Mr. Nixon: It is not our intention to oppose the motion. However, I did notice particularly that in Her Honour's speech on Tuesday, she brought to our attention the important steps taken by this Legislature to open up the debate, to open up the discussion of public business, not only to the members of the opposition but to the community at large.

Without going on to the further steps that the government indicates it intends to take in this connection, I am somewhat disappointed that the Treasurer has indicated he wants six months' interim supply rather than what I would like to consider a normal three months. As a matter of fact, we don't really have any normal amount of interim supply because in the last 18 months we have just got used to having a situation in the Legislature where the government does not demand and therefore receive a full year's supply even before the Legislature gets the opportunity to see the budget or to even complete the expenditure from the previous year.

In my time, going back some years now—and the Treasurer will recall—a standard motion was brought in. Just a pro forma motion in which the government asked the Legislature to approve all the expenditures covered by the estimates which sometimes has not even been made available. Then as the opposition members, I suppose, became more aware of the importance of that motion, which really set aside anything but the debate aspect of the discussion of the estimates, there were more and more comments made that we really ought not to vote a full year's supply in advance even before the discussion of the budget or before any examination of the estimates had come about.

[3:45]

In looking at what the custom is in other democratic institutions where this has been established, I believe it is normal to have quarterly supply, which means that on a more regular basis the members of the House, whether it's the Legislature or the House of Commons, have an opportunity to discuss on matters that pertain to the expenditure of public moneys certain aspects of public policy that they may think is important.

Certainly, there have been occasions in the House of Commons' history, not too ancient history, when the opposition, through their debate and through withholding supply, have been able to, at least, amend government policy in situations where it might not otherwise have been changeable. The opposition, of course, runs a real risk in so doing because it simply means that unless supply is voted the government cannot fulfil its legal requirements to send out certain emoluments and cheques for services rendered or otherwise. This is, of course, I suppose, the kind of lever that the government has in its own hands besides the votes of its supporters, whether they're in the majority or not.

Frankly, I'm disappointed that the Treasurer would indicate that he wants six months' supply. The efficacy of the date that's been pointed out by the member for Riverdale is an interesting one—it's good if there is an election, and it's good if there isn't. We might as well presume that we're going to be here at least until the end of June, which would have been, in my view, a suitable date for the interim supply to terminate.

As we know, in the event that the Legislature is not in session or the government or the members of this House are otherwise occupied, there is a procedure whereby the basic payments can be carried on until such time as the House does come together to give its approval, or otherwise, in the regular democratic process. So I would simply say, as the person whose amendment, some months ago, brought about something less than the full year interim supply that the Treasurer has been accustomed to, I'm disappointed that the date is not June 30, but for reasons that one can surmise we're not prepared to move an amendment because I presume that there will be a fall session of the Legislature in any event and we'll have an opportunity to discuss and examine the further expenditures of public funds at that time. Not all of you, but some of you will be here.

Mr. Breithaupt: I just have a few comments following those of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, Mr. Speaker. In the changes suggested to the rules and adopted by the House as they've now been reprinted pursuant to the adoption on December 16 last, there is now the additional new item 24 which states: "The motion for interim supply requires notice and such notice shall include a time limit of not more than six months."

As a result of the suggestions made by the select committee dealing with the fourth and fifth reports of the Camp commission, which is generally referred to as the Morrow Select Committee after the hon. member who was its chairman, there was consideration made with respect to this particular matter that the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk and I and several others have spoken to on a number of occasions over the past several years. We have, of course, been concerned that the granting of interim supply, in effect, made really rather nugatory the passage of estimates from time to time and, to some extent at least, made a bit of a sham of the development in depth of discussions on estimates because the money, in fact, had already been approved.

As a result of the minority situation resulting from the last general election, we had for the first time an opportunity to have the usual term of interim supply somewhat shortened, as the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has already stated. I realize, of course, that the time limit, even now by the new rules, suggests that six months be a maximum time. The government, whichever party and whatever its members may be in years to come, I hope will at least allow that rule to stand so that we will have at least the double opportunity within a year to discuss the traditional general grievances which might come forward from time to time before, in fact, this House grants the power to spend funds to the government of the day.

I, too, would agree that from my point of view, having been involved as Treasury critic for some years and having an interest in this subject, a matter of three months would have been a sufficient time. I hope that in future years the government will consider this three-month term, because I think it sets a better balance for the operation of the Legislature than the passage of interim supply for this length of time.

I hope that the occasion will come forward in years to come that this matter can be dealt with on a somewhat shorter term and that the quarterly suggestion, as it appears in other Legislatures and in the House of Commons, will develop into a reasonable, balanced rule that will satisfy not only the needs of the ministry to have its estimates proceeded with and funds available in the alternative but also the needs of members to be able to speak on estimates and to realize that their comments might have some effect. I hope that may happen in the future but for the present we will accept this motion.

Resolution concurred in.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, does the minister have a statement that would perhaps occasion a somewhat more concise debate?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I didn't really have any prepared statement ready. I understand that copies of the bill have been distributed to both opposition House leaders and the critics for my ministry. The compendium of background information to the bill has also been distributed, which I think is only a one-page document, and explains fully the reason for this amendment to the Act, which basically changes one figure in one section of the Act to extend the provisions of this particular part of the Act for one further year. I refer to the part of the Act relating to the size and weights of commercial vehicles on our highways. We have draft legislation in process right now which I expect to introduce later on in this session and which would deal with this matter permanently.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I find the minister's comments somewhat less than helpful in an understanding of the reasons for the bill. I can well understand that the March 31, 1977, expiry date, which is currently in the bill and which we passed a year or so ago, extending it from 1976 to 1977, now requires action by the government in order to extend it for a further year.

I would have anticipated that the minister would have addressed himself in his comments about the bill as to why it is that it has taken so long for him to come to a conclusion as to what the amending legislation should be and to indicate quite clearly to the House the kind of amending legislation which he will be presenting to the assembly so that we can understand clearly whether or not we as a party should support the extension of these particular provisions. Obviously they have to be supported, and we certainly won't be dividing the House on the bill. They have to be supported simply because they extend the existing provisions, and there is no evidence from the minister, other than a hope which he only recently expressed, that amending legislation would be introduced.

As I understand it, the provisions of part VI and part VII of The Highway Traffic Act dealing with weights and loads and with axle weights have been in the bill for some considerable period of time. There's been an alternative provision providing that compliance can be made by complying with either part VI or with part VII of The Highway Traffic Act. Now, of course, the particular intention of the Legislature as expressed in section 81(1) will not be operative because of this extension of the year in section 81(2).

I would hope that the minister, as he usually does, would give some really clear explanation of why for a second time we are being asked to extend a provision of the bill which permits compliance with part VI only up until March 31, 1977, rather than with respect to the alternative provisions provided in section 81(1), which would have permitted compliance with part VII and sections 65, 68, 69 and 70 or, alternatively, with the provisions of part VI.

I only wanted to comment to express my disappointment in the failure to have a concise explanatory statement made by the minister. We, of course, will support the extension of section 81(2) of The Highway Traffic Act for another year, but perhaps when the minister replies in this particular section of the debate, that is, on second reading, he will deal with those matters so that there won't be any need for us to ask that the bill go to committee of the whole House. I don't really think it deserves that consideration, if in fact the minister can make a response to the questions which I have raised.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to these proposed amendments which will allow the extensions. I would only say at this time that I am concerned about the difficulties that the ministry has had in the past enforcing these weight limitations, and I'm concerned about possibly the lack of uniformity of that enforcement, the lack of appropriate weighing facilities across the province. Recognizing the recommendations that we made in the interim report of the select committee on highway transportation of goods and recognizing that we are going to maintain a regulated system of transportation of goods in this province, the provision of such facilities, not only the weighing facilities but also the enforcement facilities, would serve us very well, I think, at this particular point in time.

I look forward to seeing the minister's new legislation when it comes, and I would encourage him to take into consideration when he examines the classifications of these vehicles the recommendations made by our select committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further discussion? Does the minister have a response?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The provisions under the Act, as I understand them, are very lengthy and very complicated. There are many pages and sections of tables relating to the legal weights and sizes of vehicles. It has been found in the past five years or so that we've been operating under this system that, first of all, the industry has had a very difficult time in complying with these complicated charts and tables setting out the permissible weights, while at the same time the enforcement arm of the ministry and the police have had a very difficult time in respect to the enforcement.

With this problem before us, we have been doing a considerable amount of work in developing a new set of tables which will be a great deal less complicated, although to me, and I suppose to any of us that are not totally involved with these types of tables, they still look somewhat complicated. But certainly they are much easier to understand than the very complicated ones that we have at the present time.

[4:00]

It has taken some considerable period of time to develop these tables. I had hoped as late as a week or two ago that I would have had the new legislation ready to introduce to the House at the same time as this bill was introduced on the opening day of the Legislature—by my colleague due to my absence from the province.

We are concerned and want to improve this situation. We have this legislation almost prepared at this time; we are double-checking it and having certain consultation with the industry, both the transportation industry and, I believe, to some degree the manufacturing industry involved with the vehicles. I wanted to have all this matter checked out as much as we possibly could before introducing the bill but I intend to introduce it in the relatively near future. I had intended to introduce it along with this bill and to ask the House to pass this bill to keep the regulation in force and, at the same time, deal in the normal course of the rules of the House with the new bill but I just wasn't able to have it here on Tuesday.

Motion agreed to.

The following bill was given third reading on motion:

Bill 2, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if the members of the Legislative Assembly will stand by, the Lieutenant Governor is coming in for royal assent.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the Legislative Assembly and took her seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. P. M. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has, at its present sitting thereof, passed a certain bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 2, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to this bill.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I indicate to the House in accordance with the rule, since this is Thursday, the order of business for the following week.

Tomorrow we will take into consideration the reply to the Speech from the Throne with the mover and the seconder, and also tomorrow bring forward the motion as to the membership of the committees now that we've got the committee structure in place.

On Monday of next week, the leader of the official opposition takes part in the Throne debate, on Tuesday the leader of the third party, and then we'll follow that with a session going into the evening on Tuesday for Throne debate. We will in fact, according to the resolution passed on opening day, meet on Wednesday afternoon with further Throne debate.

It has been agreed to have Friday hours on Thursday, so that we will meet from 10 to 1 on Maundy Thursday, with the long weekend off, from Friday till we resume operations here on April 12.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 31, 1977

Re the Estimates, Mr. Auld ... 19

Ontario Finances. statement by Mr. McKeough ... 19

Special warrants, statement by Mr. Auld ... 19

Family law reform, statement by Mr. McMurtry ... 20

Freedom of information, statement by Mr. McMurtry ... 20

LCBO warehouse for Durham region, statement by Mr. Handleman ... 21

Province-wide construction bargaining, statement by B. Stephenson ... 21

Jobs for youth, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Nixon 22

Housing programme, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Breaugh ... 24

Ontario Finances, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Bullbrook 25

Home buyer grants, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. S. Smith ... 26

Nuclear waste, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Moffatt ... 26

Railway land at Erieau, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Spence ... 27

Sudbury-Sault rail service. question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Wildman ... 28

Traduction des statuts, Translation of statutes, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Roy, Mr. Peterson ... 29

Alleged OHIP frauds, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Dukszta ... 29

Maple landfill project, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Stong, Ms. Bryden, Mr. Reed ... 30

French-language health services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Samis ... 31

Benefits rates, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. R. S. Smith, Ms. Sandeman, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Deans ... 31

Income tax rebates, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Davison, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Lewis 32

UTDC foreign contracts, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Cunningham ... 33

Health and safety legislation, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Mackenzie, Ms. Bryden 34

Milk prices, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Kerrio, Mr. MacDonald ... 35

Industrial deafness, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Martel ... 35

Voting qualifications, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Eakins ... 36

Maple landfill project, question of Mr. Kerr: Ms. Bryden ... 36

Presenting petitions, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Bain ... 36

Point of order re petitions, Mr. Bain ... 37

Proceedings against the Crown Amendment Act, Mr. Kennedy, first reading ... 38

Family Law Reform Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading ... 38

Marriage Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading ... 38

Succession Law Reform Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading 38
Children's Law Reform Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading 38
Elections Finances Reform Amendment Act, Mr. Johnson, first reading 38
Personal Property Security Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading 38
Class Actions Act, Mr. Lawlor, first reading 38
Occupiers' Liability Act, Mr. Lawlor, first reading 38
Labour Relations Amendment Act, B. Stephenson, first reading 39
Notice of Motion No. 2 re standing committees, Mr. Welch 39
Notice of Motion No. 1 re authorization to make payments, Mr. McKeough 40
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, second reading 42
Third reading 43
Royal assent to Bill 2, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 43
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 43

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Auld, Hon. J. A. C., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Davison, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands (PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)

Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 3

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Friday, April 1, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1977

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, April 6, the energy ministers of the 10 provinces and the government of Canada will meet in Ottawa for what seems to be shaping up as an annual ritual in this country. For the fourth successive year the government of Canada proposes to raise the price of crude oil and natural gas. This is part of the government of Canada's compulsive obsession about seeing to it that our domestic price for oil and natural gas year by year is deliberately inflated toward the artificially high world price.

Mr. Lewis: Well, welcome to the fold. It is about time.

Mr. Kerrio: You are getting as bad as Hydro.

Mr. Lewis: You reneged on every occasion until now. On every occasion you capitulated.

Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: This is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. It's a deathbed repentance so they can fashion an election platform.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I presume you agree.

Mr. Renwick: Let's dissolve this morning and get on with it.

Mr. Lewis: Who are you running against?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I feel it incumbent upon me to advise the House in advance of Ontario's position in this regard. First, we are opposed to any increase in the price of oil and natural gas—

Mr. Lewis: Well, what do you know?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Renwick: A gradual move to world prices.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —because the stated objective of this annual escalation—that of ensuring security of supply through expanded exploration and development—has not been met.

Mr. Lewis: You are too much.

Mr. Renwick: You are unbelievable.

Mr. Martel: Where do you find the courage?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: We are opposed because it will create further unemployment when the unemployment rate in Canada is the highest it has been in 20 years with nearly a million Canadians out of work.

Mr. Deans: What hypocrisy.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: We are opposed because it will deal yet another blow to the competitive capability of Canadian industry in world markets at a time when there is little competitive advantage remaining.

Mr. Renwick: Even Timbrell wouldn't have had the nerve to make this statement.

Mr. Lewis: You should be choking on it.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: We are opposed because it further fuels inflation—

Mr. Breithaupt: Like your deficit?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —places an unnecessary burden upon all sectors and individuals in our society—

Mr. Lewis: Now you are at the world price, you are fighting back.

Mr. Renwick: A magnificent elementary lesson.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —and places an intolerable burden upon those least able to bear it.

Mr. Lewis: The battle is lost.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Any increase in the domestic price of oil and natural gas at this time would be gouging the Ontario consumer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Can we not have interjections at a minimum this morning?

Mr. Renwick: Come on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is not adding anything to the procedure in this House. If you don't wish to listen to this, there is outside.

Mr. Lewis: This is provocation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Please contain yourselves. The hon. minister will continue.

Mr. Lewis: I can't.

Mr. Renwick: We will try.

Mr. Lewis: You lost the battle.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, these are some reasons why the government of Ontario is opposed to any increase at this time in the domestic price of crude oil and natural gas.

Mr. Lewis: What are going to do about it?

Mr. S. Smith: A blended price I suppose.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I would hope that the Ontario government's opposition to any such proposals is shared by all members of the Legislature—

Mr. Warner: Weren't you here last year?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —because I feel certain that I have the support of the consumers in this province. The public is fed up and rightly so. The public is prepared to make sacrifices, but only if those sacrifices deliver results.

Mr. Martel: It took you four years to find that out.

Mr. Breaugh: Turn the lights off.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In terms of increases in the domestic price of crude oil, the promises, the commitments for a secure supply made by the government of Canada over the past three years have not been fulfilled.

Mr. Lewis: This is the most unbelievable statement.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: They have not even been seen to be fulfilled and the public knows it. The public knows that for the past three years the government of Canada has justified the crude oil price increase on the premise that those funds were required to ensure a secure supply by expanding exploration and development.

Mr. MacDonald: I hope Claire Hoy takes this hypocrisy apart.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The public knows that this has not happened.

Mr. S. Smith: Is this a ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: But the public does know—and this government knows—that the lion's share of these price increases has disappeared into the consolidated revenue funds of the government of Canada and the producing provinces.

Mr. Martel: You forgot the companies.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Too much of this additional revenue is being used for purposes completely unrelated to energy.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Ontario believes any national crude oil and natural gas pricing policy should meet six basic objectives.

Mr. Martel: Macdonald last night, Taylor today.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It should develop additional supplies of crude oil, natural gas, and, if need be, other sources of energy. It should protect the competitive position of Canada's industries. It should strengthen fiscal relationships amongst provinces. It should encourage the creation of new jobs.

Mr. Moffatt: It is an April Fool joke, that is what it is.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It should alleviate inflation; and it should be equitable.

Mr. Peterson: This is absolutely juvenile.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, members should be aware of the impact that every dollar per barrel increase in crude oil would have on Ontario consumers.

Mr. S. Smith: This is a political statement, not a ministerial statement.

Mr. Peterson: He is embarrassing the province.

An hon. member: Speak to Pierre.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The price of natural gas has been related to the price of crude oil.

An hon. member: See if you can get him to change his taxing—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Assuming the current relationships are maintained, the price of natural gas—as a direct consequence of each dollar a barrel increase in the price of crude oil—would rise by approximately 15 cents per thousand cubic feet.

Mr. Lewis: This is a complete reversal of everything you have done for the last four years.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The direct cost to the Ontario consumer for each dollar price rise per barrel of crude oil—

Mr. S. Smith: Where is the blended price? Where is that famous blend?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's get on with the business of the House.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —and the attendant rise in natural gas, would be of the order of an additional $300 million for the first year.

Each dollar increase in the price of oil would result in an increase of half a per cent in the consumer price index in the first year.

For each dollar increase in the price of oil, the cost of home heating oil for the average man on the street will rise by approximately $25 over the last year. Also, if that person drives a car he is going to pay approximately $20 more per year.

Mr. Lewis: Now just listen to this next paragraph. Just listen to this one.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, if the government of Canada once again hikes the price of crude oil, it will be the fourth year in a row in which the Ontario consumer has been duped in the name of ensuring security of supply.

Mr. Lewis: Can you believe this? On a point of order, why don't you admit that you have been a party to this for four years?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is no point of order.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a ministerial statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me it is a policy statement and the minister will continue.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Moreover, the Ontario government and Ontario consumers—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —do not accept the proposition advanced by the government of Canada that artificially high prices, unrelated to the cost of production, should be used to force conservation.

Mr. Cunningham: Just like Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: If the price of oil and gas must be high because it costs more to find, produce and market, then so be it. But governments should not impose artificially high prices in the name of conservation.

Mr. Lewis: God, you are too much.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: As members are aware, for nearly two years the government of Ontario has concentrated on many energy saving projects through its energy management programme, primarily within its own ministries.

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: Where is Claude Bennett? Still honeymooning?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Much has been accomplished, and Ontario's conservation programme is serving as a model for other jurisdictions.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The price of crude oil has increased by 160 per cent in the last three years.

Mr. Lewis: With your agreement.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Where has this money gone?

Mr. Lewis: To the companies, that is where it is going.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In addition, since 1975, every time a consumer of this province buys gasoline, he has been paying an extra 10 cents a gallon to the government of Canada.

Mr. Deans: And you agreed.

Mr. Breithaupt: You can always change your sales tax.

Mr. Renwick: Every time they raise the price—this government benefits.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: This was purportedly for the oil import compensation programme, but much of that money is now being used by the government of Canada for other purposes.

[10:15]

An hon. member: Shame.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The public has a right to expect the government of Canada will reduce that special tax and relieve the consumer of this unnecessary burden—

Mr. Nixon: Are you going to reduce yours? You are taking off 19 cents a gallon you know. That is almost twice what the federal people are taking.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —either that, Mr. Speaker, or the right to know where that extra tax money is being spent and what contribution it is making to future energy supplies.

Moreover the city gate price of natural gas has increased 220 per cent since mid-1973. Where has this money gone? Again the public has a right to know.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: You tell them. The worst I have ever heard.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, earlier I mentioned the relationship of natural gas prices to crude oil prices.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Breithaupt: It must be April Fool's Day.

Mr. Lewis: This is the first time I have wished you were back in Comsoc.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Don't push it.

Mr. Breithaupt: With our luck he will go back.

Mrs. Campbell: Don't push that one.

Mr. Breithaupt: And no future considerations either.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Natural gas is about 85 per cent of an equivalent thermal value of a barrel of crude oil delivered in Toronto.

Mr. Martel: Have you had a change of heart over there, Bill?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: This percentage relationship was established by the government of Canada.

Mr. Lewis: It is easier to run against them than us, I will grant you that.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Let's get on with the business of the House. Will the minister continue and—please, order. Now if members wish to remain in the chamber, keep the noise down. Will the hon. minister continue please?

Mr. Martel: Darcy is next this morning.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In Ontario's view there was no justification for establishing that relationship in the first place and certainly there is no justification for a further increase in the price of natural gas.

Mr. Martel: Why did you agree to it for three years?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I believe Ontario stands to be reasonable, constructive and attuned to the realities confronting Canada today. Our economy and the average wage earner simply cannot afford another oil and gas price increase this year.

Mr. S. Smith: And in Edmonton as well. What happened to the blended price?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Speak to Pierre.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That is the message and the policy position which I intend to deliver in Ottawa on April 6, and I trust that I have the unanimous support of this House.

Interjections.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, my ministry will not be in a position for a few days to fully assess last night's budget address by the Minister of Finance.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It contains many complex and technical changes which will take some time to digest in terms of their impact on the economy of Ontario—

Mr. Renwick: You will have indigestion.

Mr. Breaugh: Are you going to tell them Darcy?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —which will take some time to digest in terms of their impact on the

economy of Ontario, our revenues and our taxpayers. However, I would like to make a few preliminary comments on those general matters of most concern to all of us.

Mr. Nixon: However.

Mr. Breithaupt: Without being provocative.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These are not happy times for the economy. Some of our citizens are experiencing real hardship and this budget does not put an immediate end to any of their problems. Nevertheless I am encouraged that this is an honest budget. Mr. Macdonald has recognized the two primary concerns of unemployment and inflation—

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberals are more Tory than the Tories these days.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and in his budget, concentrates on long-term performance to meet both challenges rather than short-term trade-offs.

Because we are a country that depends so much on international trade our economy can only produce real jobs and real gains for our citizens by expanding productive growth in the private sector. The budget will not accelerate economic recovery. But there are incentives to encourage the private sector to modernize, to create permanent jobs, and to face up to a very dangerous competitive situation. I believe this is honest medicine. It will lead to a safer and fairer economic future for our wage earners and our unemployed and it no doubt is the surest way to overcome the inflationary biases in the economy.

It is a budget that, in my view, attacks some long-term problems and provides some long-term directions. However, we have still not been presented with any kind of comprehensive strategy that this country desperately needs. We support his decision not to end the anti-inflation programme immediately.

As we said in the Throne Speech, we have made progress in moderating inflationary expectations—

Mr. Deans: And created unemployment.

Mr. Martel: On the backs of the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —but we should not end the programme until the country has developed a clear strategy to contain inflation after controls are lifted.

The projected budgetary deficit of $7.16 billion is very large. The cash requirements have gone up by over $1 billion. Both raise the danger of too much borrowing, which could crowd potential sources of capital for investment and for our municipalities. Even worse, it could lead to an acceleration in the money supply, which would certainly cause more inflation.

This deficit and other structural problems remaining in the economy provide a clear warning that public sector spending restraint must continue. Real co-operation between governments, business and labour must be intensified. Ontario will play its part on both counts in our budget, to be presented to the House on April 19, and by continuing the dialogue—

Mr. Renwick: It's too late.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —so ably initiated by the Premier (Mr. Davis) at his recent Partnership for Prosperity conference.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. Lewis: First, I have a question of the Treasurer. Since the Treasurer, with his government, now stands almost alone in this country as applauding the budget last night, can he explain how he is willing to endorse—even in the short term—such a dreadful, ill-advised and stupid budget in its refusal to provide jobs? Surely that's where Ontario should now step in, this morning, today?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, was that a statement or a question by the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Lewis: It was a question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That was no question; it was a statement. He is playing politics and he knows it.

Mr. Lewis: You made a statement too. You jumped into bed with Donald S. Macdonald. It's incredible.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order please.

Mr. Lewis: Another question then, by way of a supplementary: Does the Treasurer not think that this is an opportunity for Ontario to canvass every other province in Canada and to present the federal government with

a united front which rejects its priorities in maintaining a lower cost of living, which everybody will agree with, on the backs of the unemployed; and insists on unemployment strategy being changed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to canvass the other governments in this country. We have had discussions, as Ministers of Finance, as recently as a month and a half ago. The Ministers of Finance, I think, of all parts of this country remain determined to fight inflation.

Mr. Lewis: Obviously.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They remain determined in the fact that government spending and deficit spending is not the solution to our problem.

Mr. Lewis: With a million unemployed?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, this is not a debate.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You would have us in the same mess that the United Kingdom is in, dragged down by socialist policies.

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: You create the jobs; they'll give us the money.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, does the Treasurer and the government he represents really believe that there is a twitch of fairness in federal Liberal and provincial Tory policy which permits a million people unemployed in 1977 without one significant economic response? What's wrong with you people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am glad you are interested in jobs at last. I have wondered for the last three years.

Hon. Mr. MeKeough: Mr. Speaker, what's right with people on this side of the House is that we're prepared to say what we think is right for the economy in the long run and what we are not prepared to do—

Mr. Lewis: You should call the election in Ontario.

Mr. S. Smith: That's a good question.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What we are not prepared to do is to refuse to face up to problems in the economy, which the NDP won't face up to.

Mr. Renwick: We faced up. You were the government and you created this problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They go on playing politics on the backs of the unemployed.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order; order, please. This is a fine example, I'm sure, that is being witnessed by our guests in the galleries.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry to destroy the decorum, Mr. Speaker. It is of no consequence, the issue, I know.

Mr. Speaker: The issue is.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask one last temperate supplementary of the Treasurer? Can I ask the minister how he is going to reconcile last night's budget with page 8 of his own Throne Speech in which, in a preamble, he talked about the need to create jobs and then said, and I quote: "To this end it is hoped that significant assistance will be furnished through the federal budget to be presented on March 31. In turn Ontario will complement federal action."

Mr. Deans: How do you complement that?

Mr. Lewis: Since there are no actions to complement, why does he stand and endorse the federal budget?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the member obviously makes light of the increases in Mr. Macdonald's budget in terms of the Canada works programme. Whether that is sufficient or not, I can take issue with that. I think perhaps he might have done more by reordering priorities within a very large and swollen deficit to concern himself with, particularly, youth unemployment this summer. As to the second part of the members question, what we will do to complement his actions, whether they were adequate or not, will be known on April 19.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. Lewis: A question for the Minister of Energy: Can I ask the minister why he did not include in his statement to the House the fact that the government of Ontario participated willingly in the decision to increase the price of oil in the last three years on those successive occasions when it was fought bitterly in the House, why he did not explain in the statement, therefore, that the prices he outlines now are the responsibility

of his government, and how, therefore, he expects to have any credibility at all when he goes to Ottawa, since he is as much responsible for the duping as are the people in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition is misleading, and I won't say deliberately, the members of this House.

Mr. Martel: What is your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The point of order is very simple. The Leader of the Opposition said this province willingly joined in the price increases that were imposed by the government of Canada, and to say we did that willingly is just totally and absolutely wrong—

Mr. Martel: He hasn't got a point of order.

Mr. S. Smith: He hasn't got a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and the Leader of the Opposition knows it.

Mr. Martel: That is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are wrong. It is a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a point of order.

Mr. Deans: It is a point of view.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: It is a point of information, not a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Can we now get back to a more orderly question period? I think there was a question asked of the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Lewis: On the point of order.

Mr. Martel: He didn't have one.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I don't need any assistance from the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Well, you sure do.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Martel: Because he's the Premier, you know.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, with respect, the Premier said I was misleading the House. I want to say to you again, Mr. Speaker, that I stated exactly and precisely what I believe to be true. I always thought the Premier's position was mere posturing and when it came down to it, he accepted those price increases—

Mr. Breithaupt: This is an abuse of the question period.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: —and that's not misleading.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: When it comes to posturing, we're rank amateurs compared to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: The Speaker is standing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Now, can we get back to the question that was asked? The hon. minister, I believe.

Mr. Lewis: I think you should draw the Premier to order.

Mr. MacDonald: If you are not going to draw the Premier to order you're causing chaos in the House yourself.

Mr. Martel: Sure, he wanted a point of information defined.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy I believe was asked a question.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: May I just reaffirm—

Mr. Bain: Your position?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Exactly, because either the members opposite refuse to understand the problem and the issues and the involvements—

Mr. Bain: The problem is we do understand.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —or they are playing cheap politics with a very serious question of energy.

Mr. Renwick. You were wrong.

Mr. S. Smith: You want to play politics? That's great.

An hon. member: Bring on the Energy estimates.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The version that the members opposite have manifested today in connection with this statement would indicate to me at least, and I presume to the public, that they are not in support of a hold-the-line price on crude oil and natural gas.

Mr. Renwick: Don't waste our time.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: They are looking for a further price increase. Now, they should know that when it comes to the pricing of crude oil—and again, as they should appreciate if they don't, the price of natural gas is tied in with that—there are some oil-producing provinces in this country—

Mr. Renwick: We appreciated it a long time ago.

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —who feel that they have the prerogative to negotiate with the federal government in terms of what the price should be; and, certainly in one instance that I'm aware of, feel that Ontario does not even have a position. I think that Ontario does have a position—

Mr. Martel: A new one?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —because, surely, if we represent 8.5 million consumers in this country we do have a position on behalf of those consumers.

Mr. Riddell: You sure don't have an energy policy.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I think the economic well-being of this province has a very decided effect and impact on the economic welfare of the rest of Canada. Therefore, I do think that we have a position; I'm just saying that we do not have a veto position. We cannot unilaterally declare what the price will be or whether there will be no price. But we have taken a position, a strong position. Frankly, I'm discouraged to hear from you and from the other opposition parties that you appear to be not in support of a hold-the-line situation.

Mr. Renwick: You have adopted our policy. Stop that and sit down.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Well, you're deriding. I can only interpret your outbursts as opposition to a position that we are taking on behalf of the consumers of this province.

Mr. Renwick: You have adopted our policy.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) has milked the prices.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Can I assume that the minister is going to go to this conference that he's outlined for us, and present, once again, the same peculiar blending proposal that this government contributed to the last meeting that was held of this nature? Or is there some change in Ontario's position? And, furthermore, does he have some concrete proposal for convincing Mr. Lougheed not to push for a further increase at this time?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: If the hon. leader of the third party had listened to my statement, it indicates what the provincial position is at that conference. It does not include a proposal for blending—

Mr. S. Smith: No blending.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: What it is is a hold-firm on the present price of crude oil and natural gas.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: Further supplementary: Can he explain to us why the province has backed away from this blending proposal which was presented to us in such detail and with such fanfare just a few months ago?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Very simply, Mr. Speaker, this position was put forward very forcefully last year. It was rejected. The position that we're taking this year is simply that our economy and the people of this province cannot afford a further increase in the price of oil, which, of course, reflects in regard to natural gas.

Mr. Renwick: That's our position.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that the cost of oil is advancing inflation by 30 per cent in Canada? And is the minister aware that we don't know at this point what the structure of the cost of oil is, and that the federal government has to rely completely on the figures given it by the companies? Therefore, is the minister prepared, at the next conference, to ask that the price be frozen until we know exactly what the cost is of every single barrel of oil?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, may I say that when we talk about the increase in the price of a barrel of crude oil, really what we're talking about is the increase in government take; because 70 per cent—

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: You are not talking about that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You agree, you want more and more government take. We don't. At least 70 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: We are talking about the oil cost—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Look, do you want to hear it or don't you? Are you really, sincerely interested in the energy costs? Are you interested in oil costs and gasoline costs in this province? Or do you care at all about the consumer?

Mr. Renwick: Come on, you are in bed with the oil companies.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Apparently you don't. What I'm telling the members is that at least 70 per cent of the price increase goes in forms of government take—to the oil-producing provinces and to the government of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The opposition is in support of that. Obviously they are in support of that; they want further increases. Over here we don't want further increases in the price of oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary: Knowing as he does that his position is unrealistic and knowing that prices are going up and that this is just a fatuous political response, what I want to know from the minister is what contingency plans has he made that he can handle in this province, without just constantly complaining, to change pricing structures or to go to inverted pricing structures to moderate the effect on the Ontario economy? That is the only thing the government can handle, so why sit around complaining and squawking, which is all you do, about things that are not in your control.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been asked.

Mr. Peterson: What is the government going to do here in Ontario tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: First of all, I do not accept the member's defeatist attitude. He may subscribe to the present federal government's policy of tagging along to the artificially high world price of oil. As he knows, that's set by a cartel; it's unrelated to the cost of production of oil. A barrel of oil has increased six times in the last three years. He may subscribe to that, but we don't.

Mr. Nixon: You are drilling for votes, not oil.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It is not related to the cost of oil.

Mr. Breaugh: You should go back to the Flat Earth Society.

Mr. Nixon: You supported it every time.

Mr. Peterson: What are you going to do about Ontario?

BARRIE ANNEXATION PROPOSAL

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to start with a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. What is the minister's opinion and that of his staff regarding the designation of 13,600 acres of prime farmland on the outskirts of Barrie for annexation and development?

Hon. W. Newman: My only comment at this point in time is that this is an annexation application and I am quite sure our guidelines will certainly be kept in mind in the development of that property.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, since the minister is aware that the Treasurer has intervened at the OMB in favour of this proposal, will he table the letter sent by the foodland development branch to the Treasurer protesting the unnecessary loss of this vital farmland?

Hon. W. Newman: Any letter I have is public information. I don't hide anything from anyone.

Mr. S. Smith: Will the minister table that letter?

Hon. W. Newman: I'd like to review it, but I think probably I can let the member see the letter, yes. I have nothing to hide.

LEAD CONTAMINATION

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of the Environment: Can he please clarify his position regarding the removal of lead-contaminated soils in Toronto and can he explain why it is that the polluters in this instance are not being made collectively to pay the whole cost of the operation necessitated basically by the fact that lead from these various smelters has required us to have to remove that soil? Irrespective of the fact, as he mentioned in his letter of March 30, that there may be other sources of

lead, surely he has to agree that the only reason the soil has to be removed is because of the lead from those particular smelters? Why, therefore, is the polluter not paying; why is the public having to pay so much of this cost?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The fact is there has been no concrete established fact that only those plants are responsible for contaminating the soil in that particular area. Certainly, if the companies refuse to pay the total cost of the cleanup, it would mean that the province would have to sue those companies—

Mr. Singer: Oh, dear, shy away from that. The polluter will pay! Remember Dow.

Mr. Swart: Like Dow Chemical.

Mr. Singer: The polluter will pay; one of the great aspirations of all time.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and be involved in lengthy court hearings, probably taking, like Dow, three or four years of costly litigation. So the idea is, first of all, that the contaminated soil be removed and be replaced. It can only be done during certain times of the year, such as this time of year. At the present time, Hydro is laying a cable across many of those properties thereby mitigating or reducing the overall cost of removing the soil. Therefore, negotiations were going on between the committee and the companies to get the companies to pay a fair share of the cost of removing the contaminated soil.

As I indicated during the last session of the House, the prime objective here is to get rid of the contaminated soil and to decide then who should pay the total cost or part of the cost of the removal. As my correspondence indicates, there has been no decision as to whether or not we are satisfied with the companies' offer to pay a share of the cost of removal. The overall cost has been substantially reduced because of Hydro's involvement in laying a cable. We're talking a maximum of about $70,000. If we can get the companies to pay about half of that, it seems to make more sense than in getting involved in costly litigation—

Mr. Breithaupt: That's called public bargaining.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and above all, postponing the removal of the contaminated soil.

Mr. S. Smith: I have a supplementary. If, in fact, the so-called costly litigation is going to make it impossible to recover even the $70,000 from three companies—which doesn't strike me as that much money, given the volume of business these companies do—if costly litigation stands in the way of even a simple case of this kind, what meaning does the phrase "the polluter must pay" have in the province of Ontario? Are you prepared to bring forward legislation to give that phrase, that clause, some meaning, or are you just going to wave it around as a type of slogan totally devoid of real purpose and substance?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The hon member, Mr. Speaker, has obviously not read any of the reports that resulted from lengthy lead hearings—

Mr. Nixon: We read your former speeches.

An hon. member: We read about Dow Chemical.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and the complication involved when you have three or four or five companies involving a very large number of homes over a long period of time. There are also other facilities in that area. Some are municipal facilities which have contributed to the lead contamination problem. All I'm saying at this time is that there has been no decision made as to whether or not the companies will agree to pay a reasonable share of the part of that cost or whether we, in fact, pay the total share and take action against the companies to recover that share. There has been no decision. Negotiations regarding their share will continue.

I indicated last year that I thought a one-third, one-third, one-third arrangement was fairly reasonable. That involves the city.

Mr. S. Smith: They offered $7,000 each.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The city has refused to pay any amount; therefore, the negotiations go on between the province and the companies.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, will the minister give a commitment to this House that having used public moneys for the immediate removal of the topsoil in the area—particularly in my riding where we have Canada Metal; or to solve that problem—will the minister give a commitment to this House that, if his negotiations are unsuccessful with the companies, he will take the matter to the court for a final decision in order to recover for the public Treasury the expenditure of public funds?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The answer is yes.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the minister could tell us if his philosophy has changed since that June afternoon in 1971 when he pounded

his desk and said, "The polluter will pay," and forthwith announced a lawsuit against Dow Chemical—for, what, $25 million?—and why he has today said that he is concerned about the cost of litigation? He wasn't then, and the Dow action has cost the government at least $2 million in costs to this point. Has his philosophy substantially changed since that time?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, my philosophy hasn't changed. I still believe that basically our philosophy and policy should be that the polluter must pay, and we've been consistent about that. But as I indicated there is some difference between the Dow case—

Mr. Singer: I see.

[10:45]

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and a case involving four or five companies in a very complicated matter, as indicated by the lengthy reports we've had as a result of hearings. We've learned from Dow, I think. We have learned a little bit from Dow. We have learned, for example, just how effective our legislation can be and how effective—

Mr. Singer: Yes, right; how to spend but provide no solution.

Mr. Breithaupt: And how deep the river is.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The common law itself, of course, left something to be desired. So the legislation has been amended. We are satisfied with our present legislation.

Mr. S. Smith: Bring in a proper Act. Come on.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: All I want to say is, just don't compare apples with oranges.

Mr. Nixon: You mean lead and mercury.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Warner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Premier—

Mr. Singer: Supplementary.

Mrs. Campbell: I thought there were more supplementaries.

Mr. S. Smith: There are still some supplementaries, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We have spent quite a bit of time on these subjects. We have used 25 minutes now. If you want the question period to be effective you have got to abide by your own instructions. There should be time to come back if there are further questions on it. The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Warner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier: Since the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) has been unsuccessful during the past six months in convincing her cabinet colleagues, could the Premier show some leadership with the cabinet in trying to persuade them that the minimum wage should be increased from $2.65 an hour to at least $3 an hour, knowing full well that the AIB has already told us that anything up to $3.50 an hour will be exempt from the AIB guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would only say to the hon. member that our colleague, the Minister of Labour, has very little difficulty in persuading her fellow ministers on many vital issues. If the hon. member is asking me whether at this point in time we are going to increase the minimum wage to the figure that he has mentioned, I have to say to him that at this time the answer is no.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the Premier is so sure that the Minister of Labour will be successful, that her submission to cabinet on September 24 has not been ignored, could he then tell me what figure we will see as the minimum wage in the next few weeks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot tell him.

Mr. Peterson: I am glad to see the Premier using yes and no for a change.

DRIVERS' MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Now that his ministry requires that holders of drivers' licences in certain categories will be required to have medical examinations—for example, truck drivers—would he consider recommending to the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) amending section 49, subsection 1, part V of the regulations under The Health Insurance Act, which precludes legal requirements or proceedings from being services covered under the plan?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't thought of making that suggestion to my colleague, but I will discuss it with him.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary on this, if I might, is the minister aware that what has happened is that many truck drivers, including some farmers who only need the licence for the small amount of trucking they do, have gone to their physicians to receive their annual checkup to use it for the purpose of these licence applications and have been told that because of that particular clause they have to pay for it? If the minister is aware that an ordinary citizen is allowed one checkup a year under OHIP, can he please persuade his fellow minister to permit that one checkup to be utilized for the driving licence application?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am aware of this situation, Mr. Speaker. I have, of course, no jurisdiction in my ministry on that. I will discuss it with the Minister of Health. I do know that the policy under OHIP is that medical examinations for, I guess the easiest way to explain it, commercial reasons are not covered under the plan. If you need a medical examination as a condition of employment it is not covered. Of course, normally the employer pays for that examination.

An hon. member: What about the self-employed?

Hon. Mr. Snow: As for their examinations for the driving licences, I understand in some cases the employer company is voluntarily paying for these examinations because most of the companies—in fact all that I know of—are very much in support of our new system. Of course when this is a cost of employment. I consider it somewhat similar to the things the federal government had in mind two years ago when they allowed a deduction in your income tax, which I believe was increased by Mr. Macdonald last night. They raised it from $150 to $250 to cover items such as cost of employment, such as tools that a carpenter or a bricklayer or an auto mechanic has to buy. This is more or less a tool that a commercial truck driver or bus driver has to buy.

I understand that these examinations are costing in the neighbourhood of $20 to $25, depending I guess upon the doctor, for the one class of licence, the class D licence, which is the most common one. The examination is only required once. For some of the other classes of licences the tests will be required every three years. As the hon. member for Grey-Bruce knows, this is very similar to what he and I go through every six months or every year in our medical examination for our private or commercial or airline pilot's licence. We are required to supply that medical to the federal Ministry of Transport and, of course, that is not covered and we have to pay for it ourselves. So I think there are many different categories involved of this type of medical.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that many hundreds of these drivers are self-employed, or and in fact, work for small companies and that they are not going to be subsidized in any way and that they are going to suffer a hardship? These are the people that I think we are genuinely concerned about.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well, yes, of course. I thought I covered that in my previous answer. I am aware that some companies are paying these costs. But there is no compulsion on the company to do so. Of course I am aware of the self-employed individual where this is a cost—whether it is a one-time cost for a class D licence or a once-every-three-years cost for a class A licence. I am sure in some of the agreements that may be entered into in the future that may be a subject of negotiation, but that doesn't help the private businessman who requires the licence for his own truck.

But as I explained before, I feel that with the provision in The Income Tax Act allowing this to be a deductible item or considering it as part of the cost of employment package, some compensation is being given to the individual that requires this licence, the same as the individual that has to buy tools for his trade.

CONSUMERS ROAD INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: I was reading last evening, and I handed to the minister a few moments ago, the Wednesday March 30 edition of the Willowdale weekly newspaper, the Mirror. The headline on the front page states: "Plan to End Traffic Mess Gets the Axe."

The story states that an MTC—

Some hon. members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Williams: The story states that an MTC position paper has turned down a Metro Toronto underpass proposal to alleviate traffic problems in the Consumers Road industrial subdivision. I have two questions for the minister related to this topic. Firstly, on the basis of his past in-

terest in this matter, can I have his assurance that he will agree to an early meeting with the local provincial and municipal elected representatives—

Mr. Makarchuk: Why don't you just walk down?

Mr. Williams: —along with the representatives for the affected industrial and residential area? And secondly, could the minister assure me that the discussions will not only relate to a review and assessment of that position paper but to the other related proposals that have been put forward by the Metropolitan Toronto corporation? Some of these proposals will require approvals of the government of this province.

Mr. Singer: Is this a speech or a question?

Mr. Peterson: This is a serious abuse of the question period.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As the hon. member knows, over the past year I have met several times with him and with other elected representatives, both municipal and provincial, regarding this matter. Several meetings have been carried out by staff of Metropolitan Toronto, the borough of Scarborough, the borough of North York and my staff. The latest report I had was that at the last meeting four options were put forward, I believe, by the Metro traffic and roads planners. I'm not aware of any position taken on those options by the ministry at this time.

Certainly we did take a position on the one proposal that was put forward last fall where it was suggested that a direct access ramp off the main high speed ramp of Highway 401 go into this industrial development, which I definitely turned down. It's just totally unacceptable from a safety and traffic standpoint to have an access ramp to an industrial subdivision coming off the main high speed ramp at one of the main interchanges of this province.

Mr. Singer: It would be nice if they talked about this in the Throne debate or something.

Mr. Williams: Supplementary: The minister is aware of course that this new proposal, which also relates to Highway 401, is totally unrelated to the submission that we discussed earlier last summer and, therefore, it's a question for further consideration.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: Why don't you get on the list for the Throne debate?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, you have got to control that kind of nonsense.

Hon. W. Newman: Why don't you leave now then?

Mr. Speaker: That's not the only nonsense I've heard around here this morning, I might say. May I just remind the hon. members there have been some comments about the preamble to a question. Occasionally in order to delineate the area of a question, there has to be a brief preamble. I would remind all members on all sides—and you're all offenders—

Mr. Singer: Not to read the Don Mills Mirror at length.

Mr. Speaker: —it's not always on the other side—the preamble should be as brief as possible. It should simply point out the area of the question and then the question should be asked and asked once. The hon. member for Peterborough (Ms. Sandeman) will do just that, I'm sure.

Mr. Williams: On a point of order, I had asked a supplementary question, to which I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, if there is an answer. I thought the minister had completed his answer.

Mr. Williams: I haven't had an answer as yet. I was interrupted.

Mr. Singer: He shook his head.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: Is there not a rule about boring everybody silly, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I felt the minister had completed his answer. Is there an answer to the addendum there?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The date is correct, I think, on the calendar today.

Hon. Mr. Snow: In trying to answer the supplementary, I am aware that the four alternatives that were put forward at the last meeting do not involve the high speed ramp that was a part of their previous three submissions which I had to turn down.

ACCESS BY DISABLED TO BUILDINGS

Ms. Sandeman: I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

Is the minister aware that because of the long list of exclusions under section 5 of the Ontario Building Code, the disabled population of this province is still not assured access to buildings such as churches, medical centres, convalescent homes, homes for aged and a long, long list?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, I am aware of it. I've had recommendations from the Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped and we are attempting to deal with it.

Ms. Sandeman: Supplementary: Could the minister assure us that her attempts to deal with it will include making her colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), aware that he must amend his Act now?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I assure the member that the minister would be very amenable to that suggestion.

TOWNSEND TOWNSITE

Mr. G. I. Miller: In view of the fact that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) is not here this morning, I'd like to put a question to the Premier. Since the Townsend townsite is located in my riding and in view of the fact that agriculture requires many years of planning in advance, I wonder if the initial plans for the Townsend townsite have been finalized and when they may be available?

[11:00]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Housing will have a reply for the hon. member in the next few days. If he would exercise some restraint, as I know he does from time to time, the minister may have an answer for him some time in the latter part of the week, next week that is.

An hon. member: Good Friday?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Good Friday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland-Thorold.

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION PLAN

Mr. Swart: My question is to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of his alleged concern, as carried in this morning's paper, for the Niagara fruit and grape growers, is he now going to bring in an amendment to the farm income stabilization bill to provide coverage for their products? Secondly, will he also bring in an amendment to provide that the stabilization price will at least equal all the costs of production? Or is he going to go on slavishly following the federal pattern in both of these matters?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member doesn't realize we passed a bill in this House last fall.

Mr. Swart: That's not an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. W. Newman: I think he is not aware of the fact that it covers those commodities at a certain level.

Mr. MacDonald: At five per cent.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The member for Niagara Falls.

ALUMINUM WIRING

Mr. Kerrio: I have a question of the Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the grave dangers that are presented to many homeowners in this province by aluminum wiring; and an admission by Hydro in some of their cautions that if you see smoke coming out of a receptacle you should take some kind of action? I wonder if he is aware of these dangers.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the concerns as expressed by many persons in regard to aluminum wiring.

Mr. Eakins: Blame it on the feds, Jim.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I believe that matter is being addressed by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations as it comes under his jurisdiction.

Mr. Singer: What address is that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: As a matter of fact, if the hon. member redirected that question he may be able to amplify what they may have in mind in that ministry.

Mr. Singer: Is he making a speech to the aluminum wire producers or what?

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. minister referring it to the other minister? Is that what I understand?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, of course we're aware of these concerns. They

have been expressed to us periodically over the last few years. I expect we'll have some announcement to make in the near future.

Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Durham—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary.

Mr. Kerrio: Is the minister aware of the fact that there are some jurisdictions within this province that already ban aluminum wiring? Is he prepared to ban it until such time as we have a firm policy about it and see that it's safe for the people of this province?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that some of these jurisdictions in the province have taken that action. Two of them happen to be in my constituency, so I'm fully aware of their actions.

Last year we asked the federal government, under The Hazardous Products Act, to impose a ban which they have every right to do. They refused to do that. We do not feel, at this time, that the Ontario Building Code should be used to ban the use of a product which, in fact, is not being used in construction today. There is not much point in it. We're concerned about the existing situation, where it's already been installed.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Durham East had a supplementary on that question?

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No, this will be the final one.

Mr. Peterson: Well, Mr. Speaker, is there only one supplementary here?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The only supplementary has been from the member for Niagara Falls and we allow two supplementaries. I thought the member for Durham—

Mr. Peterson: You can't make that judgement now before you hear what the question is and only allow one supplementary. It's arbitrary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham East wishes to ask a supplementary; I cut him off before because I thought he was going to ask a new question.

Mr. Hodgson: Get a towel and cry on that.

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, as a supplementary, if there has been any gathering of data in insurance terms, and from Ontario Hydro and from the Fire Marshal's office, to quantify whether or not there is any substantial difference between fires in houses equipped with aluminum wiring and those not equipped with aluminum wiring? Or is he going to continue with the same course of action, saying: "We don't know there's a problem because we have not gathered any information?"

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated there will be an announcement in the very near future and all of the data that we have will be made available at that time.

Mr. Peterson: One supplementary, Mr. Speaker; one short supplementary. It's very important.

An hon. member: As usual, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: They always are. Since it is a very important subject I will allow it.

Mr. Peterson: I just want to ask this: If the minister has the confidence to ask the federal government to ban aluminum wiring, and he feels sure of that and he has indeed requested that, then why doesn't he use his own power to ban it, in this jurisdiction at least, if the federal government won't proceed? I don't understand the rules that the minister operates under.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I think one of the problems that we have in this country now, and I am sure the hon. member would agree with me, is duplication and entanglement of legislation. The federal government has a piece of legislation known—

Mr. Peterson: The Hazardous Products Act.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The Hazardous Products Act should deal with hazardous products and there is no reason why this province or 10 provinces should start putting their own interpretation on the federal Act.

Mr. Peterson: Because lives are at stake when hazardous products are involved.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We suggested that they consider a ban. We suggested it because the parliamentary assistant to the minister at that time, Mr. Norman Cafik, was asking for it and we suggested that the minister might listen to his own parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Moffatt: That's exactly backward.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Obviously the minister at the time did not want to listen to

that. This government will be taking action. We will be making an announcement here in the very near future.

GO TRANSIT SERVICE

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, without preamble: Will GO trains stop at the Exhibition Park for Blue Jay games?

Mr. Riddell: Lean over and ask him.

Mr. Eakins: Whisper in his ear.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting valuable time with the interjections. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that TATOA is arranging, where possible, to supply GO Transit services to the Exhibition Stadium as they do for the CNE itself, the Royal Winter Fair and the football games. There may be some problem in scheduling with afternoon games and the rush-hour situation, which doesn't happen the same with the other games, but to the extent possible they will be supplying a service to the stadium.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, will the minister, while he is giving consideration to that question, consider the installation of a GO train stop at De Grassi Street in the riding of Riverdale, at Queen Street?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I wasn't planning on that, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Premier with regard to the federal budget and its impact on unemployment. How can he continue his unqualified support for the anti-inflation programme, given that the programme has moderated inflation at the expense of employment; and given that the federal government has shown a complete unwillingness, or maybe an inability, to recognize that unemployment is the single major problem confronting people in Canada and particularly in Ontario at the moment; and recognizing that the federal government has gone to extreme and unfair measures to restrict unemployment benefits to people who cannot find work in Ontario and throughout Canada as the result of the anti-inflation programme; and also recognizing that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is getting to be a speech now. The hon. member for Wentworth realizes that, I am sure. He has asked the question. I think we will allow time for the answer.

Mr. Deans: I will ask by way of supplementary then. I have been told I can't ask any more in this part. I will ask it as a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, that wasn't what I understood you to say. I thought you were suggesting that there shouldn't be any preambles or long speeches in terms of the questions.

Mr. S. Smith: Or the answers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I certainly am not going to debate whether there was a preamble or not. In an attempt to answer the question as I understood it—and that is, how does this government continue its unqualified support, which I think perhaps is not a proper way of describing it—I think this government has indicated very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that we support, and we have taken certain initiatives in terms of this process, some strategy that makes sense in terms of moving out of the control mechanisms. I would say this, and I think it's a view supported by a number of people, just to state that this week or next week or three months from now that without any planning, without any consideration of the impact on the people who will be very directly affected, and that means hundreds of thousands in this province, without some plan for doing this doesn't make sense. I said at the time the control programme was introduced, yes, we would support it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Deans: You got into it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly we got into it that way. We had no alternative but to get into it that way—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as well as the other provinces. The member's friends in Saskatchewan and Manitoba didn't object to it at that time.

Mr. Lewis: Associates.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, they are your associates. Don't forget that when you start discussing the price of energy.

Mr. Breithaupt: They are no longer friends, though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The answer is very simple. We want to see a mechanism that is understood, one that is discussed with labour, with management, with the people who are directly affected by it, before the control programme is removed. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Renwick: You just want to talk; that is all you want to do.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question—

Hon. Mr. Davis: If that is a supplementary from the member for Riverdale—

Mr. Speaker: No, there's no supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —he may want to talk, but we want to see results. That's why we're here and that's why you're going to stay over there.

Mr. Lewis: Then call it, call it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You will have your chance on Monday.

Mr. Lewis: But we can't get the supporters.

Mr. Renwick: I was hoping you'd call it yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Since it appears evident that many people are being impoverished by the actions of the Anti-Inflation Board, and your complicity in the actions of the Anti-Inflation Board, where is your manpower policy that you've been promising this Legislature for the last three years?

Mr. Breithaupt: Since the days of Jack McNie.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we all take poetic licence and there's no one more poetic than the member for Wentworth. Complicity is really not the right terminology. We're trying in this government, along with other governments of Canada, to solve some pretty fundamental problems; problems that hon. members opposite don't understand. They have no sensitivity to them and I understand that. That's why I accept the question and the way it was phrased.

Mr. Makarchuk: Is that why you have a problem, because you don't understand—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: Is it fair that a burden should be carried by—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're repeating the same questions.

VOTING QUALIFICATIONS

Mr. S. Smith: I direct a question to the Treasurer: In view of the forthcoming referendum or plebiscite in Hamilton regarding the Pan-Am Games, would the Treasurer please consider the possibility of bringing in, as quickly as possible, an amendment to The Municipal Elections Act, which would permit all qualified municipal voters to vote in a plebiscite?

By way of explanation, the Treasurer is probably aware that only landowners and those with 20-year leases can vote in a plebiscite if money is involved. It would be nice to have that changed in time for the Pan-Am plebiscite in Hamilton. It would be just a small amendment, which would, I'm sure, be supported by all sides of the House.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's a rather fundamental amendment. Money bylaws in this province are voted on by taxpayers and not by tenants. I don't necessarily say that's a view which should not be changed, but I think the member is talking about something very fundamental which we would want to consider.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: The Treasurer, surely, did not mean to make a distinction between taxpayers and tenants, did he? Surely he's aware that tenants pay property tax as part of the rent. In the rent review procedure that's considered part of the reason that rents can be charged and increased? Surely he recognizes that tenants are taxpayers, every bit as much as everyone else in a municipality?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I certainly recognize that. But I have to tell the member that it is a rather strongly held view in certain parts of Ontario—parts of Ontario which the member may not be familiar with, he could ask

some members of his caucus—that only taxpayers should vote on money bylaws.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a basic principle—

Mr. Breithaupt: They all pay taxes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not endorsing that view at this moment. What I am saying is, the member is talking about a rather fundamental change, which I think would take some consideration.

Mr. S. Smith: Tenants are taxpayers.

UNITED ASBESTOS PLANT

Mr. Bain: I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. Considering that it has been almost a month since the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) and I, and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. F. S. Miller) and the Premier, discussed United Asbestos, could he indicate to the House what the government is prepared to do to ensure that United Asbestos will reopen?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member did visit, along with his leader, to discuss that issue. As I recall our discussion, the Minister of Natural Resources indicated that it was being considered by his ministry. I think he made a visit to that particular site himself. My recollection is, too, that he pointed out there were a number of difficulties involved in the situation. I won't remind the House of one of the things that he suggested, that helped create some of the problems at least, but I would suggest to the hon. member that he await the return of the minister, who will be here Monday and Tuesday, and get an up-to-date reply.

[11:15]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

PERMANENT DISABILITY PENSIONS

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Nixon: Don't kiss him, Margaret; hit him.

Mrs. Campbell: I am delighted with the change, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You'd better get used to change.

Mrs. Campbell: Has the minister addressed himself to the problem of the definition of unemployability by reason of permanent disability and permanent disability, and could he share with the House what is to be done in this area; and has he, meanwhile, given consideration to the very serious plight of those on disability pensions who are living at a very low level of subsistence?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Maybe we should change back.

Mr. Breithaupt: Oh, no. We know that answer.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of that question—and I know the response yesterday when I gave a similar answer to another question—

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, don't go into the whole rigmarole.

Mr. Lewis: Just eliminate it.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —is that it is an area that I have asked to be reviewed, and I am reviewing with staff the whole question of that rather complex distinction between the unemployable, permanently unemployable, and those who are disabled. I would hope that in the course of the next few weeks I would be able to answer the member's question more fully in terms of where we might go from there.

With respect to the level of funding available for those on disability pensions, that, along with the level of funding for all persons on income maintenance, is presently under review. I would hope to have an announcement to make on that.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may—

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mrs. Campbell: Do I take it, then, that as a result of the answer given we are no longer going to be told in this House that nothing can be done about definitions unless we get the co-operation of those horrible federal people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are not going to hear that any more.

Mrs. Campbell: Do I take it that the minister's staff is going to be able to give him the assistance to make the change here?

Mr. Breithaupt: That's in quotes, of course.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I will be in a better position to answer that at some time in the near future, I would hope. I do understand that part of the problem has been the his-

torical development of these various programmes, where they have grown up on a piecemeal basis for specific individuals with specific problems. Over the years we have this anomaly where there are those who are classified as unemployable and those who are disabled. Their needs may not vary very greatly.

Mrs. Campbell: If at all.

Hon. Mr. Norton: But because of the agreements that exist with the federal government at the present time, the level of funding does vary. Now I am not casting all of the blame on the federal government, but it will require a co-operative effort to resolve the problem.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Can the minister tell us the difference between an unemployable and a disabled person?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am not going to get drawn into that, because in all honesty that was one of the first questions I raised with the staff in this whole area of income support. I've had the same kinds of difficulties, I am sure, as the member, in trying to deal with that and explain it to those people who—

Mr. MacDonald: Ask the right question and you'll get the right answer.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —are in fact in that situation in my constituency as in the member's. The distinction, I understand, historically grew up on the basis of the kinds of needs those people were perceived to have in terms for special assistance, such as clothing and so on if they were classified as disabled. I want that to be reviewed to see if that is any longer relevant and if there is any way of simplifying it and making it more understandable for the recipients of income support under these programmes; to make it understandable or else to resolve that distinction.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have a motion but it's not quite ready yet. Perhaps at the appropriate time we could revert to motions to bring it forward.

Mr. Speaker: We'll seek permission of the House at that time.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Lewis: No, no. Now or never.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Johnson moved that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable P. M. McGibbon, OC, BA, LLD, DU (Ottawa), BAA (Theatre), Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege for me to move adoption of the Speech from the Throne of this, the fourth session of the 30th Parliament of Ontario. I do so with respect to this government and to Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor. I'm especially pleased, because a quarter of a century ago my predecessor, Mr. John Root, had the privilege of seconding the motion for adoption, presented by John Robarts, of the Throne Speech in the spring of 1952.

Mr. Martel: That's as far as it goes though.

Mr. Johnson: It is an honour for me to serve my constituency and to serve in Her Majesty's government here in Ontario in this the 25th year of her reign. I've served the people of Wellington-Dufferin-Peel since September, 1975. Mr. Root's tenure and my presence here confirm the solid support for Progressive Conservative government in our part of Ontario.

Mr. Breithaupt: By 600 votes.

Mr. Bain: What has it got the poor folks?

Mr. Johnson: Her Honour's Throne Speech stated very clearly the actions the government will take to address the economic, social and judicial needs of Ontario today, needs far different from those in 1952 but

needs which can be satisfied by this government just as they were then. The continuity of tenure of Progressive Conservative government in Ontario is testimony to that fact and a source of pride to me. I urge all members of this Legislature to support our legislative and administrative programmes. I request the support of this House simply because at a time of such economic uncertainty, a time when the definition of our nation is being questioned, we would serve our constituents best by solving problems rather than engaging in political rhetoric or partisan grandstanding.

Mr. Martel: What do you think the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) was doing this morning?

Mr. Johnson: I am well aware of the role of opposition members to question the actions of government and believe it can be a most useful process. I also believe, however, that recent abuses of that role achieve nothing positive for the people of Ontario—

Mr. Ferrier: Come on!

Mr. Johnson: —and indeed have fostered an air of cynicism towards those involved in politics. Surely it is incumbent upon us all to prevent that from happening again. I would hope that in this session we can all act more responsibly and make this present minority situation work rather than destroy the credibility of our Legislature and those who participate in it.

Mr. Wildman: You can say that after listening to the Minister of Energy?

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I would like first to complement our Premier (Mr. Davis) for the positive approach he is taking with regard to the province of Quebec and the intentions of its government to separate that province from this great Confederation.

Mr. Bain: En français.

Mr. Johnson: I, like the Premier, have a great love for Canada and believe through open discussion, such as the forum for Canadian destiny, we the citizens of Ontario and all Canadians can find a sense of common purpose and understanding for each other. That singularity of purpose will enable all Canadians to see the benefits of staying together as a family—a family of Canadians whose greatest asset is the accommodation of her cultural diversity. Let us not allow that asset to become our greatest liability.

I would also like to compliment the Premier on the establishment of a northern affairs ministry. I am confident that this ministry can address directly the problems of northern Ontario. The survival of the smaller and indeed dispersed communities of northern Ontario is critical to the survival of Ontario's economy.

Mr. Bain: Ask the Premier what he will do for the people of Matachewan.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Johnson: Local secondary manufacturing at the point of resource development will ensure that the economy of the north will continue to grow and, most importantly, will provide job opportunities for young people in that region of our province.

Mr. Martel: They are all down here because there are no jobs up there.

Mr. Johnson: The northern affairs ministry will bring government at the provincial level closer to the people of the north.

Mr. Martel: That's what Allan Lawrence said in 1970.

Mr. Wildman: It will be another barrier.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Wildman: How are you going to help Blind River?

Mr. Johnson: At the same time we must not forget the rural parts of the province.

Mr. Bain: They have been forgotten.

Mr. Johnson: In the past few years, with our preoccupation with the great problems faced in northern Ontario, we have often forgotten to mention our concern with the rural parts of southern Ontario.

Mr. Bain: Both the north and the rural south are forgotten.

Mr. Johnson: Much as northern Ontario needs industry both large and small, so does rural Ontario. To use my riding as an example, we face many of the same problems as do people living in the north.

Mr. Bain: Cross the floor!

Mr. Johnson: In particular we have had great difficulty in attracting small, clean industries. These industries tend to concentrate in the golden horseshoe. I am sure that my colleagues on all sides of the House would sympathize with that problem. I see

this as a concern second only to our concern for northern development.

Mr. Martel: The Tories have been in power for 34 years. What are they doing about it?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Johnson: Despite difficult times, tight money, and the demand by people for more services at a lesser cost, we on this side of the House have retained our commitment to rural Ontario. I have often thought that if there was any concept which could encapsulate what I feel as a member of this Legislature, and what this government feels as a partner in Confederation, it would be my and our commitment to people.

The initiatives announced in the Speech from the Throne, our new Ministry of Northern Affairs, our health care programme, our educational system and many other programmes demonstrate this government's and my concern for the ordinary citizens of Ontario.

Mr. Wildman: You missed all the problems you caused in 34 years.

[11:30]

Mr. Johnson: Let's glance for a moment at some of the programmes which demonstrate this government's intention to benefit people, all people. Small businesses are just one example of this government's commitment to people. I would at this time like to reconfirm my government's commitment to the small businesses of Ontario.

Mr. Bain: You are going to tax them more.

Mr. Eakins: You won't have any problems up there.

Mr. Johnson: No sector of our province is more important to the spirit and growth of this province than the people involved in small business. The essence of Ontario's society is the freedom, initiative and commitment to accomplishment that exists in small business. I would add, at the risk of angering the socialist segment of this House—

Mr. Martel: Watch the hordes.

Mr. Johnson: —that it is the commitment of people in small business to free enterprise that keeps Ontario strong. Whether they are involved in farming, manufacturing or retailing, small business people in Ontario are a priority of this government and will remain so.

Mr. Bain: Do you disavow the Blair commission proposal to tax them even more?

Mr. Johnson: It is the small businesses that provide employment opportunities in so many of our smaller communities. Clearly, we must continue to stress their importance and through the activities of the development corporations and small business assistance programmes, aid their growth.

Small businessmen are people too, and we must give them the same attention given to anyone else.

Mr. Philip: The same way you did for the oil companies?

Mr. Wildman: How about the small gas stations?

Mr. Johnson: My riding consists of small businesses, farming and some of the most pleasant small towns in Ontario, each part depending upon the interaction and support of the others for its survival. Although primarily a rural riding, we do have problems similar to those in the urban centres.

Mr. Bain: Yes, the government.

Mr. Johnson: Local transportation and local employment opportunities for young people are two of the greatest problems we in rural ridings face.

Mr. Wildman: How can you have problems? The Tories have been in power for 34 years.

Mr. Johnson: In Ottawa and Toronto people argue over how many buses and trains will be provided. In Wellington-Dufferin-Peel we are concerned that basic services be maintained and improved. We in rural communities need far better transit systems connecting us with larger cities and other communities within our regions. My government has as much of a commitment to transportation needs in rural as in urban communities. Senior citizens, commuters, young families and students all require better bus and, if possible, rail service.

Mr. Bain: If it goes the way it has been going there won't be any of either.

Mr. Johnson: With respect to employment, the problem is far too severe for the provincial government to solve on its own. However, as the Speech from the Throne indicates, we believe that all who wish to work should have the opportunity. Incentives to businesses to increase productivity and hence employment, summer job programmes for

students and a rational application of minimum wage laws and labour standards are all directed to providing more employment to people.

Small businesses in particular, if given the proper stimulus, could provide a great deal of employment for our pre-post-secondary youth. Farm vacation programmes such as the one practised successfully in Prince Edward Island and the farm income stabilization programme could provide a greater and more stable income for farmers and facilitate the hiring of more employees at reasonable wages.

All of these problems I have been discussing are faced by those of us who live outside the cities in northern and southern rural Ontario. They are difficult problems, no more so than in urban centres, but difficult problems nonetheless. I am sure, however, that my constituents and those similarly placed across the province will, with the help and concern of the provincial government, solve the problems facing them and Ontario today.

Mr. Speaker, Her Honour's speech outlined a number of actions which addressed directly the problems we as a government face. Those actions show leadership and initiative and adoption of that speech by this Legislature will show that we as legislators are going to get that job done. We will continue to provide programmes which meet the needs of Ontario society, programmes that are reasonable based on need and cost effectiveness.

Needs such as those of our senior citizens —financial assistance is required for senior-citizen homes and apartments. The provision of this form of assistance will relieve the pressure on hospitals and provide meaningful care to the people of Ontario who need our help the most.

Needs such as those of the agricultural community. The productivity of the agriculture industry in Ontario is a source of pride to all of us, yet there is still work to be done. Through tile drainage and other similar programmes, tens of millions of dollars have been committed to rural Ontario to increase productivity. Crop yield for tile-drained lands is estimated to be over double that of undrained lands. Ontario's commitment to food production and the well-being of the farm community is more than just talk, or rather obscure ideals. It is a solid commitment to people, a financial commitment to make farms grow. Marketing opportunities for our products, technology, innovations as a result of work from our agriculture colleges, and tariff changes will further aid the farmers in facing the cost pressures that exist today.

Let me emphasize here today the concern and understanding that this government has for our farmers. They are business people, working very hard, investing in the province with a personal commitment to prosperity and seeking nothing more than a fair profit. This government has ensured and will continue to ensure that a climate exists where they can achieve that single, reasonable and honourable objective.

Ontario has just experienced a period of excessive inflation which appears to be coming to an end. I'm sure all members now are aware of the unemployment problems that we face. Rest assured that we will take action to do what we can, this government, to aid in providing work for the people of Ontario, meaningful employment throughout Ontario.

Mr. Wildman: Things are pretty tough.

Mr. Johnson: But let us at the same time reconfirm our commitment to restraint in the public sector and assistance to the private sector.

Mr. Wildman: Can we really afford more years of you?

Mr. Johnson: This government has participated in the anti-inflation programme and we have succeeded. This government has exercised restraint as directed by the Premier and we have succeeded. This government is committed to the rights of individuals to strive for excellence and we have succeeded. This government is committed to free enterprise consistent with responsibility and we have succeeded. This government is committed to a judicial system equitable to all and we have succeeded. This government is committed to a strong Confederation, Canada, and we will succeed.

Mr. Deans: This government should be committed.

Mr. Johnson: I request the support of this House and the adoption of the Throne Speech in this the 25th year of Her Majesty's reign.

Mr. Moffatt: Before the member for London North starts, does he know where he is going?

Mr. Deans: Did he move to second some budget address?

Interjections.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for London North is about to speak.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, as I have been given the distinction of seconding the motion put forward by my good friend and colleague,

the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel, that the Speech from the Throne delivered so eloquently by Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor be adopted, I cannot but feel that this represents a great and rare privilege. The Throne Speech is an all-embracing document offering us encouragement to face difficult tasks, expressing the hope and the confidence that we can overcome the obstacles that face Ontario and the challenge which now faces our nation.

Mr. Speaker, we now find ourselves at a crossroads.

Mr. Deans: Which way are you going?

Mr. Moffatt: There are four directions—which way are you going to go?

Mr. Shore: I know now where I'm going.

Mr. Philip: He wants to go straight up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You guys wish you did know.

Mr. Riddell: You're not too sure of the people of London, though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, we are.

Mr. Shore: I have a lot of confidence in the people of London. The problem over there is that you have no confidence in yourselves.

Mr. Nixon: I guess Darcy remembers last year's speech because he walked out.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in the history of every nation when that nation must decide whether it can answer the question of its own survival. During this period of conflict and testing—

Mr. Bain: Are you going to declare a war on somebody?

Mr. Shore: —it is necessary that we, in Ontario, answer in a strong and firm voice. In this, as in so many other regards, I'm grateful for the leadership of our Premier, Mr. William Davis.

Mr. Moffatt: I'm sure you are the one who said, "Save us from Davis," last year.

Mr. Nixon: He must have some friends.

Mr. Shore: He is a man who has carried this recent burden—

Mr. Cunningham: You are just lucky there aren't four rows.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Eakins: He didn't say that last year.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London North will continue.

Mr. Shore: —of responsibility with openness, sincerity and single-minded devotion.

Mr. Nixon: What a lot of crap.

Mr. Shore: The Premier has spoken clearly on this subject, travelling to Quebec, speaking to audiences in Ontario and throughout Canada, working to build a firm bulwark of dialogue, and establishing Ontario as a real leader in the battle to save Confederation. In the fire of, perhaps, the most serious crisis that we have ever had to face, our people can rest assured that this government will remain true to its goals, steadfast and determined.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity to be among the first in this session to offer to you my best wishes, along with your deputy. We are confident that you will preside over this chamber, demonstrating the same qualities of fairness and earnestness which have marked your service in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today proudly—

Mr. Eakins: Your speech is better than last year, Marvin.

Mr. McCague: He has lots to talk about.

Mr. Shore: —representing the constituency of London North, a riding which has a unique and special place—

Mr. Ferrier: That's a Liberal commitment.

Mr. Shore: —in the history of this province as well as the annals of the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Deans: It certainly does.

Mr. Shore: For this is a riding whose boundaries take in parts of the area that were represented in this Legislature by such distinguised personalities as—

Mr. Cunningham: Gordon Walker.

Mr. Shore: —the former Minister of Agriculture and Food, Mr. William Stewart, and the former Treasurer of Ontario, John White. And it cannot be forgotten—

Mr. Nixon: Is that South Cayuga John?

Mr. Shore: —that London North is the historic riding of the former Premier of Ontario, John Robarts—

Mr. Bain: Oh, that! Those good old days.

Mr. Shore: —a man whose name is synonymous with a whole air of integrity, good government and high ideals.

Mr. Moffatt: As opposed to—

Mr. Shore: From the first crack of an axe felling the trees that would become the first house at the forks of the Thames, London has led in the dynamic growth and prosperous development of the southwestern region of this great province of Ontario. A town by 1848—

Mr. Eakins: That's what Dave Peterson says.

Mr. Philip: He did a lot for the insurance companies.

[11:45]

Mr. Shore: —a city by 1854, London became, by virtue of its ideal location and industrious inhabitants, the industrial and financial hub of the region. Freely translated, the motto of the city's coat of arms reads: "Through labour and perseverance." Yes, through labour and perseverance the city I proudly call my home has become a city of more than 250,000 people, responsible for more than $1 billion of manufacturing output each year.

London is as cosmopolitan in make-up as the fabric of Canada itself. Today, a street named after an old London location—Hyde Park, Covent Garden, Chelsea Green or Piccadilly—

Mr. Nixon: How about Cheapside?

Mr. Shore: —is likely as not to be the site of a Greek Orthodox Church, an Italian, German or Portuguese social club, a showing of works of art by a Dutch-Canadian painter or yet another example of the many cultural threads which make up the fabric of life in Canada.

Mr. Cunningham: How about the Hunt Club?

Mr. Shore: The cosmopolitan reality has come together in an atmosphere of understanding and equal opportunity to make London a dynamic and thriving community and the fourth largest city in this great province. What's more, it has come together in a manner which proves beyond doubt the practicality of cultural co-existence. In this regard there is the Folk Arts Council of Women, which is the umbrella for more than 70 ethnic organizations in that city. This spirit of co-operation extends to many other institutions and thus has directly contributed to the quality of life in our city. This spirit is particularly evident in the contribution that labour, both organized and unorganized, is making to London's communal life.

If London is a microcosm of Ontario, the riding of London North is surely a mirror image of the Canadian social and economic scene. From the efficient and productive industrial concentration in the east of my riding, regarded as a model for environmental and antipollution practices, to the new, carefully planned and prestigious residential areas in the west, the riding covers the entire spectrum of sociological and economic desires as well as achievements. I note proudly the number of women in London North who are active in community, professional and public life.

Like many residents of London and London North, I first came to the city as a young man seeking a beginning. I was fortunate to choose London for many reasons, not the least of which was the fact that the University of Western Ontario, one of the oldest and most prestigious campuses in Canada, is located in this city and, I am proud to say, partially located in the riding of London North. My parents, non-affluent, had taken it as a great joy to have me attend the university. Today, the student population of this soon to be 100-year-old seat of learning numbers nearly 20,000, the second largest enrolment of all Ontario universities. Another important element in this community is Fanshawe College, an institution which has demonstrated initiative and flexibility in meeting educational challenges. The city itself is served by more than 100 elementary and secondary schools.

The fact that quality of life is highly regarded in London is testified to by our many volunteer and community organizations as well as by a strong and creative cultural scene. Fortunately for all of us in London, we are able to work from a broad base of good planning which goes back many years. There are, for example, nearly 2,000 acres of parks and playgrounds in this city and London is indeed coming into its own as a sports hub for all of southwestern Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: London has a real good mayor.

Mr. Shore: Yes, it has got a fine mayor.

As a centre for head and regional offices of major enterprises such as London Life, Canada Trust, Labatts, Northern Life, General Motors and 3-M, London is emerging as a

bustling financial metropolis. In this ever-evolving community of competing and co-operative interests, fast and accurate reporting of news developments is assured by a concentration of media services. The media take seriously their responsibility to keep Londoners informed, and speaking personally as one who has been both lauded and roasted by them, I can personally attest to their tenacity.

While being proud of our accomplishments, Londoners cannot afford to lose sight of the problems which still confront us, for we share with the other cities in Ontario the whole series of challenges that are related to our increasing, complex, urban way of life. These are issues which all legislators can sympathize with. As a body we must stand together if we are to make London and her sister cities in this province the model for good living and environment.

Involved in public life because of my consistent and long-time commitment to free enterprise, educational opportunity, necessary reforms—

Mr. Nixon: I would say what an unfortunate word that was.

Mr. Shore: —and the struggle for individual rights, I have been able to find a welcome and true political home in the party in whose midst I now stand.

Mr. Kerrio: How can you say that?

Interjections.

Mr. Shore: Having grown with experience, I have come to realize how fundamental is the importance of leadership. I will not shrink from saying what must be said in reply to those who spend their time pointing fingers. On the issues that concern me most and should concern all of us—the economy, Confederation, the cost of living, education and the opportunities open to young people —it is this government and this Premier who have taken the lead. It is important to recognize that as a province citizens are better served here, have more chances here, and have greater means of expression here than is the case in many other parts of this country.

We are well aware of the great challenges which lie before us—economic threats, unemployment, housing issues, financial insecurities. These, my friends, are our real enemies and these are the issues, and our war against them must be intense, as unrelenting and as inspired as can be waged by a government not trapped with rigid, out-of-place ideology or by a caucus gone wild with bedlam disorganization.

Mr. Breithaupt: The one you were in.

Mr. Shore: Our proposals are decisive, realistic and forward-looking.

I believe this Throne Speech represents a continuing pledge that this government, so overwhelmingly endorsed by popular opinion, will continue a programme of action and development. Its content—which includes such proposals as extended French-language education, a commission of freedom of information, the extension of rent controls, an effort to create jobs for the young people, to improve housing, and to better plan the management of our resources—is individual, positive programmes designed to meet specific needs, and yet at the same time to be woven together to become the cloth from which the continued prosperity of this province will be cut.

If I might speak on one problem which has long concerned me and to which the Progressive Conservative caucus is making a strong commitment, it is in the area of small and independent business.

Mr. Nixon: Free lunch at caucus.

Mr. Shore: If small business—which includes most of our firms and is the wellspring for so much of our competitive initiative and new ideas—can't make it, then our whole system will suffer and each of us will pay a price. It is evident that a highly competitive economy is still the best consumer protection as it is the best guarantee of our individual right to choose. In keeping with the spirit, the Premier has taken the lead and established a caucus committee that would be a link between the government and the interests of small-business men and women.

I have been given the responsibility and the honour to serve with men who have real experience and genuine concern, the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea), the member for York North (Mr. Hodgson), the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. Johnson), and the member for Lanark (Mr. Wiseman). We have set out to travel to various parts of this province, meeting business people, listening to problems and complaints, coming to grips with several alternatives and seeking to arrive at well-considered policy proposals. This is an opportunity which we cannot allow to fall from our grasp.

We are therefore pleased to see the additional initiatives for small business in the Speech from the Throne—the advisory com-

mittee, the lending assistance, and so on. It reflects a real and practical sensitivity which is what government is all about here in Ontario.

Mr. Deans: Do you mean you are taking credit for all that?

Mr. Eakins: You put in an application.

Mr. Shore: Another issue with which I am heavily involved is that of educational reform and a return to a more basic approach to learning. As a parent with three children in the school system, as a former chairman of the board of education in London, and as an elected provincial member, my record is clear and unwavering. My fight for new guidelines in spending, a return to core curriculum, essential basics in the teaching of English, three Rs in the elementary school, a renewed emphasis on standards, and a decentralized more-human system was begun literally years ago.

Mr. Kerrio: That's our policy.

Mr. Eakins: You said that last year.

Mr. Shore: In this regard, I can only applaud the curriculum reforms recently announced by the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells).

Mr. Breithaupt: You can swallow anything if you can swallow that.

Mr. Shore: As he has said, we cannot leave it to chance that young people get the fundamentals. We have to ensure it.

Mr. Eakins: Is that what the Premier has done?

Mr. Shore: While much has been done, while in some instances it might have been slow coming, there have been great accomplishments. Much still remains to be done. There is absolutely no reason why our children cannot get the greatest education that money and caring and reasoned government can supply.

The Speech from the Throne is a human and responsive document. It seeks to lead and to serve and to lay before this House the programme that does both. Ontario's real economic and social needs will be advanced through carefully balanced and fair government, government which all responsible members of the opposition will, I am sure, wish to support and sustain.

Instability in Ontario now and unnecessary manoeuvres in this House by those that would distort the will of the people will only discredit the institution of the Legislature and foster a lack of confidence at a time when confidence in ourselves as Canadians and Ontarians, confidence in our institutions and capacity, is more necessary than ever before. Canadians in our province are not looking for expressions of no-confidence in our future and in ourselves. We are looking for the confidence that builds nations, fosters understanding and provides growth and prosperity. That is what this Speech from the Throne offers us all.

In summary, while I am not party to the politics of pie-in-the-sky optimism in that I realize the tough challenges that lie ahead in the economy, in Confederation, in promoting the best welfare for our citizens, I can remain confident because of the often-demonstrated concerns and decency of this government and its leaders.

If the hopes expressed in the Throne Speech are to be fulfilled—

Mr. Deans: It will be a miracle.

Mr. Shore: —all of the members of this Legislature must co-operate, despite their partisan differences, for the sake of the higher ideal of real service to the people of Ontario in these difficult times. That is why with great pride I second the motion to adopt Her Honour's Speech from the Throne. Let it be said that in the face of adversity the bywords of this Parliament were to remain strength, compassion, justice.

On motion by Mr. Deans, the debate was adjourned.

[12:00]

MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I move that on Thursday, April 7, the House meet from 10 a.m. till 1 p.m.—

Mr. Deans: Why is that, by the way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and when the House adjourns on that day it will stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 12.

Mr. Deans: Don't you really think it is more important to do the business of the House—

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis moved that on Thursday, April 7, the House meet from 10 a.m. till 1 p.m., and when the House adjourns on that

day it will stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 12.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the membership of the standing committees established on March 31 be as follows:

Social development committee—15 members as follows: Belanger, Conway, Dukszta, Ferris, Grande, Jones, Kennedy, Kerrio, Leluk, McClellan, Sandeman, Shore, Sweeney, Villeneuve, Wiseman.

Resources development committee—15 members as follows: Bain, Eakins, Eaton, Ferrier, Gaunt, Hodgson, Johnson (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel), Lane, Laughren, Martel, McNeil, Reed (Halton-Burlington), Riddell, Rollins, Yakabuski.

Administration of justice committee—15 members as follows: Drea, Edighoffer, Gigantes, Grossman, Johnston, (St. Catharines), Kennedy, Lawlor, Leluk, Lupusella, Maeck, Philip, Renwick, Roy, Singer, Stong.

General government committee—15 members as follows: Cassidy, di Santo, Evans, Good, Gregory, Irvine, McEwen, McCague, Morrow, Reid (Rainy River), Rollins, Ruston, Smith (Nipissing), Warner and Wildman.

Public accounts committee—11 members as follows: Angus, Drea, Germa, Grossman, Hall, Mackenzie, Makarchuk, Peterson, Sargent, Shore, Williams.

Statutory instruments committee—eight members as follows: Belanger, Davison (Hamilton Centre), Johnson (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel), Jones, Mancini, McKessock, Samis, Williams.

Procedural affairs committee—eight members as follows: Drea, Campbell, Cunningham, Eaton, Foulds, Haggerty, Irvine and Morrow.

Members' services committee—eight members as follows: Davidson (Cambridge), Evans, Givens, Lane, McNeil, Miller (Haldimand-Norfolk), Moffatt, Swart.

Motion agreed to.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 1, 1977

Oil and gas prices, statement by Mr. Taylor 51

Federal budget, statement by Mr. McKeough 54

Federal budget, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 55

Oil and gas prices, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Lewis, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. di Santo, Mr. Peterson 56

Barrie annexation proposal, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. S. Smith 59

Lead contamination, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Singer 59

Minimum wage, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Warner 61

Drivers' medical examinations, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Sargent, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Kerrio 61

Consumers Road industrial subdivision, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Williams 62

Access by disabled to buildings, questions of Mrs. Birch: Ms. Sandeman 63

Townsend townsite, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. G. I. Miller 64

Farm income stabilization plan, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Swart 64

Aluminum wiring, questions of Mr. Taylor and Mr. Handleman: Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Peterson 64

GO transit service, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Renwick 66

Federal budget, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 66

Voting qualifications, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. S. Smith 67

United Asbestos plant, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Bain 68

Permanent disability pensions, questions of Mr. Norton: Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Martel 68

Throne Speech debate, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Shore 69

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deans, agreed to 76

Motion re membership of standing committees, Mr. Welch, agreed to 77

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 77

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent P.C.)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)



No. 4

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Monday, April 4, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

QUEBEC LANGUAGE LEGISLATION

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on Friday the government of Quebec tabled in the legislature of that province a language charter which, as a prelude to promised language legislation in that province, is a document of both import, significance and controversy. Many questions with respect to the direction and tenor of that document have been raised from various sources, including many outside the province of Quebec.

I want to inform the House that I have directed the law officers of the Crown to prepare a detailed opinion for the cabinet as to the legality of some of the proposed areas of language legislation in the context of the constitution and its various restrictions and guarantees.

We do take the view, and I cannot express it strongly enough to members of the Legislature, that all governments must operate within the confines of the constitution. While it is legitimate to seek change in that document, it would not be legitimate to operate outside the constitution for any reason or purpose.

It would be our expectation that any legislation emanating from any province which was ultra vires, would be challenged. In view of the great sensitivity of this legislation, when and if it is brought down, it would be our expectation that the federal government would be prepared to initiate such a challenge, should they have an opinion which deems its provisions to be unconstitutional.

I would like, therefore, to register our province's concern with respect to the constitutionality of this proposed legislation, without commenting generally at this time on the tenor and direction of the charter.

I would also like to take this opportunity to provide one basic assurance, to this House and to the people of Ontario, with respect to a very deeply held commitment in this province. Whatever legislation or restrictions may be imposed in another province or jurisdiction with respect to minority rights, this province's commitment to our Franco-Ontarian citizens, to their educational, language and social rights will not be diminished.

As I have tried to explain before, that commitment is not tied to the welfare of any minority group elsewhere; it is tied to our commitment here in Ontario to an open, diverse and pluralistic society, strengthened by the vitality of our two founding peoples, and enriched by the presence of a multicultural milieu. We will continue to seek ways of improving and expanding, where fair and practical and where numbers justify it, French-language government services throughout Ontario. Our commitment to French-language public education and increased second-language French education stands.

I might add, by the way, that French-speaking residents of Quebec who choose to move to Ontario have full and unrestricted access to our French-language public school system—without limit. I take great exception to any proposed denial of similar rights to Ontarians moving to our sister province of Quebec.

The French-language culture and French Canadian reality are an indelible part of Ontario's heritage and make-up—a reality we are all richer and better for embracing and advancing within the context of our society as a whole.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain some of the background and provide further details concerning the initiatives affecting children's services which were announced Tuesday in the Speech from the Throne.

It has often been said before, but it bears repeating, that children most need to be able to grow up in a normal fashion, nurtured by family and community. Where problems arise, help needs to be available in ways that will reinforce the family unit and rely on community resources.

For many years this government has been committed to helping children and their families and communities. As a result, programmes have arisen and evolved in a variety of ways.

Our efforts to increase the range and variety of services have, inevitably, produced inconsistencies—as between insured health services for children, social services for children and so forth. Motivated by a primacy of concern for children, many efforts have been made to cope with the interrelated services. Spontaneous voluntary efforts at co-ordination have developed in a number of communities.

At the provincial level, the cabinet committee on social development commissioned the study of residential services, and created as well the interministerial council for troubled children and youth in order to identify possible avenues of reform, and produce improved co-ordinating structures.

The government has now concluded that it is appropriate and necessary to make two fundamental changes. At the provincial level, a new division of the Ministry of Community and Social Services will be established to provide for the total spectrum of services for children with special needs, excepting only special education services which will continue to be the responsibility of the Ministry of Education.

At the community level, children's services committees will be established under regional and local governments.

The new division in the Ministry of Community and Social Services will have responsibility for: (a) overall policy development; (b) the development of unified standards and licensing; (c) financing; (d) those services which will continue to be provided directly, and (e) procedures for monitoring and evaluation.

At the community level, the children's services committees will be responsible and have authority and resources for:

(a) Determining the special needs of children and taking the responsibility for ensuring appropriate assessment and placement services;

(b) Ensuring that appropriate services are provided. The committee would not be expected to deliver services directly, but rather would acquire them from suitable agencies. Where services are not available locally, services could be acquired elsewhere;

(c) Monitoring and evaluation;

(d) Ensuring or exercising wardship responsibilities for children placed in care under The Child Welfare Act, The Training Schools Act, The Juvenile Delinquents Act, or their successors. The Family Court would adjudicate under these Acts; the local committee would take the responsibility for ensuring the proper care and custody of the child;

(e) The planning necessary to meet community needs.

It is essential to focus on the individual child and his family rather than on the various systems and institutions. We feel communities are best able to do this. The government wants to ensure that a child is supported in his or her own home whenever possible, and that residential services and placement outside the home should occur only if essential, and that this should be provided in the child's own community except in the most unusual circumstances.

We look to work with communities to ensure that whatever group homes are required are provided within the home community of the children served. We look to see arrangements made with the family courts that will further safeguard the rights of children. We hope that the federal proposals for new legislations affecting young offenders will harmonize with our own reforms.

It will take time to effect these changes.

Mrs. Campbell: Thirty-four years.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: My colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Services, will provide details in a moment on how the policy will evolve and how we are committed to consult with those who are now engaged in one way or another in the provision of services for children.

I have said in this Legislature before, and I must repeat, that probably we will never have all the answers. There are no magic cures, and despite the public's expectations we will not achieve success with all of our children, but we are committed and we will try.

This government is determined to put an end to the isolation of children who need care, to put an end to the multiple assessments that many children are subjected to, and to put an end to the sometimes senseless movement of children from one service to another. The integration of children's services underlines our determination to provide a compassionate, caring and effective flow of services to the many children who need our help.

Copies of the statements have been placed in the mail boxes of all members and I'm now tabling a compendium of background information.

Mr. Cassidy: Is that why it took you three and a half years to prepare it?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, it is the commitment of this government to unify the separate programmes into an integrated system that is better designed to meet the special needs of children and youth across this province. The first step of implementation of this policy at the provincial level will be the introduction of legislation this session to effect the transfer of the following programmes to this new division:

From the Ministry of Health: children's mental health services branch of the ministry, facilities and programmes operated under The Children's Mental Health Centres Act; regional children's centres; special units for children in psychiatric hospitals, and the family court clinics.

From the Ministry of Correctional Services: the juvenile division of this ministry; its training schools; group homes; foster homes; special rates homes; probation and after-care services.

[2:15]

From the Ministry of the Attorney General: observation and detention centres and contract homes.

From within the Ministry of Community and Social Services: the child welfare branch of the ministry and facilities and programmes operated under The Child Welfare Act, including Children's Aid Societies, The Children's Institutions Act, The Children's Boarding Homes Act, and The Charitable Institutions Act (for Children); the child abuse programme of the ministry; mental retardation services for children; the day nurseries branch of the ministry, and facilities and programmes operated under The Day Nurseries Act.

The new reporting relationships will take effect on July 1, 1977, but over the next few months there will be considerable discussion on the specific implementation of this policy. In some programmes, such as psychiatric, mental retardation and day care, it is anticipated that administrative changes will take a little longer period of time to implement in order that the transfer may be accomplished as smoothly as possible. Other programmes, not yet identified, may also be included in the new children's services area.

In addition to the organizational transfer, it is my intention to move towards omnibus children's legislation that will rationalize and reform such matters as licensing requirements, operating standards and funding.

To implement these changes at the provincial level, I take great pleasure announcing the appointment, effective immediately, of Judge George Thomson, judge of the provincial court (family division) in Kingston, to the position of associate deputy minister, reporting directly to me.

Mr. Deans: How about someone from Wentworth?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Throughout Ontario, and in fact Canada, Judge Thomson has initiated training programmes for the bench to help judges in the area of juveniles. Through leadership in numerous local provincial and Canada-wide committees and boards and through extensive written publications, Judge Thomson has established a very high reputation in the area of family law, and in particular with respect to juveniles and children. He has the direct personal experience, empathy and commitment necessary to spearhead the implementation of the overall goals of an integrated children's services system.

To assist Judge Thomson, I'm pleased to announce that Mr. Peter Barnes, director of organization, policy branch of Management Board, is named as executive director of the new division. Mr. Barnes has several years' experience both within the Ontario government and as a consultant to many levels of government, both in Canada and in Europe, specializing in organizational matters. The integration of the children's programme both at the provincial and the local level will require the special skills and the sensitivity that Mr. Barnes brings to bear on this new office.

Similarly, at the local level, we will be moving quickly to implement the policy in which local governments will be responsible for ensuring the provision of services to their own children. In consultation with regional governments, we will start the implementation at this level with the establishment of local regional governments, appropriate methods of cost-sharing for these children's services. In so doing, we will also take into account the implications of the proposed federal Young Offenders Act and Social Services Act.

For those municipalities not under regional government, the province will be initiating pilot projects to begin to phase in, in a unified approach, children's services. The pilot projects would demonstrate various ways to provide for a consolidated approach best suited to that particular community.

In order to provide ample opportunity for consultation with local governments and

agencies, and yet move as swiftly as possible toward the consolidation of these services, I will be announcing, not later than July 1, a full timetable for the implementation at the community level.

The implementation of the consolidation of children's services will take the co-operation of literally thousands of government staff and many more thousands of staff from agencies, residences and services throughout this province. If we are to reach our goal of an integrated delivery system that truly meets the needs of each child, there will need to be a high priority placed upon consultation. To this end I have already written to the heads of provincial staff, agencies and residences that have been identified to date, to outline the proposed changes and to solicit their assistance.

Over the next few months, I will be holding meetings with these senior staff and with key agencies to inform them of the progress and to seek their comments, concerns and support. I'm confident that these people, as well as the members of this Legislature, share my concern in providing the very best possible special services for children and youth. Over the coming months and years I trust that we will move together towards this goal.

OPP SALARY INCREASE

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am pleased to report that a settlement has been reached in contract negotiations between the government and the Ontario Provincial Police Association.

The new agreement runs from April 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978, and will provide a salary increase of 7.4 per cent for the 3,900 members of the bargaining unit, except for probationary constables, who will receive 6.6 per cent. In addition, there will be improvements in shift premium and vacation entitlement, and the government will pay 100 per cent of the OHIP premium and 85 per cent of the premium for the long-term income protection plan. The previous figures were 90 per cent and 75 per cent respectively. The plain clothes allowance will be increased by $50 per year.

In a similar announcement following last year's negotiations, I recall making reference to the fact that the parties to these negotiations had established the enviable record of not having required the assistance of a third party to resolve salary differences in all the years that they have been negotiating—I think it's some 10 years. I am pleased that the record has been extended another year.

There are those who claim that real bargaining does not take place in a system that has binding arbitration as the final dispute-settling mechanism. The successful completion of all contracts with this association in direct negotiations is clear evidence that our system can and does work where the people at the bargaining table have the will to make it work.

HOUSING PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) produced a document I had not seen and asked for comment on the disposition of HOME lands now that the HOME programme has evolved into a grant programme. I would like to respond in the form of a statement so as not to take up the time of the question period.

I find the document he was quoting from was material provided to Ontario lenders when the ministry was exploring whether or not it would be prepared to lend under the proposed programme. The figures were preliminary but close to what we have in mind for the disposition of land as it is developed.

As we have been saying since the announcement of the new programme, we will continue to develop our holdings at a rate of between 3,500 to 4,000 housing units a year. These would be marketed to builders at the lower end of the market appraisals with the bulk being used for housing under the new AHOP/HOME plan and the others for a range of housing. That's exactly what the document says.

When the programme was announced on March 7, I said: "Ottawa has agreed with us that the land we and they have purchased should be sold at market values—actually at the low end of market, as we will use the lowest of three appraisals—primarily but not exclusively to builders who will make use of the AHOP/HOME ownership assistance programme.

"This will have two benefits. Our funds generated from the sale will be used for housing-related programmes. This provides additional financing for housing at a time of constraint both in Ottawa and Queen's Park. Second, it will provide for the development of more balanced communities in the larger government developments. The same range of housing types can be developed there as developed in neighbouring private subdivisions."

My press release at that date stated we would be developing land "in a way that would create more balanced communities" and that this has been discussed with and agreed to by the federal Minister of State for Urban Affairs, the Hon. Andre Ouellet, as CMHC is the major shareholder in many of the land banks.

The material quoted by the Leader of the Opposition from the memorandum to the lenders is in agreement with the policy as I announced it. The memo contains some preliminary estimates that some of the land units likely to come on to the market in the current fiscal year would be of higher-priced land which would result in housing over the AHOP limits. It will depend upon appraisals as to whether or not the land will fit with the new programme. However, I would point out the programme is universal—not restricted to housing on government land—so it is available across Ontario and not just in HOME subdivisions.

The Leader of the Opposition stated that selling land at close to market will provide a profit to the two levels of government. This, of course, is true. That's what we said when we announced the programme and said the money would be ploughed back into other housing programmes.

He suggested the first buyers should benefit from any increase in land value and not the taxpayers whose agency develops the land. I would point out his party for years argued that under the original HOME plan, individuals should not be allowed to reap the benefits of enhanced value, that it should go to the state.

On June 22, 1973—as quoted on page 3814 of Hansard—the former minister responsible for housing announced a change in the HOME plan where "any increment in the land value, therefore, will accrue to the public instead of a private individual" as land will be sold at market value and not at the price set when the lease began. This was warmly greeted by the then NDP housing critic, the member for Ottawa Centre who stated: "It looks like the minister has been reading NDP policy."

As for keeping the municipalities informed, I would tell the hon. member we mailed details on the new programme to all municipalities. Also, we have already held two of about a dozen workshops which will be used to discuss details with municipal officials. Some municipalities will want representatives of the ministry to appear and discuss the matter. This has already occurred and we will be pleased to do so.

Under the new approach, we will follow the accepted procedures in dealing with the municipalities. We will still apply to them for subdivision approvals as we have done in the past. Municipalities will have as much say as before, as we will be acting as any normal developer.

Mr. S. Smith: And land speculator.

VOTING QUALIFICATIONS

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, just by way of a perhaps somewhat longer answer to a question which was asked on Friday with respect to the Pan-Am Games in Hamilton, my understanding is that the council of the city now wishes to invite the games to Hamilton. So far as I know, the city of Hamilton is not at present considering what is known as a vote on a money bylaw. The city has under present legislation the ability to approach the Ontario Municipal Board for permission to have a vote between elections of the electors, tenants included, to gain opinion if it wishes.

This broad approach that the hon. member for Hamilton West seems to favour is there now if the city council wishes to pursue it. On the issue of eligibility to vote on money bylaws, if and when it comes to that —and they are very rare occurrences in Ontario these days, since we rely basically on representative councils and the Ontario Municipal Board to make these decisions—I would be glad to review the base from which these votes are taken as we review, as we are doing now, The Municipal Elections Act.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. Deans: In rising, Mr. Speaker, just before I ask a question, I wanted to say to you, sir, that I am sure I speak for more than just my own colleagues when I say to the Premier that we welcome his concerns expressed on behalf of the government of Ontario with regard to the recent position taken by Quebec. I would just like to assume that we will be kept informed as to what answers come from his constitutional questions and that he will make some representations to the Prime Minister of Canada.

CANCER AND ASBESTOS

Mr. Deans: The question that I have is to the Minister of Labour: Can the Minister of Labour produce any epidemiological study, other than that provided by Dr. Selikoff, to justify the action taken by the Workmen's

Compensation Board last week with regard to Aime Bertrand?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I have seen the report of an epidemiological analysis of the information provided by Dr. Selikoff to the Workmen's Compensation Board. I do not have a copy in my possession at the moment, but I shall be glad to get a copy and to present it to the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: Can the minister indicate what it is about this relationship among the Ministry of Labour, the Workmen's Compensation Board and Dr. Selikoff that has the board accept at face value evidence presented only some months ago by Dr. Selikoff with regard to cancer of similar types in other organs, because it happened to suit the board to do it, and now turn around at this time, on similar evidence, properly put together, and turn it down with just simply a reference to Dr. Miller at the University of Toronto?

[2:30]

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the acceptance by the Workmen's Compensation Board of the classification of cancer of the gastro-intestinal tract in asbestos workers was made not upon examination of Dr. Selikoff's information at face value at all. It was made upon the examination of all of the published information regarding asbestos and gastro-intestinal cancers which was carried out by Dr. Ritchie and then reviewed in an accurate and very long epidemiological study by Dr. Miller. Indeed, the response in that instance, I think, was entirely responsible.

The paper, which has been provided by Dr. Selikoff, is one piece of paper with some figures on it listing the results which he found in his study of asbestos workers—with no real conclusions drawn. Therefore, that paper was submitted to the epidemiological study which has been carried out on the previous information, and the epidemiologist reported his finding would be that Dr. Selikoff's results were, indeed, equivocal rather than being specifically on one side or the other.

At this time there are two other studies of this matter being carried out, and when those are produced and published—and I do wish that Dr. Selikoff would publish his material so that it could be subjected to the critical analysis of his peer group—we shall again be reviewing this specific matter.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the Workmen's Compensation Board indicated previously that they were awaiting Dr. Selikoff's report before making a final decision on laryngeal cancer, how is it that the Minister of Labour allows Dr. McCracken then to seek out evidence to the contrary rather than extending to the workers of this province the benefit of the doubt? And, further, doesn't the minister think Dr. McCracken has outlived his usefulness on the Workmen's Compensation Board of this province?

Mr. Warner: He should resign.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I would first say that I think Dr. McCracken is serving both the workers of Ontario and the Workmen's Compensation Board extremely well. He is functioning as a very concerned, responsible physician in this aspect.

Mr. Warner: That board runs by itself.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The report presented by Dr. Selikoff was only one of the pieces of information we had asked for. If, indeed, the epidemiological study of Dr. Selikoff's figures—and I must admit when one looks at Dr. Selikoff's single sheet of paper the first impression is that there is a direct causal relationship which, unfortunately, does not stand up under the epidemiological scrutiny it has been subjected to. There are other experts in this area—

Mr. Warner: By whom? Let's see the answer.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Dr. Selikoff is not the only one.

Mr. Warner: You're playing games.

Hon. B. Stephenson: He is an important researcher whose information we value, but it must be subjected to the kind of analysis which any other researcher's studies would be subjected to. On that basis, at this time, there is no reason for accepting the causal relationship between asbestos and laryngeal cancer.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: If decisions such as this one are being made because of pressures applied to the Compensation Board by the employers of this province, will the minister direct the employers in Ontario that if they find the assessment of compensation against them to be too heavy, they clean up the work place and not extract the pound of flesh from the workers?

Mr. Warner: Why don't you get some control over that board?

Hon. B. Stephenson: That is a spurious accusation. The decisions made by the Work-

men's Compensation Board are not subjected to any pressure from any employers. They are made independently—

Mr. Warner: It runs by itself.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —by the specialists and the consultants which the Workmen's Compensation Board asks for advice, and that advice is entirely independent of everyone.

Mr. Warner: Including you?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes, including me.

Mr. Mackenzie: I would like to ask the minister at what point, apart from the studies and surveys, Aime Bertrand gets the benefit of the doubt in his tragic case?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I have promised Mr. Bertrand that I will review the decision which was made in his case, and I intend to do that.

Mr. Deans: Just for clarification—it's not a supplementary. Did I understand you correctly—in answer to my question—that you will produce the additional epidemiological studies that were done to justify the decision?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I said that I had seen a copy of the submission which was made by Dr. Miller to Dr. McCracken. I will try to get a copy of that letter for the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: Maybe this is a good time for a freedom-of-information bill.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

Mr. Deans: I have a question for the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer produce for the House all the capital-works-projects proposals of all the ministries, and all those produced for the Ontario Municipal Board by municipalities for the years 1974 through 1977, and the state of completion or readiness that they are now at, in order that we can determine which, if any, can be proceeded with now to create employment in the province of Ontario?

Mr. Breithaupt: He can answer that off the top of his head.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, no, not off the top of my head, as I heard somebody say.

Mr. Nixon: Starting to get thinner.

Mr. Cassidy: Shame.

Mr. Laughren: Some Management Board.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would think you would have to ask the various ministries as to what capital projects they might or might not have on the shelf, so to speak, and what position they would be in to accelerate or otherwise if funds became available. I would have no such list, nor do I think would the Chairman of Management Board. We could go through various submissions, I suppose, which are made to Management Board, but often we find that even six or eight months or a year later they are out of date and priorities have changed, and they might not necessarily be on the list.

With respect to those expenditure items, capital works programmes which would be put in front of the Ontario Municipal Board, I think that information in gross amount is contained in the Municipal Board annual report, which is tabled in this Legislature by the Attorney General. I believe that figure would be there. There again, I'm not sure that the Ontario Municipal Board keeps any ongoing record of what has been not approved for one reason or another.

I would also say that, not to my certain knowledge but certainly by comments made by the Municipal Board and others, I think it is fair to say that very little that has been put forward to the board in the last couple of years has not been approved. When the urge to restrain went forward from me to the board in the supplementary actions and in the last budget, the municipalities responded very well and did not, in fact, make application to the board for greater amounts than either the board thought to be prudently handled, or which were not in the nature of something which really needed to be done as opposed to wanted to be done.

So I think the variance between what was proposed to the board and what the board approved is probably very small, and that information, I think, would have to come from the municipalities.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: What then did the Treasurer's statement on page 9 of the Throne Speech mean when he said "special funding to create jobs in both the private and public sectors will be a feature of the new Ontario budget," if he doesn't know what his own government was proposing to do during the years 1974 through 1982 in terms of capital projects and the possibility of the use of those to create employment for people not working?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think we are talking about apples and oranges as opposed—

Mr. Breaugh: No, bread and butter.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to the very large aspirations of the ministries at any given point in time.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary to the first question asked by the member for Wentworth, regarding what's in front of the OMB, has the Treasurer spoken with the Attorney General to see if something can be done to speed up the pace about the hearing regarding Toronto's downtown plan, given the rate of construction unemployment in this particular city? Has he also asked whether or not it's possible to have the senior citizens' projects separated out from the present OMB hearings so that they can proceed more rapidly and create the construction jobs accordingly?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I discussed this matter with the Attorney General as recently as an hour and a half ago, and the member might like to direct the question to him.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Supplementary, the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mrs. Campbell: Answer the question.

Mr. Cassidy: To the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer say—

Mr. S. Smith: It is hard to redirect a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the hon. Treasurer provided the opportunity to transfer the question—to the Attorney General, was it? Is there an answer, Mr. Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I met with the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board last week to discuss this problem, and we discussed it in some detail, he having reviewed it with his own people before. He indicated that in his view there was no practical way that any of these matters could be separated out.

An hon. member: Why not?

Mr. Speaker: All right, the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Since the Treasurer has said that he has not canvassed the government departments to find out what jobs could be created this year by the acceleration of provincial projects, can he say how many jobs have been lost over the last few months by the reduction of $77 million in lending by the Ontario Mortgage Corporation and the Development Corporation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that opens up a new area.

An hon. member: No, it's the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a supplementary. Final supplementary, the member for York North.

Mr. MacDonald: In view of the universal concern about unemployment, would the provincial Treasurer canvass the ministries within his own government and in his budget indicate what share for public works, capital works projects, there is? Surely it is easier for him to do that than for us to ask each ministry—and it's a very relevant piece of information for his budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, one can ask ministries what they would like to do if money was no problem, yes. Certainly that is done from time to time, and we would have—

Mr. Foulds: Just before an election usually.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —a rather large list—a very large list—of public works projects.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Treasurer exercise his judgement?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's exactly what we do. In the course of preparing a budget that's exactly what Management Board does. We exercise our judgement.

Mr. Foulds: Usually bad.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have been spending for the last four or five years, I would guess, in the neighbourhood of a billion and a half to two billion dollars on capital projects of one kind or another, which is very large indeed. No jobs have been lost because of the reduction in spending by either the Ontario Mortgage Corporation or the Ontario Development Corporation.

The Ontario Mortgage Corporation rates are such that they are now no longer, I think this is fair to say, an inducement. Private-sector mortgage money is available and those are the reasons why that money was not taken up, rather than a curbing on the spending of it by the Minister of Housing.

With respect to the Ontario Development Corporation, the demand for loans simply has not been there.

TORONTO DOWNTOWN PLAN

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Knowing that the Attorney General shares with me the view that the present construction unemployment in Toronto and in Ontario generally is really an emergency, could the Attorney General explain why he will accept the view of the OMB chairman that (a) the senior citizens' projects could not be separated out and (b) that the hearings have to go on at the present somewhat leisurely pace? Surely in an emergency the Attorney General could instruct the OMB to meet overtime on a regular basis to get this matter on the road and get these people at work as soon as possible.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the counsel for the city of Toronto has considerable discretion in the manner in which he chooses to present his case; and the members of the Municipal Board—the three members who are hearing this matter—don't feel that they have any right to indicate to counsel the manner in which the case is produced or how quickly the city's case is completed.

Just following this matter in the press, I think the leader of the Liberal Party will have noted, as I have, some concern, expressed publicly by various members of the board hearing it from time to time, as to speeding up the process. I think the members who are hearing the matter are urging counsel to proceed as expeditiously as possible but there are obvious limitations in that respect.

With respect to the technical problems involved in relation to separating out any specific projects—namely the senior citizens' projects—I have a number of details and information in my office in relation to this, and rather than just trust on my recollection today I'd prefer to attempt to respond in greater detail tomorrow with respect to the technical problems that confront any effort to separate projects and expedite them or the bylaws that would affect them.

[2:45]

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary; I appreciate the answer but could the Attorney General tell the House whether he has personally communicated to the mayor of Toronto his concern, and his government's concern, that counsel for the city proceed more expeditiously and more rapidly. And can he assure that if counsel will proceed more expeditiously that the OMB officers would be willing to work overtime to get some of these projects underway while the need is still great?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I haven't communicated directly with respect to the mayor of the city of Toronto. As a practising lawyer for some years, I always regarded it as inapropriate to communicate with a client with advice as to how their counsel should conduct a matter before the courts or tribunal. I don't think this would be proper for me, with all due respect.

With respect to the longer sittings, I think the board members have been prepared to sit regularly and for reasonable hours. There is a very large volume of highly technical evidence that is being introduced—some say overly technical, or this view has been expressed by individual members of the board—and to expect them to sit any longer hours than what they are sitting, I don't think it is in the public interest, because I think individuals in any type of hearing such as this are capable of only absorbing facts for so many hours a day. I think the leader of the Liberal Party with his own professional training would appreciate that problem.

Mr. Speaker: The member for London Centre.

Mr. Peterson: As a Metro member particularly and one who is sensitive about these kind of problems—and I think it is the kind of thing that requires assistance from everyone, particularly from the minister as a Metro member—would he be prepared personally to attempt to come to some kind of accommodation with Metro and with the OMB to accelerate this? Would he get involved from now on?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't really understand the question. I don't know in what manner the hon. member is suggesting the Attorney General become involved. I think in matters such as this there are a number of interested parties with conflicting views. I think it would be most inappropriate for the Attorney General to intervene in the manner suggested.

OHC RENT ARREARS

Mr. S. Smith: A question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Housing: In view of the

rather severe hardships, including some evictions in Toronto and in Ottawa, caused by the attempts of OHC and local housing authorities to collect so-called arrears which resulted from the retroactive exclusion of public housing from rent review, would the minister not agree to forgive the additional amounts charged for that period, December 1975 to the third week in May 1976? Would he at least agree to meet with representatives of the various tenants' groups to discuss this particular unfortunate situation? There have now been evictions, as he knows, in Toronto and in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, I am sure, is aware that a great many of the persons who were residing in the particular units he is referring to have in fact paid the rents they would have been required to pay under the normal rent-geared-to-income scale. It would be improper, I believe, to now forgive those who did not. Despite some of the comments that have been made, Ontario Housing Corporation officials have attempted in many ways to accommodate the payment of those funds. There has been no pressure brought to bear.

Mr. Good: Doesn't the minister call eviction pressure?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As I understand it the evictions have only come about as a result of people who have flatly refused to pay the rents they were required to pay under a rent-geared-to-income scale.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary; is the minister aware of the case in Ottawa February 14 where a young couple with two small children were made homeless under rent review? The husband 23, an illiterate; the wife 19, naive. They paid their rent; they were then asked for arrears of $500, the amount by which their rent went up. They were asked to sign a paper agreeing to pay the arrears and they thought they had no alternative but to sign so they signed. Then they were evicted because they failed to pay these arrears. Has the minister looked into that particular case? Doesn't he think this type of hardship was unforeseen by the House?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I must say I am not familiar with that particular case. I would be pleased to hear the details, although some of them are a little bit strange as portrayed by the hon. member.

Mr. S. Smith: It's not particularly funny.

Mr. Good: Supplementary: Did the minister authorize this or was he aware of the fact that during the term that rent review procedures were legal for people in OHC housing that OHC was sending letters to those people asking for the additional rents that would apply if they were not under rent review? Was he aware that that happened, or can he confirm that that did happen? Would he not consider that an illegal action at that time?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, yes, I am aware of that. I do not consider it an illegal action. What was done was that a letter was sent advising those tenants that there was a possibility that their units might not be subject to rent control.

Mr. Good: But they were at that time.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. They were then. The letters were sent to them saying that they had the choice. They could pay the rent as it was controlled by the rent review process or they could pay the full rents and the differences would be held for them. You see, Mr. Speaker, some of us were of the opinion—and I believe some of the tenants became aware—that there might be a turnaround of the Liberal Party position in that particular matter.

An hon. member: You've had it.

Mr. Breaugh: Supplementary: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would consider treating that in the same way as the government has treated the first-time home owner's grant and pursuing it with the same diligence?

Mr. Good: Talk about breaking faith.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Oshawa is asking a question.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I apologize to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, I was listening to interjections from the hon. member from Waterloo at the time.

Mr. Breithaupt: They were of some value too.

Mr. Breaugh: I'll repeat the question. I certainly don't want to interfere with any interjection over there.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't hear the member for Oshawa, the only one who has the floor. Thank you.

Mr. Breaugh: Thank you. I'm impressed. Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider putting this in the same box as the first-time home owner's programme and treating it with the same diligence?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wishes us to proceed and to collect the arrears, as this House has generally directed should be done under the first-time home buyers grant, yes.

An hon. member: The same way.

DRIVERS' MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Mr. Philip: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications concerning the new licensing system for transport drivers: Is the minister aware that at a meeting last Thursday between officials of his department and the Ontario Joint Council of Teamsters the officials indicated that the only real guarantee of confidentiality of medical records was their word of honour, with the possible exception of certain sections under The Transport Act that would give them some protection? If so, would the minister indicate what sections of the Act offer protection of confidentiality of their medical records and what amendments the minister might be considering to strengthen these sections to guarantee that these records will not be made available to other people who might like to use them?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I was aware that my senior officials were at that particular meeting last week. I have not had a report from them on the outcome, so I will have to look into the matter and get the information the hon. member wants.

Mr. Philip: By way of supplementary then, would the minister at least answer the second part of my question; namely what protection do they have, under what sections of the Act, of confidentiality? And why would the minister not accept a simple statement by the medical profession that drivers are fit to live up to the kinds of requirement that the ministry is setting for drivers?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of what sections of the Act were referred to at that particular meeting, because as I told the hon. member I have not received a report on that meeting yet; I will get the information.

Mr. Moffatt: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has promised to come back with an answer. Have we got something that is supplementary to that?

Mr. Moffatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Since the minister is going to provide further information, maybe he can provide this as well. Why is it that the provisions under the regulations governing this new driver's licence system provide that no person who takes insulin in any form can drive any kind of commercial vehicle?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would have to get advice on that from my medical advisory committee. I don't pretend to be able to answer that question.

Mr. Speaker: I indicated that was the final supplementary. We can come back to it at a later time.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. May I first commend her on the fact that she has now been motivated as a result of the activities of this party in the group home field.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: You can't say that with a straight face.

Mrs. Campbell: On page 3 of her statement she refers to the activities of the family court, the local committee taking responsibilitiy for ensuring the proper care and custody of the child. Does this mean we are going to see a continuation of full responsibility in these cases being placed upon the municipalities, in place of the province, where they used to lie under section 8?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would just like to reiterate this government didn't take action because of the pressure of the Liberal Party.

Mrs. Campbell: After 34 years?

Mr. Reid: Like the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Breithaupt: It just happened.

Mr. Ruston: The same as the Minister of Education and his education policy.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would like to say publicly that the indication that the hon. member has tried to say the Liberal Party was responsible for the report on residential

services is very misleading. I would say I'm very disappointed she would try to give this impression.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: But not unexpected.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This government has been very involved and very interested—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't hear the answer.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: From last July. The minister had that report for two years.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Interjections.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The hon. leader of the Liberal Party should appreciate more than anyone else in this House the difficulties in trying to get the kind of treatment for the children of this province who need help.

Mr. S. Smith: You had the report for 20 months.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: And he above all, I would think, would appreciate the government's major reform in this area and would be so appreciative of what we are trying to do on behalf of the children of this province. These kinds of misleading comments are far beyond anything I can accept.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't hear. We're wasting time.

Mrs. Campbell: I wonder, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is this supplementary?

Mrs. Campbell: No, it is not supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking the minister to address herself to the question I put as to whether or not the local communities, via the local committees, would continue to assume the full per diem responsibility as they did when this government evaded its financial responsibilities on the repeal of section 8.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again I take unction with some of the comments she's made.

An hon. member: It's a fact.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would just like to say to her—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —that it has been pointed out very clearly that there will be continuing consultation with the people who live in those communities—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: You are too unctuous by now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —to see that the children really deserve the kind of attention they should have.

Mr. Reid: Who pays?

Mr. S. Smith: Who pays?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't hear the answer. I'm not even sure whether there is an answer or a question on the first part.

Mr. Breithaupt: Remind the minister.

[3:00]

Mr. Speaker: May I just remind the hon. members that when you ask a question, keep the editorial comment to a minimum—really zero—and the same thing with answering questions, of course. The question was a good question, I think, and I'm not sure even whether the answer was given because of the interruptions. I think there was an answer given to the last part. We'll allow another supplementary from the member for St. George on the answer.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I guess, to make it as simple as I can: Who pays under this programme? Who has the right to assess the efficacy of the programme?

Mr. S. Smith: It is your friend who says "unction" when she means "umbrage."

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would again like to reiterate what we've said in both of our statements. There will be consultation as to the cost-sharing between local municipalities and the provincial government.

Mr. McClellan: May I ask the minister how quickly she'll be introducing legislation establishing the children's services committees?

Interjections.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would refer that question to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Mr. McClellan: May I redirect? Mr. Speaker, may I redirect?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you may redirect.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the first stage of the consolidation of the youth services will be the introduction of legislation during this session to consolidate at the provincial level. During that time, as I indicated in my statement, we will be consulting initially with the regional municipalities since we see that government structure as the most likely one for early implementation.

Mrs. Campbell: They are paying now.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would anticipate that before the end of this year we would introduce the legislation with respect to the local committees. It would probably not be possible for them to be in place prior to some time early in 1978, but we will move as quickly as possible in order to have them established. I trust that the member—I'm sure he realizes—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —that the consolidation alone at the provincial level is in fact a major administrative undertaking—that it's going to take some time. We have set the target date at July 1 for the transfer of accountability from the units and the existing programmes in other ministries—transferring that to the new children and youth division—because of the fact that it's going to take that period of time, two or three months, in order to make sure that the mechanism is in place for a smooth transfer of responsibility so that we don't launch into something irresponsibly and end up with a mess. I think surely the member understands that that kind of a lead-in period is necessary. To reiterate my answer specifically to the member's question, I would hope that before the end of this year, we would have legislation before the House to set in place the local committees.

Mr. McClellan: That is a long way off.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Don't be so ridiculous. You know very well that is not a long way off.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. We are wasting time with the interjections.

HOME BUYER GRANTS

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a question on home buyer grants asked last Thursday by the member for Hamilton West. However, before answering the specific question, as the new Minister of Revenue I wish to make some observations about the grant programme.

Mr. S. Smith: Revert to statements—

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: In the past six weeks, I have made a point—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I have made a point of reviewing this programme and it is my conclusion—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I presume this is a short answer?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Yes, it is, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Otherwise, it should have been given as a ministerial statement earlier.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: No, sir.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Well, we'll time it. Thank you very much. The hon. minister.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I have made a point of reviewing this programme—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: The minister has said that before she answers the question, she wants to make a statement with regard to the grant programme. This is not the time for ministerial statements.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: At this point in time, I cannot tell whether it's part of an answer. I can't tell what's been said—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: She said it is not.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The hon. minister will answer the question as she sees fit. If I decide that it's a ministerial statement, I shall add time on to it, but I'd suggest that statements of policy and other such like matters should be given as ministerial statements. Maybe this is really part of an answer; I don't know at this point in

time. I can't help what was said. We'll hear the hon. minister and then we'll decide.

Mr. Deans: The minister said it is not.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot tell.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, as part of the answer, I wish to provide a very few remarks as background.

Mr. Ruston: A few remarks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is as part of the answer.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I have made a point of reviewing this programme and it is my conclusion that the programme has been extremely successful in meeting the goals set forth by the government.

Mr. Sweeney: That is just propaganda. That is not an answer. That is not even correct.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: It materially assisted some 86,000 people in purchasing their first home. Indeed, more than a year after the end of the eligibility period—

Mr. Sweeney: That is on the election brochure.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: —we still get calls from people wanting to apply for a grant.

While there has been an attempt to paint a picture of a great ripoff by the citizens of this province upon the public purse I am pleased to say that this is simply not the case.

Mr. S. Smith: What is nine million?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: The vast majority of people applied in all honesty and sincerity. In the case of the limited number of applicants who received the grants in error, the mistakes that were made were mainly honest mistakes.

Mr. Sweeney: That is the only kind you make.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: In fact, after approximately one year of intensive audit, my ministry has discovered a two per cent error factor in grants paid to ineligible applicants.

Interjections.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: All the most flagrant cases of abuse were uncovered in the early stages of the audit. The ineligible recipients now being discovered are those who purchased modestly priced homes and sincerely believed they were entitled to the grant. Sadly, recovery of these grants now works a real hardship on the families involved.

In response to the point raised by the member, out of 70,000 first supplementary grants of $250 each paid to date, only 18 were paid to persons who had previously been identified by our auditors as ineligible receipients of the initial grant payment.

Mr. Sweeney: How could there be any if you had already identified them?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Of these, 10 have been repaid already and there are no problems anticipated in collecting the remaining eight.

In my reply to the hon. member I have expressed my views of the grant programme. Although the problem of enforcement is not a happy one, we are continuing the audit of the home buyer grants.

Mr. S. Smith: It is my understanding that there are 18 people who received the additional money even though they had been identified as ineligible in the first place, but there was another part to the question which I asked originally and I didn't hear whether she answered that, Mr. Speaker. That is, how much money has she recovered in total so far in her attempts to recover money from ineligible recipients, however honest the mistakes might have been in the first place?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: As I said in my statement, Mr. Speaker, it is two per cent—$2,014,500.

Mr. S. Smith: You have recovered $2,014,500?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: This is the amount that is being recovered, yes.

Mr. Makarchuk: A supplementary to the minister: How can the minister reconcile her statement that the mistakes were made by modest home purchasers with that of the auditor who said most of the mistakes were made by people who bought expensive homes?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: That is simply not so, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Peterson: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell the House how many audits her ministry has performed out of the total number of grants that have been given out by her ministry, and what her plans are with respect to the rest of the grants given out?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: This is a matter of public record at the present time. It's somewhere on the order of 25 per cent. A very high audit.

Mr. Peterson: And what are the minister's plans?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: As I said in my statement, the audit is ongoing.

Mr. Peterson: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does that mean the minister plans to audit 100 per cent of the grants?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: No, Mr. Speaker, I made no statement to that effect.

Mr. Peterson: What does it mean? If it's ongoing it doesn't make any sense at all. What does it mean? What are the minister's plans?

Mr. S. Smith: You're still not going to audit them all?

Mr. Speaker: Do you have an answer? All right. One final supplementary. Is this a supplementary? No, okay.

Mr. Godfrey: Are we going to get an extension in the question-period time?

Mr. Speaker: No. As I recall the question, what was asked was partly answered.

The member for Bellwoods then with a question—I'm sorry, Algoma.

Mr. Cunningham: On a point of order, the last one was over here, I believe.

Mr. Speaker: An answer was given over here.

Mr. Cunningham: The answer was over here. The last question was over here.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. We go in rotation here, here and here and we are now back here. The hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, am I given to understand then that the arbitrary answer of a question on this particular side of the House disrupts the question procedure?

Mr. Speaker: I answered that question a moment ago. I answered it and I said that what was said was, in my opinion, part of the original question. The member for Algoma, at last.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Mr. Wildman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the widespread serious concern over the effects of coke-oven emissions on the health of workers at Algoma Steel and the protests from the United Steelworkers of America over the minister's decision not to hold public hearings in Sault Ste. Marie on the new omnibus workers' health and safety legislation, is she prepared now to reverse her position and schedule hearings in the Sault?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I spoke with the leaders of the steel workers in the Sault on Friday afternoon and told them at that time, and I will reiterate it now, that it was not possible to schedule all the hearings in all the centres that we would have liked to have scheduled them in. We should have had them, I suppose, in Peterborough, in Kingston, in Windsor, in Sarnia, in a number of areas.

However, what we have done is to try to centralize the hearings in places where it would be reasonably convenient for both employers and employees to present their points of view to the staff of the ministry regarding the proposed legislation. When I spoke to the steelworkers on Friday in the Sault, I suggested to them that if they had difficulty in attending meetings either in Thunder Bay or in Toronto, they could let me know and we would very seriously consider their request to have a special hearing in Sault Ste. Marie to accommodate them.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary: Is the minister aware it is 400 miles to Thunder Bay or Toronto from Sault Ste. Marie, and if she is, is she willing to take into account the statement by her deputy minister in Sudbury on Thursday that he felt they should look very seriously at scheduling hearings in the Sault as part of their regular hearing process?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I do wish the hon. member would listen. I agreed completely with the kind of thing that my deputy specifically said.

Mr. Breaugh: Now, now, now; be nice.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am very much aware of the distances between Sault Ste. Marie and Toronto and Thunder Bay, but I would remind the hon. member, who lives in Sault Ste. Marie, that Sault Ste. Marie is only 185 miles from Sudbury.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Can the minister clarify whether the hearings in Thunder Bay are two days or one day? There seemed to be some confusion over the weekend.

Hon. B. Stephenson: They are two days in all the centres in which they have been established.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. In view of the minister's decision to pay for the cleanup of lead-contaminated soils in the vicinity of the three Toronto lead smelters, will the minister apply this same principle and pay for the washing of insulators on Windsor utilities poles, insulators contaminated by air pollution emanating from Detroit industries?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated on Friday, this particular cleanup in Toronto can come within the provisions of health-related environmental projects. I also indicated that there was no final decision as far as the allocation of public funds for that cleanup. I question whether or not one can draw the analogy between what's happening in Toronto and the hon. member's proposal for the Windsor area. However, if the hon. member would send me more particular details, I would be happy to look at it.

Mr. Singer: How about the St. Clair River and mercury?

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that approximately two years ago a Mr. Donnelly Hadden, a US lawyer acting on behalf of 11 La Salle families, obtained $117,500 in settlement as a result of air pollution from US industry? Will the minister join with the Windsor utilities in suing the air polluters from the American side, in the light of the fact that Mr. Hadden states that the case is a very good one and the chance of being successful is very high?

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We would be very happy to consider that.

STORMONT, DUNDAS AND GLENGARRY TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. Samis: Question to the Minister of Education: In view of the fact that the secondary school teachers in the counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry have gone on strike this morning, could the minister advise the House if he's planning any special or personal initiatives in order to try to get the two sides back to the bargaining table?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have already conferred with the Education Relations Commission. They stand ready, as they always do, to assist in this matter, and they have a mediator standing by to help the parties arrive at a satisfactory negotiated agreement.

Mr. Samis: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the dispute seems to revolve around working conditions, and because the board does not consider working conditions a negotiable item, is the minister satisfied that both parties are negotiating in good faith and within the spirit and terms of Bill 100?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I've seen nothing to indicate to me that either party in this dispute has been negotiating in bad faith. I think there are some very spirited negotiations going on, but I've seen nothing to indicate any bad faith.

GLENGOWAN DAM

Mr. Edighoffer: Question for the Minister of the Environment: As the main purpose of the new proposed Glengowan Dam in the Upper Thames watershed seems to have been changed from flood control to flow augmentation, would the Minister of the Environment make certain a review is undertaken under The Environmental Assessment Act?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Conservation authorities will come under the provisions of that Act, hopefully by June. At the present time, the authorities are working with people in my ministry to include various projects that are planned now, are on the books for the immediate future, so that we can get under way as far as those projects are concerned; and then, of course, any subsequent projects.

I'm aware of the controversy surrounding the Glengowan Dam, because of the changes the hon. member mentioned, and I would expect the authority would want us to hold a hearing in respect to that project.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr. McClellan: Question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, who I

think is still in the assembly: Given the fact that the Minister of Community and Social Services has indicated it will take upwards of a year, a year and a half, possibly two years before this scheme is in place and functioning—and I suspect that may be optimistic—could you tell us what measures you may have in order to deal with the kind of chaos that the report details—on a short-term basis, on an interim basis? Or do we have to live with this chaos for another year and a half or two years?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm sure the hon. member does appreciate how difficult it is to bring in three or four major ministries with children's programmes and do it very quickly. As the minister indicated, our desire is to have it integrated as smoothly as possible so as not to interrupt those programmes that are helping children at the moment; but it will be done as quickly as possible.

Mr. McClellan: Supplementary: May I ask the minister when she intends to respond with respect to the concerns that were raised at the PMLC meeting of January 21, given that she indicated she would be responding to those financial concerns by early March?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The Minister of Community and Social Services and I will be at the PMLC meeting on April 15, I believe it is.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: In view of the concern expressed by the ministry in relation to children's services, can the minister explain why children's aid budgets were so savagely cut back during the period that these recommendations were being—

Mr. Speaker: That is not a supplementary to the first question.

HOME WARRANTY PLAN

Mr. Givens: To the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Since the passing of The Ontario New Home Warranties Plan Act last year, what has the minister been doing to weed out all the bad actors, those who have been guilty of dishonesty and shoddy construction practices, who have defrauded people to the extent of thousands of dollars? Has he simply been registering everybody under the Act, or has he refused registration to anybody under the Act because of previous bad conduct on their part?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If the hon. member has examined the Act, he knows we neither register nor refuse to register anybody under it.

An hon. member: No, you don't.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It is administered by a completely independent board which handles all the registrations and the refusal of registrations. I am prepared to ask the board that question and see if I can get a reply for the hon. member.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary: Under section 7(b), isn't registration refusable to anybody who in the past has conducted himself in a way where we are afforded reasonable grounds for belief that he will not carry on his undertakings in accordance with law and with integrity and honesty? Don't the ministry and the registrar have the right under that to refuse registration? Isn't it a mockery under the Act for them to accept everybody with open arms?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear that we don't accept anyone, and I don't have the right to refuse registration. The registrar does. The registrar is employed by the private sector. I am prepared to get a report from the board for the hon. member to tell him what has happened under the Act insofar as refusal of registration is concerned.

Mr. Samis: Since there was a report recently that, I believe, half the builders in the province still aren't registered with HUDAC, can the minister tell us what's being done to try to expedite the whole registration process?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have asked the board of directors to put on additional staff. They have agreed to do that. There was absolutely no way of knowing the number of builders in this province, since they have never previously been registered, and we had underestimated the number and so had the board. However, we are prepared to try to catch up with that as quickly as possible.

ALLEGED OHIP FRAUDS

Mr. Dukszta: I have a question to the Minister of Health. Can the minister tell me when he will introduce the amendments to The Health Insurance Act and others, if necessary, which will enable him to legally recover the OHIP overpayments to the sum of $1,106,737 as defined in the recommendations of the medical review committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons as at June 30, 1976?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as the member will recall from last Thursday's question period, I indicated then that we were considering whether legislation was required or administrative changes to carry out these procedures. I am not aware that there have been any difficulties in recovering any of the sums pinpointed through any of the audits, whether it be the profiles done by OHIP or whether it be audits by my inspection branch of particular laboratories and other facilities.

Mr. Dukszta: Supplementary: The two cases which I mentioned on Thursday—the medical review committee against Wakil and the other one involving the College of Optometry—have put in jeopardy 175 cases which are waiting. The amount of money that I specified is over $1 million. The ministry has recovered so far $600,000. My question is, if the physicians decided now to recover that money which they paid and sue the ministry, will it be compelled to pay $600,000 right now for the money already recovered?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have had no such indication of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dukszta: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question, then, not a complete statement.

Mr. Dukszta: Yes. Could the minister tell me then on what legal grounds he can assure me that these physicians will not attempt to recover this money when the court has already judged that The Health Insurance Act is actually inoperative?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will review it further with the solicitors of our ministry. But in the previous reviews on several occasions since I took over the ministry, there has been no such indication that there's a danger of that. The member is not a lawyer, I'm not a lawyer; I'll check it again with those who are.

Mr. Dukszta: But what—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You are asking about the same question over again.

Mr. Dukszta: I want to establish one thing, Mr. Speaker—whether the minister is aware of those two cases I am talking about and how they affect the functioning in his ministry in respect of recovering the funds—and he is not answering my question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the cases; I indicated that last Thursday. Perhaps the member would read Hansard.

MARKET VALUE ASSESSMENT

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Treasurer, I will direct this question on market value assessment to the Minister of Revenue. Since the Treasurer has indicated there is virtually no chance of implementing market value assessment on the present legal schedule which now exists, since he asserts that much more information on this subject will be needed, could the minister tell us why a complete data base was not developed prior to the Blair commission hearings so that both the public and the commission could have a better understanding of its implication? Secondly, why is a complete data base for the province not now available for a better study of the proposal?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I have no idea.

Mr. S. Smith: Why not?

Mrs. Campbell: We knew that.

Mr. Good: In reply to the answer, I'd like to ask a supplementary. When the minister does try to get an idea of that, would she also get an idea of—

Mr. S. Smith: Of anything.

Mr. Good: —how she expects a proper assessment of the implication of this to be of any value without a statement by government as to what its proposed grant structures might be to correlate with the market value assessment?

Mr. Peterson: At the same time that she's answering those questions—

Mr. Singer: Or not answering, as the case may be.

Mrs. Campbell: It's a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the member proceed?

Mr. Peterson: —I wonder if she could provide to the people of this province specific information on the specific nature of the impact of property market value assessment on certain communities.

HIRING OF HANDICAPPED

Mr. di Santo: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Last November the minister announced that the Ontario government would set an example for the private sector in hiring the handicapped. Could she tell us how the programme has been developing since January, when it was supposed to start?

Is the programme restricted to her department or open also to the other ministries? Third, as a result of this programme, has any handicapped person been hired by the government in the meantime?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The programme—the pilot project—is restricted to the Ministry of Labour at this time. The co-ordinator for the programme has been employed. The co-ordinator is reviewing with all the associations of handicapped individuals within the province of Ontario the names of potentially available handicapped persons to be employed in certain areas.

There are, to my knowledge, two who have been employed since, I think, December—actually before the programme started—as a result of the impetus of the programme, and more are being considered at this time. In addition, a programme of increasing awareness in an educative way is being developed by the ministry in order to assist other ministries to develop this kind of programme within their specific responsibilities once we have got ours really under way and functioning.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Laughren: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to standing order 28 and to the provisional rules which apply for this session, I wish to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that I am dissatisfied with the answer to the question on laryngeal cancer and compensation by the Minister of Labour and that I wish there to be an adjournment debate tomorrow night at 10:30. I have so notified the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. So noted.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: As I indicated on Thursday last, I informed the House that I would take Mr. Bain's petition under consideration and inform the House as to whether or not it constitutes a proper petition to the House under the standing orders. At the same time, I said I would make a more comprehensive statement with respect to petitions.

[3:30]

As I stated on Thursday, we are proceeding at this session under the provisional changes to and additions to the standing orders as adopted by the House in 1970. These provisional changes and additions were adopted unanimously by the House on December 16, 1976. Paragraph 5 of that order specifies that the government shall provide a response to the House within two weeks to all petitions presented to the House. If this provision is to work, I am sure the members will agree that petitions must be only those properly within the jurisdiction of the House and presented by petitioners who knew when they signed that they were signing a petition to the Legislature.

If frivolous petitions or petitions which are intended for individual ministers—or on matters which are not within the jurisdiction of the House to remedy—are continuously tabled, the whole procedure of presenting petitions, which is a very ancient and important one—having originated in the 13th century—will be compromised to the point where it is useless. The public petition serves as the only mechanism by which an individual or the community can directly ask Parliament to change some aspect of the general law, rectify some personal or local grievance, or reconsider a general administrative decision.

I refer you to May's Parliamentary Practice, 19th edition, page 811, and W. F. Dawson's Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons, page 238. The history of the modern petition actually dates from the 17th century. In 1669 the Commons passed two resolutions which constitute the legal and philosophic foundation of the modern petition. These read as follows: "that it is the inherent right of every commoner in England to prepare and present petitions to the House of Commons in case of grievance, and the House of Commons to receive the same"; secondly, "that it is an undoubted right and privilege of the Commons to judge and determine, touching the nature and matter of such petitions, how far they are fit and unfit to be received."

In all jurisdictions of which I am aware, petitions may be sent to the table as provided in standing order 83. If, after examination, the Speaker rules that the petition is in order, it is deemed to be received by the House, and may be read by the clerk if required as provided in standing order 85, clause b of which provides that no debate may take place at that time unless on a complaint of some urgent personal grievance requiring immediate remedy, in which case, it will be taken into consideration immediately.

As to the substance of the petition it must, as I mentioned previously, relate to a subject matter over which Parliament has some control. Hence, the House will not receive a

petition relating to a matter which has been delegated to the control of another body. For example, in the House of Commons of Canada, a petition complaining that certain recommendations for the House have not been implemented by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission, was held by Mr. Speaker Lamoureux to be outside the House's purview. Moreover, a petition may not specifically ask for the expenditure of money. This principle is incorporated in our standing order 84.

In dealing with the substance of petitions, Mr. Speaker Jerome in the House of Commons of Canada recently made the following observations: "This is a representative institution and the elected representatives are the ones who should carry into this chamber opinions or reflections on the performance of the government, not messages from the outside brought in here in some other guise. A petition which seeks to place before the House the opinions of people who are not responsible elected members, ought to be viewed in accordance with the straight interpretation."

For the above reasons, it is my intention to receive petitions, and give myself time to study them. I anticipate that on the sitting day following the presentation of a petition by a member, I will be able to rule on the propriety of the petition. I, therefore, point out to the House that when sending a petition to the table a member should not make any comment on its contents. If and when the petition is declared to be in order, standing order 85 will then apply.

I also feel obliged to caution members that, in the past, documents purporting to be petitions have been offered to the House. These documents have, in fact, been altered after they were signed by the petitioner. I will insist that petitions be properly addressed to the House by the petitioner and that no alteration of the document takes place. My point simply is that petitioners must have known that they were petitioning Parliament, not only signing a document as an expression of views to an agency of government.

The House has gone a long way in modernizing the procedure on petitions and eliminating some of the ancient forms of speech which are still required in petitions presented to other jurisdictions. As stated, the only requirement we have really retained is that the petitioners must be aware of what they are signing and that this must be evident on the document they sign.

Finally, it appears clear to me that the House wishes to provide an avenue for the citizens of this province to address grievances directly to Parliament. The House has declared itself in this matter and it is incumbent on all of us to maintain the integrity of this procedure. I ask for the assistance and co-operation of all members.

Referring specifically to Mr. Bain's petition tabled last Thursday, while it does not appear evident that the signers knew they were petitioning Parliament, I am giving it the benefit of the doubt on this occasion and will accept it. But I urge upon the members that in future when a petition is circulated, it indicate that it is addressed to the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly and is in fact a petition to the Legislature for the redress of a grievance. Under provisional rule 5, the government has until Monday, April 18, then to respond to this petition.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, may I make a comment on that statement and ask a question on a point of order? Since it is not a remedy that is used by members of the assembly but is a method by which the everyday citizen of the province can petition the government, would Mr. Speaker give consideration to publishing in the Ontario Gazette at least some form of specific statement showing what the form of the petition must be, similar to the detailed instructions which are given with respect to private bills? Otherwise, the citizen of the province will not know what this technical procedure may be, interesting as it may be to us in the assembly.

Mr. Speaker: I realize the difficulty. Do you wish to make a brief comment on this?

Mr. Breithaupt: I just wanted to comment as well, Mr. Speaker, that when you are considering the possible eventual reprinting of the rules of the House, as these other rules may well be included, not only the matter of an index, of which we had spoken as being possibly useful as an addition, but perhaps an example or two of a petition in the end papers of the rules of the House would be most useful.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just before you complete your statement in this connection, since you are establishing ground rules for a procedure in this House, which we all hope will be used much more extensively than in the past, I didn't fully understand your proscription prohibiting a petition calling for the expenditure of money. I understand, of course, that only the government or the

advisers to Her Honour can introduce legislation calling for the expenditure of money, but it might very well be clear that in order to achieve redress, money would have to be spent.

For example, an easy indication would be an inadequate road system in a certain area. It may well be that money would have to be spent. I just wonder if further consideration might be given to your proscription and that in fact we might make it clear that petitioners might bring forward a petition that would call for the expenditure of money, if accepted by the government.

Mr. Speaker: We don't want to get into a debate on this.

Mr. Godfrey: It's important.

Mr. Speaker: I know it's important. If all members will read and digest what I have just read, I think it might be useful. I think the suggestions which have been made, by the way, are quite reasonable. We'll certainly try to be as helpful as we can in those regards, such as an example of a petition to the Parliament and other suggestions here. I think we can fund these. Also it might be helpful to get together on an informal basis to discuss these various things. I know I have been involved, along with the other presiding officers and the clerk's staff, with quite a lengthy discussion on what is really meant by the word "petitions."

As we reflect upon this, on reading the statement which I have just made and applying it to rule 5 in the new provisional order, I think we should start on that basis.

To answer the query of the hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, rule 84 in our standing orders is quite clear in that regard. If there is a matter of interpretation of what is the expenditure of public moneys, which is the next thing, I don't think we can get into that and explain it here. But I think a little thought upon the statement will be helpful.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a constructive suggestion. The new procedural affairs committee was intended to advise on matters like this. I certainly have grave reservations about a number of the things in your statement. I fear it may put us back to where we were a couple of years ago where petitions have to be vetted by the table before they can actually be raised publicly in the House. Would it be possible for the recommendations that have been put forward to be treated as that, rather than as a ruling, and for the matter and the comments therefor thereon to be considered by the new procedural affairs committee?

Mr. Speaker: They need not be vetted by the table before they are presented. You may present them and I'll examine them and report the next day to the House as to the propriety and reasons therefor. But I might say with the new standing order 5, petitions become very important and they must be true petitions or the process as requested and instructed by the House will break down.

Mr. Godfrey: On a point of information.

Mr. Speaker: I still think, rather than getting into a number of questions here, we should examine the statement because it's pretty hard to grasp. It's quite a lengthy statement. Is there anything that needs immediate clarification?

Mr. Godfrey: The problem is that there are a number of petitions, I'm sure, being signed at this very minute throughout Ontario. Are you going to rule these out?

Mr. Speaker: Well, maybe. If they're not petitions to the House on something on which the House can properly act, then they are not true petitions. Mind you, many of the things which have been entered as petitions can be certainly handled by the House, but not under petitions, if I may say, and that can be explained at any meeting which you might decide to hold.

Mr. Deans: One point, if I may: Wouldn't this be a suitable matter to refer to the new procedural affairs committee?

Mr. Speaker: I still think if people read the statement and think about it, a lot of questions will be answered. If further clarification is needed, I would suggest we have a meeting caucus by caucus or whatever you have to discuss the matter and explain it. Petitions are now—and I say it again—a very important order and they should be proper petitions, or otherwise the House cannot properly deal with them.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TAX REFUND DISCOUNTS ACT

Mr. Davison moved first reading of Bill 15, An Act to regulate Transactions involving the Purchase of Tax Refunds by Discount.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Davison: The purpose of this bill is to regulate certain business practices relating to the purchase of tax refunds by discount. The bill limits the amount of the discount which may be charged when a person enters a transaction of this nature. The bill requires that the person who purchases a tax refund must pay at least 95 per cent of its value to the person selling his right to the refund.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT

Mrs. Campbell moved first reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to.

Mrs. Campbell: By way of explanation, the purpose of this bill is to prohibit discrimination on the basis of an individual's sexual orientation.

[3:45]

PUBLIC UTILITIES AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill Pr 17, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to set up a review committee before a public utility can shut off water, Hydro, gas, oil or telephone. The exploding costs of gas, oil and energy, including electricity, has made it extremely difficult for many to be able to meet their bills on time.

GOOD SAMARITAN ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of Bill Pr 18, An Act to Relieve Persons from Liability in Respect of Voluntary Emergency Medical and First Aid Services.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of The Good Samaritan Act is to relieve persons from liability in respect of voluntary emergency first aid assistance or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or any other sudden emergency.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise to reply to the Throne Speech, since I suspect it will be the last opportunity before we hit the hustings sometime in 1977 to do so and therefore I'd like to set a number of matters before the House and before the government.

I'd like to start, if I may, rather than with the usual frivolity, right at the end of the Throne Speech itself and try to set a tone for the government House leader, who is here, if not the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), who wouldn't believe me anyway. On page 29 of the Throne Speech it says, Mr. Speaker: "With dependable legislative co-operation, it can be achieved"—meaning the programme of the government—"by this assembly by the end of the present year." I want the government House leader to know and to report to the Premier (Mr. Davis) that while there will be volatile moments from time to time in this legislative chamber —we witnessed them this afternoon, we witnessed them last Friday morning—by and large we on this side of the House, in the official opposition, will be positive models of co-operation.

Mr. Breithaupt: Except when he moves his amendment.

Mr. Lewis: The government cannot possibly—except perhaps for the occasional amendment—the government cannot possibly ask of us more co-operation than it will get. We come from that inheritance—members may recall the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Co-operation is an endemic, genetic part of every social democrat in this House and I want to assure the Premier, through the leader of the House, that we will certainly assist in the passage of useful and important legislation.

There are, of course, important things to do which flow from the Throne Speech. No one denies that. It would seem that, from time to time, minority government is acceptable to the people of Ontario. I myself was surprised, during a recent CBC radio noon phone-in on minority government, to find a very large number of people calling in to say that they hoped it went on virtually forever. Therefore, without prolonging it,

we will not be distracted by procedural trifles, not trapped into the irrelevance of turning this place into a steaming cauldron for the sake of a challenge to the Chair or some such. But if there is an issue which genuinely divides us, as I suspect and I'm sure there will be on more than one occasion, so be it. If that should lead to the campaign which everyone now talks about, so be it. There is neither fear nor hesitation on this side of the House if that comes about.

The Throne Speech itself, Mr. Speaker, was not bad as Throne Speeches go. I have said that before and I say it again. I guess I've been in this House 30 or 40 years—so it seems—but I've certainly listened to 13 or 14 Throne Speeches. As they go, consistent in their rhetorical and substantial mediocrity, this is a trifle better and I won't cavil with that. It's ironic that the government should receive such plaudits, even on occasion from the opposition, for simply including in a Throne Speech that which it is a job of any normal government to do. As a matter of fact, the Throne Speech largely compensates for errors of omission which have harassed and been characteristic of this government for the last several decades.

Doesn't it trouble the government members to be talked of in terms of decades?

Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Lewis: But in truth we'll try—no, I guess it doesn't—we'll try to overcome that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It's nice to be a part of the heritage.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I guess it is. They begin to take it for granted, don't they; and then these trifling setbacks are always the more traumatic for it.

We will deal with a number of matters which flow specifically in the Throne Speech, and I don't hesitate to make the acknowledgement that some of them are worthwhile.

In NDP terms—if I may, Mr. Speaker, address the members opposite—the Throne Speech showed two things. Number one, it showed how contained the government is in its approach and therefore how much further we would wish it to go in a number of specific and important areas. For the government, politics remain still the art of the possible—or the art of the minimum I suppose would be more accurate. For the New Democrats, of course, politics remain the art of the reasonable. We are angelic by comparison.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The art of the impossible.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The art of the impossible.

Mr. Reid: At least he didn't say it was the art of the rational.

Mr. Lewis: It sounds magnificently reasonable to me. I kind of like the juxtaposition, Mr. Speaker; it flows lightly off the tongue. The art of the minimum versus the art of the reasonable; I think that flows neatly and shows the differences on opposite sides of this House.

Mr. MacDonald: You're obviously not too quick over there.

Mr. Lewis: More than that, the government Throne Speech also demonstrated a number of fundamental areas of disagreement, partly by what it included partly by what it omitted; a number of areas that evoke profound ideological difference between the official opposition and the government. That's fine. That's what a Throne Speech should do; and in many ways that's what is healthy for the politics of Ontario and wouldn't they be sad if we didn't polarize it that way anyway, eh fellows?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Absolutely.

Mr. Lewis: So, in fact, we are accommodating them by drawing attention to the reality of politics in this province.

What I'd like to do is try to illustrate first where the differences between how far the government has gone and how far it should go are apparent in a number of specific issue areas, and then speak to various fundamentals which emerge from the speech.

First, a number of specifics, just to give you a sense of what we mean, Mr. Speaker. Number one, rent control—or, lest I offend dear Sidney, rent review; right. He is not the only Sidney to say it was a far far better thing that you have done. In any event—

Mr. Foulds: You know what happened to him.

An hon. member: Guillotined.

Mr. Breithaupt: But not until the last moment.

Mr. Lewis: Well, what happened to him at times this Sidney would prefer. I want to submit, Mr. Speaker, it was perfectly logical for rent review and rent control to be extended, and to the extent of that logic

we can support it. But isn't it absurd that, having had the opportunity to deal again with the rent control-rent review process, the government is clearly determined simply to give an imprimatur on what already exists without taking into account some basic and useful reforms?

For example, the government could of course lower the percentage rent increase which is permissible, to follow again the wage and price guidelines which permeate the rest of the economy. It could of course lower it to six per cent. Clearly the government has already indicated that it won't do that because it is absolutely tenacious in its ideological rigidity.

The government could also use the whole reform of rent review legislation to provide for important and fundamental administrative reforms of the process. The administrative process in rent review is a nightmare for those who experience it. In several instances, particularly as it applies to appeal, the administrative aspect comes virtually to an end. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) knew better than most to exempt himself from the field as quickly as possible. He is a relatively logical man. He can find his way from A to C via B. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), on the other hand, finds it difficult finding A, let alone going beyond. As a result the administrative process in rent review is really impaired.

I want to remind the members opposite—

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Am I going to be heckled? Is there no safety in numbers? This is what I hoped for.

I now want to read, via the Chair, to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the fascinating comment made by Brian Bucknell, the associate professor of law at Osgoode Hall, who has written the first major paper on the rent review process. You will know, Mr. Speaker, he was a tenant representative on the rent review board before he removed himself. His paper was called "Rent Review in Ontario: Policy, Politics and the Well Paved Road." Just let me read a paragraph into the record for the edification of the House:

"While many of the policies embodied in the rent review programme are open to debate, there are two fundamental assumptions which from both a substantive and administrative point of view shaped and misshaped the whole scheme.

"The first of these assumptions was, as noted previously, that rent control could be a temporary measure, that a two-year life span for the whole programme was acceptable and that the administrative structure required by the programme could be assembled, have its work completed and be disassembled within 18 months. Obviously the decision to have a temporary scheme had no foundation in economic theory and it can only be regarded as a political response of a disaffected government to a programme which it disliked.

"The other assumption was that the rent review programme could be established and administered wholly separate from the general law of residential tenancies. Rent control is in theory inseparable from a regime of security of tenure."

The maladministration of rent review haunts the validity of the programme. It makes it for many tenants in the province of Ontario unworkable. If the minister had one whit or spark of creative juices about him, he would use the opportunity of the extension of rent control to provide for a complete revamping of the administration of the Act. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that that will not happen; and it is because it won't happen that the New Democratic Party finds itself at variance, again, with the government.

I really think—and I want to say this as genuinely as I can, because I have no ill feeling at all for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations—he is the wrong minister for rent review-rent control. As a matter of fact, if I may submit to you humbly, Mr. Speaker, he is the wrong minister for anything to do with consumer protection—anything at all, whether it's rents or whether it's television repairs. His refusal to consider a simple intrusion on the private marketplace to protect consumers from illegitimate private behaviour makes this often unworkable; and it leads to the minister's own lovable eccentricities, which then govern, piously, the programmes we implement.

Making the member for Carleton Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations is almost as silly as making the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) Minister of Revenue. In both instances it simply doesn't make sense.

[4:00]

The second specific I want to draw attention to—not to mention beer at the ball game, which I wouldn't let past my lips for fear, either.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What, the beer or the comment?

Mr. Lewis: The second point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, relates to the alleged programme in the Throne Speech to stimulate rental accommodation and to continue the government's increase of the building of low-income family housing. We've heard so often in Throne Speeches the stimulating of rental accommodation it seems hardly necessary to pay it heed now. I can only say that we will wait with appropriate anxiety what the government is going to do, although its actions have belied its words a thousand times before. In terms of the significant pretensions—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You haven't got an envelope yet? Didn't you get an envelope yet?

Mr. Lewis: No, I haven't but I will. I will and I'll see the programme.

In terms of the pretentions over the building of low-income family housing I also want to remind the government how little the facts jibe with the rhetoric in the Throne Speech. It talks about increasing the continued increase of low-income family housing. Can I remind the government of something? Before the Ministry of Housing was formed we were building low-income family units in Ontario—socially assisted housing—at somewhere between 2,000 and 8,000 units a year. Then we created the Ministry of Housing, in October, 1973. In 1974 we built 494 units of socially assisted family housing for all of Ontario. In 1975 we built 474 units; and in 1976 we built 202 units for all of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Shame.

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't think that's valid? The figures come from his ministry. Those figures are for low-income, socially assisted housing.

Mr. Cassidy: They're right on, and you know it.

Mr. Lewis: That doesn't include the senior citizens' housing, which is a separate component, in which he also hasn't been making any great strides.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What else?

Mr. Lewis: What else?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Go ahead, there must be more.

Mr. Lewis: No, that's it.

Mr. MacDonald: How much more devastating do you want it to be?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Housing will have an opportunity to enter into the Throne Speech debate later on.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is nothing out of order.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's a matter of judgement, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: My apologies.

Mr. Lewis: Your apologies are accepted—on behalf of the Speaker. I want to remind the minister—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have always known the Deputy Speaker to be a man who could speak for himself. He doesn't need the Leader of the Opposition to speak for him.

Mr. Lewis: The Leader of the Opposition is a close enough friend of the Deputy Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fact, if you listened to him more often you guys would be better off.

Mr. Lewis: —to know when to be cautious. I see him in a reasonable mood and I am taking advantage of it while it exists, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Just don't press.

Mr. Lewis: Fair enough. I simply ask the Minister of Housing, therefore, if he'd like to document and refute the facts by all means, but in socially assisted, low-income family housing, his record has been dreadful. It speaks volumes about his ministry.

As a matter of fact, it might as well be said now: the Minister is turning OHC administration over to the municipalities; he is selling HOME land to the private sector as fast as he can; he's reducing the number of houses that he can build generally; he's tying himself into the federal programmes—AHOP in particular—so that the province has very little involvement. The minister is dismantling the Ministry of Housing with an adroit facility. He is in fact making himself a minister without portfolio.

Interjections.

Mr. MacDonald: The only thing desirable about it is that the people didn't suffer.

Mr. Lewis: The third point I wanted to make to the Premier, just in a brief review

of some of the ingredients of the Throne Speech, has to do with the royal commission on the freedom of information and individual privacy. Again, as in rent, as in housing, it's another missed opportunity.

And if I may say, earnestly, to the Premier, it just doesn't make sense. The government has all kinds of laws to choose from, and what we are receiving on this side of the House and in the public in general, is the beneficence of a government that is unwilling to share what it regards as secrets. This is in fact—if I may respectfully say through the Speaker—a very secretive government. Its members think that government secrecy is somehow the art of politics; it is, of course, the bane of democracy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all. We are interested in some measure of privacy.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate the measures of privacy, that need not deny freedom of information. I want to remind the government, since I see the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) shaking her head, I want to remind the minister and her colleagues how long the government sat on that report on residential treatment for children before it was publicly released. If the ministry wants to understand—

Mr. Breithaupt: Twenty months.

Mr. Lewis: —the feelings of those on this side of the House about whether or not it is genuine in what was advanced today, one need only put it in the context of the absolutely indefensible secrecy which the government tolerated for 15 months.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It really is silly.

Mr. Lewis: I hope, through you to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that this commission will mean something. My colleagues the members for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) and Wentworth (Mr. Deans) found it a matter of some irony that the man chosen to head the commission, Dr. Carlton Williams, past president of Western University, was during the time of his tenure one of the people who refused to give information to the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism when it asked for it; and that makes one worry just a little about the nature of the commission.

May I say to the Premier, as gently as I can, I think he knows that I have, and my party has, complimented the government on certain appointments. Whether it was Arthur Porter or Arthur Maloney, on very many occasions we congratulated the government on the appointment. May I say this appointment is one of its lesser marvels. I say no more than that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is too bad, because he is a very able person and will do extremely well.

Mr. Peterson: The Leader of the Opposition is very wrong. He is very wrong.

Mr. Foulds: Not in that field.

Mr. Peterson: If he knew the man he would change his mind.

Mr. Lewis: If the commission turns out to be an excellent commission, I'll accept it.

Mr. Speaker, the next point I want to deal with in terms of the items—

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of information, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition could tell us as to the extent of the freedom of information Acts in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, how far-reaching they are—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Or British Columbia.

An hon. member: What about Alberta?

Mr. Lewis: May I proceed now, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: I don't feel constrained to answer. I don't know if there is a freedom of information Act in Manitoba or Saskatchewan. I wouldn't really wish to prolong it—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is out of order, unless you specifically accept it.

Mr. Lewis: May I move next, Mr. Speaker, to an item in the Throne Speech relating to initiatives in French language in the English schools. I doubt, in fact I'm sure, no one in the opposition benches will oppose such initiatives. But what an enormous pity that at this moment in time the government couldn't bring itself to a collective initiative, which would be applauded right across the country, of making the French language obligatory, in a number of grades in the elementary system at least, so that finally we could have French language instruction in Ontario which began to be universal. That's not something which anyone in this Legislature on the opposition benches has resisted, it seems to me, over the last number of months or years.

It is something which the government could have won from this House easily and willingly; and it is an example, again, of the difference between the extent to which the

government is prepared to proceed and the extent to which we in the opposition think it ought to proceed. I am sorrier than I can say that on this matter the ministry was unwilling to take its courage in its hands for the sake of whatever opulent carrot it is prepared to offer the various school boards.

The fifth point I want to make about minor matters arising from—if not minor of less than fundamental weight—arising from the Throne Speech, is the question of some of the multicultural initiatives which seem to be inherent in that speech—English as a second language and the reference to a heritage-language programme; I'm not at all sure what that will mean, obviously at some point we will learn.

But again, it seemed to us to be an opportunity to put to the province of Ontario, through the vehicle of the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, a number of specific and particular initiatives which would have given a tremendous measure of good feeling and reassurance to many communities, naturally a little anxious now because of our public obsession and preoccupation with matters English and French and matters Ontario and Quebec.

What might have been appropriate for the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, if I can submit, is a proposal which would have earmarked specific funds to school boards for the provision of English as a second language, because the programme is still far too amorphous.

The government might have expressed it in terms of a specific weighting factor and spoken to the concerns, although not yet policies, which the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) has expressed, and my colleague from Oakwood and others have expressed. The government might have amended, or announced intention to amend The Education Act to permit the teaching of languages other than English and French at all levels in a way which would encourage the boards to do so; funded considerably by government, not unlike what it is now doing with the teaching of the French language; hopefully never having to resort to the extremity of the Essex county situation, although that becomes unavoidable.

But why was it that we have to have, instead, a vague reference to a heritage language programme when we might have done this kind of thing specifically? Not to mention, in other parts of the province like the northern parts, an amendment to The Education Act which could have provided for Cree and Ojibway to be put on a similar footing.

And further, Mr. Speaker, there might have been a specific initiative in the Throne Speech which spoke to the experience of teachers in the various education colleges, in order to provide teachers from a much wider multiplicity of backgrounds to teach, not to mention providing a sensitivity to some of the more difficult problems.

In the midst of the present crisis in the country, Mr. Speaker, none of us can afford to forget the wealth and variety of languages and cultures which make the composite of Ontario. It would have been nice to see something other than the facile reference to heritage languages in the Throne Speech. That's something, again, where we would like to take the government rather further than it was prepared to go.

It is, I guess, worth pointing out that these are the same groups of people, largely immigrant groups of people, who are experiencing enormous economic problems at this point in time. I judge an absolutely disproportionate number are unemployed, with terrific inflationary pressure to boot; and one senses the need for a demonstration of faith contained in the Throne Speech. It was not there.

Number six, Mr. Speaker, I might like to make reference to what was tabled today in the Legislature in the consolidation of children's services in the province of Ontario and the striking of a provincial authority. I am not willing to cavil, nor do I want to get into the argument about who was responsible for bringing it—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well they weren't, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: —but I can remember back to debates in this Legislature when William Davis was a mere Minister of Education—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: —in the middle 1960s, when the therapeutic environments for emotionally disturbed children were discussed most heatedly. I have often wondered to myself since, and I'd like to pursue it when the bill is actually introduced, what went wrong. I have a feeling that we concentrated our energies with such focus on young children that we forgot the adolescent range.

We did provide some important social changes for kids of six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11; it was really quite fundamental and quite dramatic and quite important. But somehow the pressure of the disturbed

adolescent in Ontario society escaped this legislative forum; things went from bad to worse, as a result of the enormous proliferation of statutes—group homes, therapeutic settings, whether it was a psychiatric hospital, a Thistletown, a children's boarding home, a children's institution, a centre under The Children's Mental Health Centres Act—and then the residential report chronicled it all.

[4:15]

We have on this side of the House some anxieties about what the government has introduced. We have some considerable anxiety about how long it seems it is going to take before the local or regional groups get together to decide on rationalizing the system, sorting it out and finding the money to pay. We will be pressing very hard to get some details about that. But I want to put to the minister, because I know she is genuine in this, something that worries me personally even more greatly, although I suppose it isn't the kind of thing on which one bases opposition to the principle. I have a feeling, intuitive but firm, that we have chosen the wrong ministry.

One of the reasons that we have had this incredible consequence of children in trouble in Ontario flows directly from the previous Department of Social and Family Services, which was completely inadequate to deal with it. The minister may recall that the reason we set up The Children's Mental Health Centres Act under the Ministry of Health was because the Department of Social and Family Services was utterly incapable of dealing with it. They never seemed to have the capacity or the apparatus. I think that was partly because it is seen as a welfare ministry, and I guess it will never be seen otherwise.

I have heard nothing but positive things about Judge Thomson, for example, from all those I have talked to. And I understand that the civil service appointment from Management Board—is it Barnes or whoever?—is a go-getter, an active person; so maybe there will be reasonable administration. But I really wonder about the competence of Comsoc, whether it is under the present minister or anybody else, to handle it.

I want to remind the minister that when we moved mental retardation from Health into Comsoc it was an utter disaster. Not only did we have to have an inquiry into Huronia shortly after, but no one can persuade anybody in this province who is knowledgeable that that ministry has adequately handled the mentally retarded or that services in the community have been provided, as the member for Brock (Mr. Welch), when he was Provincial Secretary for Social Development, promised in his now infamous green paper or white paper, or whatever the devil it was. One worries about that ministry.

I would have thought in the best of all possible worlds—and we think in terms of the best of all possible worlds over here—that Education might have been the place. An educational environment is really what you want for these kids—not in the strict learning sense, but in the sense that if kids are identified earlier, responded to through the educational process, and integrated early, then you don't have to set up separate institutional arrangements for them.

By setting up a children's authority, a separate division, in the Ministry of Community and Social Services, I wonder whether we are doing anyone a favour ultimately. I understand the politics of it. I understand the difficulty of it. I am expressing a grave personal reservation. I worry about all of the implications. I look at the rest of the programmes in Comsoc and, honest to God, I don't know how the children will not be defiled by the inadequacy of the rest of the ministry. With all of the best will in the world, the whole inheritance of that ministry, precludes an appropriate setting. But I don't know what one does, other than to register as strongly as I can what would have made more sense; and politics often becomes the art of what is essentially common sense.

The other thing I want to put to you, Mr. Speaker, is this question of the new occupational health and safety statute. It is the last specific item I would like to make reference to that flows from the Throne Speech. Again, who would dispute it? But if I may say to the House leader, and to the Premier in the wings, we in this caucus are increasingly worried about the way in which occupational health is still being dealt with, despite the alleged successes or advances we have made.

For example, may I ask, plaintively, where is the occupational health institute that was promised by this government in the last throes of the 1975 election campaign? And why the devil don't we have it? Does not the government yet recognize that an occupational health institute of that kind is absolutely indispensable to do the kind of scientific and educational range of work without which individual statutes are of only modest use or modest application?

Because there hasn't been a focus—because the government has refused to en-

tertain that vehicle which could have said something to the world—then, if I may, I submit there are a number of matters arising which worry many of us greatly.

Why are we having the perversion of Bill 139, which was passed in good faith in this House? How is it that the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) is prepared to side with the International Nickel Company over the question of whether or not a worker has a right to leave a place which he or she believes to be unsafe?

I mean, we passed it in the House in good faith. Nobody ever believed in this Legislature—never—that a worker who left a job because he believed on reasonable grounds that it was unsafe, would then be sent home without pay and that some other worker, who could be dragooned into it, would step in to do the job. No one thought that that would be the interpretation of the legislation in this House.

That's a breaking of faith. It's a breaking of faith in the field of occupational health on the part of the Minister of Labour. And it is simply unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Why this instinctive wish to close out the media to the public hearings that were being held on the new omnibus bill? It again bespeaks the same frame and attitude of mind which still worries about whether occupational environmental health should be shared with the public, with workers, with all of the people who might otherwise be interested. Why are we still relying, and intend to rely in the new legislation, on threshold limit values that come from this conference of industrial hygienists in the United States, whose values are largely discredited in the more progressive and enlightened scientific community, but by which values our workers, in our work place, will be governed?

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I can ask the House leader, in the absence of the Minister of Labour, whether he heard Mr. Cleverdon, head of the occupational health division of the Ministry of Labour, recently on radio—a Radio AM programme—after my colleague from Hamilton East had raised a question of asbestos dust at the airport.

I heard rumours of what Mr. Cleverdon said. I didn't believe them. When I was at Radio Noon doing a recent show a few days ago, I asked to hear the tape and listened to it; and I want to say to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't believe it.

Mr. Cleverdon, who heads an important branch of government, with the greatest respect in the world to the man, doesn't know what he is talking about. He got his figures wrong. He got his assumptions wrong. He provided sweeping reassurance for which there is utterly no evidence anywhere. And he didn't seem to recognize that asbestos is, I guess, the single most dangerous contaminant in the work place we have yet come across.

I felt again as though something was wrong about how concerned we are prepared to be around this issue.

I was shocked, I want to tell you—I don't know how else to phrase it—when the new Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. F. S. Miller) went up to Matachewan to meet with the workers after the closing down of that asbestos mine and is quoted in the Globe and Mail as saying: "On the subject of environmental controls Mr. Miller described the government's health standards for workers exposed to asbestos dust in the work place as among the strictest in the world. 'The trouble with our standards is whether we have erred on the side of being too strict.'

"Mr. Miller said his minority government was forced—" that's the verb he uses—"forced to adopt the stringent occupational health standard."

You have to wonder what happens to normally reasonable people when they move into the Ministry of Natural Resources. It's like a kind of a metamorphosis, you know. It's a science fiction transmogrification or whatever the word might be. But anyway, poor Frank Miller is transfigured the moment he moves into Natural Resources and has to thump the party line; and if that can be true of a man who was in the Ministry of Health, who fought these battles through, who one assumes would have supported, rather than seeing it as a coercive act, better environmental health standards, God help the ministry; that ministry is an absolute menace.

I'll deal with the Workmen's Compensation Board in this matter of occupational health in just a little while, Mr. Speaker, but around this particular matter we are sensing an absence of good faith and would wished to have sensed otherwise.

All right, Mr. Speaker, what I guess I'm trying to say to the Premier is that there are a whole range of specific items in the Throne Speech where we would have taken things much further. But we fully recognize that he hase taken it, recognizing or paying tribute to the art of the minimum, as far as he is prepared to go. However, there are a number of fundamentals which I'd also like to raise with the Premier, and the most profound area of disagreement, the one which is most compell-

ing for this caucus, an issue on which we know one day we will divide, whether it's in the House or outside, is the question of management or mismanagement of the economy of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is interesting that at long last you are interested.

Mr. Lewis: We have been putting it for a long period of time in terms of the management of the economy.

Mr. Deans: Continuously.

Mr. Lewis: Continuously.

Mr. Deans: You never listen.

Mr. Renwick: Since the member for Brampton became Premier.

Mr. Lewis: That's right, as a matter of fact it began with his ascension to Premier. That's when we really twigged to the frailties and that's when we took it on seriously. But I want to remind him, lest he has forgotten, although his memory is legendary, of all those years in the early and mid Seventies when we on this side of the House tried unsuccessfully to persuade his intractable hordes that inflation was doing terrible damage to Ontario and that unless he did something about curtailing prices and profits we were going to be in a real jackpot in this province in the management of the economy; and we could never persuade him at all.

But we knew, for whatever worth it was, that in the context of the economy that was central then; just as, if I may say, unemployment has become equally central now.

Now in terms of the mismanagement of the economy, the Tories pay lip service to it, I understand. Those are some very gracious and elegant words in the Throne Speech, and again no one can deny them; but when Darcy McKeough, Treasurer of Ontario, rose in his place on Friday morning to make the statement he made it all become fairly clear. When all is said and done, the Tories are simply going to opt for the traditional, economic sophistry. They're going to opt for those old-fashioned, traditional economic approaches, which have brought us to this pass, and have in fact characterized, indeed defined the problem for the last several years. From the point of view of this party, we think that the focus now must be equally shared with jobs. As a matter of fact, in many areas jobs are transcendent and we have to rip ourselves free of this conventional, self-serving assumption that it's got to be an either/or proposition. As far as we're concerned, we can do something about controlling inflation while at the same time creating employment. It's as simple as that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One of these ways is not to restrict capital programmes.

Mr. Lewis: Well I will come—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You people love to have it both ways.

Mr. Lewis: Were you engaging in some kind of doctrinal forum?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just to the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), for whom I have great respect and affection, one day he's worried about jobs and the next day he wants to limit the programme of Hydro where there's a lot of jobs involved.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order please, the hon. member will continue.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I'll get to Hydro, I'm very pleased the Premier has introduced it. It allows me another entry point, as it were. But I'll get to that in just a moment. This isn't—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't mean to interrupt.

Mr. Lewis: No, I know he didn't and, perish the thought, I never interrupt him.

This is not a budget reply and I'm not going to make it into that—we're going to have a great deal more to say about the management of the economy in this province when we reply to the budget—but obviously there is a deep concern expressed in the Throne Speech about jobs and the economy and I want to reply to it.

[4:30]

I want to reply to it starting this way, if I may, Mr. Speaker. There is a conventional mythology in Ontario, generally afoot, that the Tories are not bad economic managers, except that the facts constantly refute the assumption. I know the problems of Ontario aren't separate from Canada, they're not separate from North America. We are reminded ad infinitum about international markets and all the matters that impinge on this poor, fragile flower here in Ontario.

But on the other hand there is a very great deal of initiative and understanding which we could exercise and which we are not exercising. The role of the province of Ontario and the pretension of the Tory government as good economic managers is severely under attack, and I suspect that crescendo is going to mount rather than abate over the next number of months.

Let me remind the House of something. Let me remind it first of last week's tabling of Ontario finances by the provincial Treasurer. This is, in many ways, quite a testament to the provincial Treasurer. Do the members know what it shows? If I can provide a simple dossier for my colleagues in the House: Number one, it shows that revenues were understated. Number two, it shows that—sorry. I'll start again. I'll start at the other end.

Mr. Shore: You were close. You were close.

Mr. Lewis: I'll start at the other end. Number one, it shows that economic growth was overstated by the Treasurer. Number two, it shows that expenditures of government were understated by the Treasurer. Number three, it shows that the revenues to be received were overstated by the Treasurer. Number four, it shows that unemployment was underestimated by the Treasurer. And number five, it shows that the provincial deficit was exaggeratedly understated by the provincial Treasurer. In other words, on all five economic indices of major import, the Treasurer was wrong. Dead wrong. That takes some doing, because he's been around for quite a while.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's nearly 100 per cent.

Mr. Foulds: He should resign.

Mr. Lewis: What it shows is a capacity—well, I don't think you'll disagree with any of those matters. I think it shows a capacity for consistent prophetic error, or alternately, consistent rhetorical cant, and that's what we have received from this Treasurer for a considerable period of time. I think what it's going to do is to call into serious question the capacity of the government to make further economic forecasts. I ask the House, albeit the Premier treats it with a benign smile, to think that with all of the Treasury apparatus around him he can be wrong on revenues, wrong on expenditures, wrong on growth, wrong on deficit, wrong on employment, all by the same man, all within the period of 11 months. Not bad. Not bad.

Mr. Makarchuk: Almost a perfect score.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: I put it to the House as an interesting example of the mythology of the Conservative capacity to manage the economy.

I want to take that to a second point. The mismanagement also abounds in other smaller but identifiable ways. I remind the Premier of the millions spent on Minaki Lodge. I remind the Premier of the millions spent on the South Cayuga purchase, for which that town site will never see the light of a town. I remind the Premier, through the Speaker, of what was revealed around the OHIP billings to private labs and around, indeed, the administration of that system in general. I remind the Premier of the home buyer grant, yet to be accentuated week after week and month after month in this Legislature. I remind the Premier of the controversy around whether or not the exemption should have been granted to Ronto.

I remind the Premier, in other words, that there are individual identifiable examples, some of them mounting into the millions of dollars—South Cayuga amounting to $30 million—which are absolutely indefensible in the context of good economic management. Yet they are at the feet of the Conservative government. So on the one hand, the government's forecasting is off—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You were going to landbank the whole province a few years ago.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, dear! Is the Premier going to go back to silliness?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by all means do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some people have never left it.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: That happens to me often, too—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You've never left it.

Mr. Lewis: —and it's very aggravating, particularly when it speaks the truth involuntarily.

Mr. Makarchuk: You didn't come out that well on that one, Bill.

Mr. Lewis: I want to remind the Premier that there is yet another example of this mythology evaporating over time: his uncritical acceptance of the Anti-Inflation Board guidelines. He expressed occasional reservations but, boy oh boy, did he leap in quickly to endorse it, just as quickly as the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) leaped in to endorse Donald S. Macdonald.

Mr. Reid: And who voted with you on it?

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, was it Sinclair Stevens my colleague from York South heard today saying that Donald S. Macdonald should resign for the budget he brought in. If he brought in that kind of balance sheet as president of a private corporation, they'd boot him out of office. But one never expected federal Tories and provincial Tories to see alike on such matters, I suppose.

Mr. MacDonald: They're only fundamental.

Mr. Lewis: That's why you're here and Joe Clark is there. I understand that. I recognize it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's why you're here and Dave Barrett is back where he is.

Mr. Lewis: Don't malign—my goodness. you're going far afield; nationalizing land in Ontario, Dave Barrett in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Same party philosophy.

Mr. Lewis: Is there nothing else you can invoke? Cuba, Czechoslovakia? Surely there are no limits to your horizons.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There's a slight difference.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Let me remind the Premier that although he expresses the occasional caveat about the Anti-Inflation Board, he's betwixt and between as much as the federal government is about what happens next, having imposed this phenomenon upon the people. But even though the Premier has exercised some restraints in the public sector, and I will have more to say about that shortly, he has never been able to bring himself, even now, to take a look at prices and profits. Indeed, one of the interesting aspects of the government's inability to manage the economy is the way in which it has allowed a certain number of prices and rates to increase unconscionably while the controls programme is in place.

Mr. MacDonald: Milk prices, for example.

Mr. Lewis: Ah, thank you very much. I'll accept any assistance that will come to me from my colleague. Milk prices, for example, said the member for York South. Does the Premier recall that his own government has done a study which indicated that the retail price to the consumer was illegitimately set for two years in succession? And they are talking about increasing milk prices yet again. Did we hear a twitch—we never will hear a twitch from the Minister of Agriculture and Food or a roar from that minister when it emerged that milk prices might go up again? Not a chance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You don't hear twitches; you see them.

Mr. MacDonald: When the minister is here, I'll see them.

Mr. Lewis: When you come right down to it, when it comes to the crunch, the government simply doesn't intervene.

Hon. W. Newman: You would intervene in everything.

Mr. Lewis: May I also recall to you that when John Clement was Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, when that portfolio was inhabited by a partisan rather than an antagonist, he did a study of 16 major food retailers, pointing out that the prices that were charged were frequently illegitimate. The government has had it all arrayed before it but in the question of food prices, during the course of controls, it has never been willing to intervene to protect the consumers or to protect the farmers. The government's only interest is to protect the middleman. That's whom they have protected.

Hon. W. Newman: Wait a minute. In Quebec the farmers—

Mr. Lewis: I think that's true. I believe that to be true.

Hon. W. Newman: That's not true.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to you how these Tories managed the economy in terms of energy prices? They were begged by this party to smooth the Hydro rate increase over a period of time so that people didn't have to accept 25, 26 or 27 per cent rate increases capriciously, unexpectedly, in given years. They found it impossible, absolutely impossible.

Now that the Treasurer is back, the Premier may leave. I understand—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We're just sort of alternating a bit. It takes two of us to handle you at any time.

Mr. Lewis: No, I don't think that's true, but I am prepared to admit that they are indistinguishable one from the other.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will be back.

Mr. Lewis: I say that affectionately. I mean simply in girth if nothing more.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have been working very hard.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not below the belt; it is on the belt.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On you—it's below.

Mr. Lewis: Exactly. On matters of food and on matters of energy costs, there has been absolutely no wish on the part of the Treasurer or the government to protect people in the province of Ontario. On the question of housing costs, it is engaged in exactly the same activity, exactly the same activity. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Housing read a statement today before the orders of the day, announcing fulsomely that of course the government is going to make a profit on the sale of the land. Well, land is the single most extravagant component, the one that has been going up most speculatively over the last several years—in the cost of a house. If you have 20,000 to 22,000 acres of publicly-held land all over the province of Ontario, why in God's name not build upon it and reduce the price of the house to the buyer by virtue of reducing the price of the land?

Now, it is my opportunity to correct what the minister said because when I talked about the first buyer, I was talking, of course, about the province—not about an individual home purchaser. It seems to me that the province should keep the price down. I don't understand the government's whole programme. But I speak again to its inability to keep prices under check, yet at the same time allegedly supporting the wage and price control programme.

It also speaks to property taxes. May I say a word about property taxes? It speaks to procrastination, to delay, to a refusal to act upon suggested reforms, to the apparent acceptance of many of the preposterous propositions in the Blair commission and those propositions from government which preceded it. Again, we will have much more to say on the budget when we respond. I simply point out that whether it's food or energy, housing or land, property taxes or whatever, the government supports the AIB guidelines on the one hand and, on the other, does nothing as a government to manage the economy. And that speaks volumes to us in this caucus, because it shows that the mythology around the Conservatives is mythology indeed.

That brings me to the fourth point I want to make: Whenever the economy of Ontario needed stimulation in the minds of this government, whenever it felt that jobs were required or that investment had to be increased or that something had to be done to get this economy going again, it turned to its favoured, absolutely single-minded preoccupation—a tax rebate of one kind or another to the corporate sector. That is its fine tuning of the economy, a blunt-edged instrument used again and again in successive budgets from 1971 through, I dare say, to 1977.

It never seems to understand that there has to be a multiplicity of economic factors altered, changed and implemented, when dealing with the kind of stimulation which is allegedly required. And even when the government had conclusive evidence that additional jobs were not being created, even when it had conclusive evidence that the tax rebate wasn't really working, it persisted in its application.

And what's the bitter irony? The bitter irony is that in 1977 we are in worse shape economically than we were when the government first happened on the idea in 1971. By the end of this fiscal year, it will have budgeted for tax rebates equalling $830 million to the corporate sector. And for what? We have never been able to get from the government the number of jobs created.

An hon. member: None.

Mr. Lewis: You have always denied—

Mr. MacDonald: John White said none and he was right.

Mr. Lewis: John White admitted there were no jobs created but we have never been able to get that from this Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: You eliminated jobs, in fact.

Mr. Lewis: I would be glad to receive a lesson in elementary economics from the Treasurer whenever he wants to give it to me. More paradoxical is the fact that the government kept on providing tax rebates to the corporate sector for the purchase of machinery and equipment when there was significant unused capacity in the manufacturing sector throughout. How, in God's name, does that make economic sense in Ontario to provide that kind of fillip to the corporate sector in precisely the area where they are unable to use it?

[4:45]

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 when they began this proposal there was already unused plant capacity of 10 per cent to 15 per cent in the province of Ontario, with the

provincial Treasurer sitting idly by? Perhaps I can read into the record the percentage of capacity utilization in the manufacturing sector by a number of major groups for the fourth quarter of 1976.

In wood it's running at 75 per cent; in furniture and fixtures at 70 per cent; in printing at 79 per cent; in primary metals at 65 per cent; in metal fabricating at 80 per cent; in machinery at 86 per cent; in electrical products at 79 per cent; in non-metallic mineral products at 73 per cent; in chemical and chemical products at 82 per cent.

If you take all the major sectors of the manufacturing area by group you find we're running at a use capacity of 79.43 per cent. That is, to echo the words of my colleague from Downsview, we've got over 20 per cent of unused capacity across the country, and it is generally conceded that those figures are directly transferable to the central manufacturing province, such as this one. It makes no sense.

It makes no sense when our exports are down as well. And I want to remind the House of the response of many of the corporate people to the Donald S. Macdonald budget. A number of them said, what use further tax rebates because we've got unused capacity? A number of them also said, why in the devil didn't they provide a significant tax cut—obviously these were people in the service and retail trades—because that's what we require to stimulate our sector? Surely, therefore, that significant tax cut must be part of the provincial Treasurer's next budget, using some of the money he has so inappropriately deployed for the corporate sector. Yet his response to Donald S. Macdonald shows otherwise.

Can I remind the Treasurer of his clairvoyant words on Friday morning last? "These are not happy times for the economy," he said. "Some of our citizens are experiencing real hardship and this budget does not put an immediate end to any of their problems. Nevertheless, I am encouraged that this is an honest budget. Mr. Macdonald has recognized the two primary concerns of unemployment and inflation and his budget concentrates on long-term performance to meet both challenges, rather than short-term tradeoffs."

That is a devastating statement for Ontario, and it's terribly disappointing because the problem has been long-term for a long time. Yet this government, with its straitjacketed view of economic management, cannot seem to adapt. You're always good at curtailing the public sector. You're always good at trumpeting the private sector, you invariably use tax rebates as a cure-all, but you're not managing the economy well. Your statement on Ontario finances was wrong. Your support for the AIB and your refusal to curtail prices was wrong. The evidence of mismanagement in a number of identifiable areas is unacceptable, and in the crucial matter of the tax rebate you have clearly made an error.

Can I put it simply this way, Mr. Speaker? This Treasurer and those around him are terribly fundamentalist people. They're far more dogmatic in their economic approach than the New Democratic Party will ever be. They're stale, they're narrow, they lack common sense. It is very, very difficult for any of us to appreciate why they rely so entirely on one economic strategy when it has led to indefensible unemployment—or at least it has existed alongside indefensible unemployment in this province.

The government has said very often that we are the doctrinaire people. Utter balderdash! If ever there was a government of fundamentalists, it lies over there. Its mismanagement of the economy is proof of it. I can't imagine any less creativity, flexibility than the government has displayed. As a matter of fact, if I can coin a phrase, this Treasurer and the government of Ontario suffer from what might be called an almost terminal scrawniness of the imagination.

Now I suppose, in a way, that it was all bad enough before, but now that jobs have become so fundamental, so central to the Ontario economy, it becomes dispiriting and demoralizing. Three hundred and sixteen thousand people unemployed in February of 1977—that's quite a testament to the provincial Treasurer. Can I read the unemployment rates into the record, Mr. Speaker, lest members of the House haven't seen them? In eastern Ontario in February 1977 the rate was at nine per cent. In Peterborough-Haliburton, 9.8 per cent. In Toronto, 6.9 per cent. In Hamilton peninsula, 8.7 per cent. In southwestern Ontario, London-based, 8.9 per cent. Southwestern Ontario, Windsor-based, 9.4 per cent. Southwestern Ontario, Kitchener-based, 6.3 per cent. Georgian Bay-Lake Huron-Barrie, 10.4 per cent. Northwestern Ontario, 7.2 per cent. Northeastern Ontario, 9.3 per cent. Three hundred and sixteen thousand people unemployed.

Does the Treasurer remember the budget of 1971? Can I quote his words back at him? I quote:

"Low-income workers have been particularly hard hit, as have young people and students who find themselves unable to enter

the labour force in ways which fully utilize their abilities and training. During this period of forced slowdown, large numbers of older employees have lost their jobs and many of them will find it difficult, if not impossible, to secure equivalent positions when the economy ultimately recovers.

"The real cost of unemployment to these people has been enormous, not just in terms of lost incomes but also in terms of human dignity and family security. In addition, there has been a heavy cost to the community at large in lost output and weakened confidence."

That was in the budget of 1971. What happened to those words by 1977?

Remember John White and the budget of 1973? He says, and I quote: "Let me repeat, however, the message of my predecessor, who stated that any unemployment figure in excess of three per cent is unacceptable to this government."

An hon. member: Well, well.

Mr. Lewis: We'll never see three per cent again, so long as the Tories are in power, because now we have a government which is willing to accept eight per cent. I know it's a difficult proposition to deal with unless one sort of sees it visually in human terms, but imagine accepting as an economic premise in Ontario at least 316,000 people out of work for a continuing period of time. That's not this month's figure. There was a time when that would have turfed a government right out of office.

Mr. Deans: It will.

Mr. Lewis: And so, of course, it should turf this government and may yet do so, if it ever brings itself to facing the electorate.

I might say that a goodly number of people in my caucus have visited Manpower offices. They see them in their own constituencies. They talk about the individual ruination in families. One cannot deal in this society with that kind of unemployment rate. But it persists. It continues.

As I was driving to the Legislature today, I passed Shaftesbury and Yonge where they are putting up some kind of apartment hotel or whatever, and they are advertising on a billboard for workers. They have 160 to 200 jobs available. By noon they already had 500 applications, and the applicants were lined up down Shaftesbury and all the way along Yonge.

This is 1977, for God's sake. This isn't depression psychology. There is utterly no reason in the world why this government, were it able to manage the economy a little more creatively, there is utterly no reason in the world why it couldn't step in and revive the confidence that it finds so elusive. But in its own straitjacketed persistence, it relies on one avenue alone—the tax rebate to corporations.

So obviously we would be in favour of a fairly major tax cut. As a matter of fact, if those tax cuts to low- and low-middle-income groups had been exercised over the last two or three years, rather than these rebates which show little point, we probably would be a lot better off than we are today.

But we go further than that. What we're saying to this government in no uncertain terms, what we're asking, urging, proposing is simply this: Let the government be seen to be actively, urgently involved, region after region, creating jobs, saving existing jobs, taking equity positions, encouraging the private sector, restoring confidence, not by abstract theories, but by showing the world that we can make a significant dent on unemployment and that we can do it while still managing the economy in terms of inflationary pressures. Let the government use the existing funds it has. It has already budgeted for $160 million a year, for heaven's sake. It isn't as though it had to raid the Treasury further, although additional funds for direct investment would be a perfectly legitimate decision. Let it make its variety enormous and put life and enthusiasm back into the economy.

Let me put to the provincial Treasurer, if I may, a number of concrete examples. Let me not talk in abstracts. Let me tell him exactly what we mean. I'm just going to recite them at him pell-mell in the context of everything that's gone before in this argument.

Number one: Take the example of Collingwood. Several hundred workers are going to be laid off in that Ontario shipbuilding community within the next several weeks. By the end of August 1977 there may be 1,000 people laid off. It is facile and inexcusable to consider Collingwood a federal shipbuilding responsibility. When I was in Collingwood some number of months ago, seeing the place and trying to understand what the unemployment hazards were and why there was so much anxiety—and the Premier, I know, has been involved via back-benchers and others—one of the things that struck me, small but compelling, was the wish on the part of the company to extend its dry-docking facilities from 750 feet to 1,000 feet in order to allow it to tender on a number of ships it couldn't otherwise build.

No one is asking the government to give a subsidy to the shipbuilding industry. All we're saying is, here is an identifiable role for the provincial government to have gone in there, helped them with their expansion to 1,000 feet and helped them therefore gain additional contracts. It never occurred to the government to do so. As a result, the unemployment in Collingwood is as layable at this government's feet as it is anywhere else.

Number two: Take Timmins in the riding of my colleague from Cochrane South. Timmins now has 4,700 people on the role of the Manpower offices, although that takes in an area beyond Timmins itself. But it hasn't been this high in 20 years. Timmins is suffering from the gold mining decline. They've lost 730 jobs over the last two years in the various gold mines. I guess Texasgulf is not now hiring at the moment, although it has expansion plans for the future. The Timmins community is in serious economic hardship.

I throw the government's mind back to July 1975. The Treasurer stands in the Legislature and says; "We are going to build a consolidated government structure in Timmins. We have apportioned the funds for it already." It's April 1977. Where's the government structure? It's never been built. The people in Timmins have never seen it.

Mr. Ferrier: They haven't turned the sod.

Mr. Lewis: They haven't turned the sod; they haven't let the tender. Why, when the government has a community which has such heavy unemployment can it not at least meet a building project to which it is committed?

Why not do more than that? Why not take a look at the gold mining situation in a place like Timmins? Finally, the value is going up on the international markets. Finally, the government has from the gold-mining companies themselves—the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Maeck) shakes his head. He's shaking to a colleague, but I'd prefer to use it for my purposes. He agrees gold is up in price again on the international market. He knows, as few others know, that the International Monetary Fund has now looked as though it will stabilize the sale of gold. He knows because he has something to do with Natural Resources, doesn't he?

Mr. Maeck: Don't carry this too far.

Mr. Lewis: He used to have. He used to know that one of the major gold-mining companies, Pamour, has presented a piece of material to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Treasurer demonstrating the kinds of gains and jobs which could be available in the gold-mining sector if only it had some confidence and economic support.

[5:00]

Is equity such anathema to those people opposite? Is it not possible to give a community continuity and economic resilience by stepping in at the moment when a small public, private venture would guarantee it long-term security? What is wrong with the Tories? They can't extend a dry dock in Collingwood. They can't build a government building in Timmins. They can't provide equity for gold mines.

Let me ask them something else: What about Matachewan? My colleague from Timiskaming (Mr. Bain) has certainly raised it with the Premier and the former Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier). So have I. There is a company, United Asbestos, which went through a terribly difficult time. I think it is generally agreed by those who have looked at it, including the Mercantile Bank, I suspect including the government itself, that the problems of United Asbestos are very deep. They go back to management, they go back to a capital inflationary spiral which the company did not anticipate. But the place is relatively safe; safer than most asbestos environments in Ontario. The machinery is now installed and it could probably go to 100 per cent production.

And the Tories are dealing with Kirkland Lake. Do they remember Kokotow Lumber —down the drain 18 months ago—no jobs? Notice Ontario Dynamics, a little manufacturing plant in Kirkland Lake—down the drain —no jobs. Now we have 275 jobs at a viable operation, and they sit there in that absolutely intractable rigidity and say, "We will not intervene in the market place." Why do they give rebates of $160 million to private companies? Why don't they take an equity for the province of Ontario in certain of the industrial or resource sectors in order that the jobs be fulfilled?

I spoke to the president of the Mercantile Bank. My colleague spoke to the vice-president of the Mercantile Bank. This government has been in touch with the bankers, the people who hold the notes. The Premier knows that if the government showed some confidence in Matachewan that place could reopen and the people would go back to work. There seems to be a good international market. That is a concrete job-saving proposition, just as there are other concrete job-creating propositions.

Why can't the Tories do it? Why can't they bring themselves to do it? Why can't

they flood out from this place with sirens ringing, establishing a number of job situations all across Ontario to show that they are serious about it? What about the east end of Metropolitan Toronto? What about light rail transit for Scarborough? They have the money apportioned. They have shown some evidence of good faith. What is it about this government that it can't step in and say, "We want that light rail transit system built. It is (a) legitimate and (b) will provide jobs and we will move heaven and earth to get it done."

They move with alacrity and with support from us when they stop the Spadina expressway. It doesn't take them long to do. They move with alacrity and support from us when they stop the Pickering airport. It doesn't take them long to do. Why can't they move with the same feeling in job-creating areas which are concrete and identifiable? Do they know that the building of that Scarborough light rail transit will create 1,325 man-years of work? That will be several hundred construction workers in Metropolitan Toronto employed for two, three or four years. This isn't a LIP project; this is real. And they can't get themselves to do it.

Can I remind them about construction in Metropolitan Toronto? Bricklayers; the rate of unemployment is 29.5 per cent. Carpenters, it is 28.7 per cent. Electrical workers, it is 23.1 per cent. Ironworkers, it is 24.5 per cent. Labourers, it is 70 per cent. Five thousand, five hundred and ninety-nine labourers unemployed as of April 1 out of 8,000 workers. Painters, 13.8 per cent. Plumbers and steamfitters, 17.3 per cent. Sheet-metal workers, 22.9 per cent. You know as I know, Mr. Speaker, that these are terribly vulnerable people, these are largely immigrant people, people who need jobs more than most, people for whom life is perilous at all times in the adjustment to a new society and a new economy. The government has a project. Why the devil can't it rouse itself to do it?

Let me point to another. What about the whole question of environmental and pollution control measures to create jobs? There is an enormous job benefit inherent for eastern and northern Ontario, and this is totally the private sector. We don't have to spend a penny of government money. And does the government know how to do it? It does it simply by enforcing the environmental regulations which the Minister of the Environment allows the companies to flout and prolong at will. The Premier, when we raised the question of the pulp and paper companies and matters of environmental control and water management, said we wanted to close down the plants. And then he learned from the Minister of the Environment alone, who is on record in Hansard in an exchange with my colleague from Durham West, that we wouldn't lose a single job, that it's all economically possible, that it's all there, if only they would clean up.

Now we learn that if we insist that the companies clean up, there are more economic and job benefits than we could have imagined, because there has now come to light a study called "Benefits from Industrial Production Pollution Abatement Equipment for the Pulp and Paper Industry," dated January 1975—a study right across Canada showing that if our environmental standards were met it would require from the private sector $740 million of legitimate expenditure which, like the Minister of the Environment's study, it shows they can afford—much of which would come into Ontario.

Do the members know how much? Shall I tell them how much? Sixteen thousand, four hundred and thirteen man-years of work—4,000 in manufacturing, 5,000 in construction, 6,000 in services. Even if we only took 4,000 to 5,000 workers we would keep them employed for up to four years at an important environmental and economic undertaking which everybody applauds, which should be undertaken by the private sector, and which would provide jobs all over the province.

We have pulp and paper mills, 37 of them, everywhere in the province of Ontario, particularly the east and the north. Why isn't it possible for the people opposite to undertake that kind of thing?

But let me go further, Mr. Speaker, while we are speaking of that. We managed to lay our hands upon a draft copy of Design for Development from the Ministry of Natural Resources submitted to TEIGA very recently. I want to read a paragraph from it because it speaks to exactly the kind of proposition this party is making:

"A number of byproducts can be recovered from pulp mill wastes, thus reducing pollution and providing a base for further chemical processing. Quantities of crude tall oil and turpentine already are being recovered from the spent liquors, but a significant proportion of this is exported without further refining into such products as tall oil, fatty acids, resins or other derivatives. A number of byproducts such as lignosulfonates, sugar and minerals can also be recovered from sulphite mill spent liquors.

"Other pulp mill wastes have byproduct uses as well, for which new applications and markets are developing. There is some potential for development of a wood-based chemical industry in this region. This related secondary manufacturing substantially increases the number of employment opportunities and the product dollar value added over that derived from primary producing operations. The appropriate provincial ministry should carry out immediate investigations to harness this potential."

So where is the potential? Where is the harnessing of that potential for northwestern Ontario?

Don't talk to us about the Reed Paper company, five, 10, 15, 20 years down the road. Talk to us about secondary manufacturing for northern Ontario today, now, because it's today.

Mr. Wildman: What about Blind River?

Mr. Lewis: I'm coming to Blind River. The support I'm getting is superb. The prompting is dead on. That's my next subject. Everywhere you turn in this province there are job-creating possibilities if the government weren't so terminally scrawny. The Minister of Culture and Recreation should not take it personally, although I will admit the description has a certain unerring glance.

I just want to remind the government—whether it's Collingwood, whether it's Timmins, whether it's Matachewan, whether it's Scarborough, whether it's communities with pulp and paper mills, whether it's Design for Development northwestern Ontario—it has projects, private and public, crying out to create jobs. And the government can't undertake it.

Well, how about looking at the possibility of creating new industries as well in this time of high unemployment? Why not look at that seriously? And when the government thinks about that, and I can't go into it at great lengths—my colleague from Durham East I hope will do so at some point in this session and perhaps my colleague from Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Burr) as well—why not look at energy?

The government talked about Ontario Hydro; the Premier interjected about Ontario Hydro. There's no invidious contradiction with Ontario Hydro. The problem with Ontario Hydro and energy in the province of Ontario is that those beggars monopolize everything. They are monolithic to a point where one can't even make a dent on them. They have tied us into a nuclear option which may or may not be valid in itself—that we do not yet know—but sure as the devil, it precludes effectively the development of all kinds of other alternatives. So we limp along in solar, and we limp along in wind energy and we never undertake anything seriously. They want $25 billion by 1985. If the government can refer one, two or three per cent of that, think of the job creating possibilities.

Let me put to the Minister of Energy one particular aspect of that. Let me put to him the aspect of methanol as a job-creating potential, as an alternative fuel source in the province of Ontario and as one of the most exciting and imaginative experiments we might undertake, if anybody over there had the imagination or the wit to do it. I simply want to point out that methanol of course is not meant to be a substitute for electricity, but it can by way of additive be a significant substitute for gasoline and diesel fuel. As we know, as we've heard from the Minister of Energy just Friday morning, we have so much of a problem in the amount of money we're paying for oil that it would be nice to begin to develop some alternative supplies.

The methanol process, while not yet economic, has some clear possibilities, and again one doesn't understand why the government can't be flexible or imaginative enough to embrace it. For example, the government could have three prototype plants in this province. One would be based on waste wood from current mill operations from full tree operations. I don't have to go into all the details and definitions, but that is possible adjacent to one of the current mill operations, let's say, at Kapuskasing.

The government could also have a mill, a methanol plant, tied to a tree-farming project for methanol production. I come back to Blind River. What a beautiful place to have a prototype to instill confidence in the economy again, to produce a fuel which more and more is accepted as a viable possibility, if only a government will come to grips with it. I don't want to depreciate the possibilities around Blind River for a long-term, land regeneration programme, but in the short term, given the amount of land we need for tree farming for the production of methanol, there is an appropriate place, or somewhere in eastern Ontario.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that for roughly 4,775 square miles—that's about three million acres—we could provide 15 per cent of the total gasoline and diesel fuel requirements of this province in the year 1985?

I assume the House leader also knows that the Ministry of Natural Resources has experimented with poplar plots in eastern Ontario

which have achieved a work production rate of 320 cubic feet per year, which is 13 times the present growth rate. Yes, I know the Minister of Culture and Recreation has personally investigated them.

Mr. Moffatt: He even gave them a Wintario grant.

Mr. Lewis: Probably that's true. What I'm pointing out to the government then is that when it talks about 19,000 square miles for the Reed Paper company, 4,000 square miles doesn't seem very much, does it? When the Minister of Agriculture and Food talks about 12 million acres of class 6 and 7 land available for eventual agricultural use, three million acres doesn't seem like very much, does it?

The government could have a tree-farming operation as a prototype in a place like Blind River and bring life back to that community and create a great many jobs. It could also do it from solid waste in around the Metro Toronto region and have a prototype plant here, as the Minister of the Environment nods his head. You people are so bullishly frustrating—if the minister will forgive me for using an unlovely adjective to describe such a demure creature as himself. I don't understand why he sits there—

[5:15]

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: —in constant agreement, but can never initiate anything. We produce about two million tons of waste now in the Metro region—annually. Four hundred thousand of it will be going to the Watts from Waste programme. There will be enough remaining to create a fairly major methanol plant—and methanol is a legitimate fuel in this part of the province.

All of this isn't hearsay, because fortunately people are at work on it. There is now at the federal level—done for the Ministry of the Environment—a report entitled The Economic Prefeasibility Study: Large-Scale Methanol Fuel Production from Surplus Canadian Forest Biomass. And there is Ontario's paper which the minister is acquainted with: Methanol in Ontario, a Preliminary Report, done by two University of Toronto professors, Donald MacKay and Russell Sutherland, for the Ministry of Energy.

So, finally we're getting the documentation. Where is the creative verve? Why the failure of imagination? You could provide a prototype in at least two other parts of the province and, above all, you could provide jobs.

And what about measures to refine and process more of our minerals in Ontario as a way of maintaining jobs? Mr. Speaker, you have probably looked at the list of exemptions given to the mining companies of the province of Ontario for processing and refining abroad. I have 34 such exemptions updated to March, 1977. Some of them are very, very large. Falconbridge, for example, has an exemption of 85 million pounds of nickel per year. What is the reason given? Let me tell you—"Inadequate further processing capacity exists in Canada; and funds for construction are not available at this time." My colleagues in the Sudbury basin haven't noticed the penurious state of Falconbridge —certainly not when they deal with Norway.

There are other conventional reasons given in this report. One of the most frequently given is this: "No further processing facilities exist in Canada and the benefits obtainable appear to be too low in relation to costs to justify construction." Who makes the judgement? The Ministry of Natural Resources makes the judgement? "Appear to be too low"? I hope it is not unkind of me to say that the Ministry of Natural Resources has had such an unhealthy, supportive, and often lackey relationship with the mining sector, that they should not be making judgements on whether or not refining and processing is done abroad. It should not be permitted.

We are exporting jobs. We're exporting thousands of jobs, many of them, I expect, illegitimately. And again, all of these exemptions should be subject to public scrutiny. The government might have a select committee of this Legislature take a look at some of those exemptions, because I'd like to know how the Ministry of Natural Resources arrives at its conclusion as to whether or not it is apparently valuable to have the processing facility here.

Mr. Laughren: In the Albany Club.

Mr. Lewis: In the Albany Club? I don't know. But I do know that it is a highly suspect process, given the actors in the play—on other matters—up until now.

Let me remind the House about servicing of land in southern Ontario to get housing directed to land of lesser value—something the government keeps on talking about. When the government builds its pipe, it builds it through the York and Durham regions rather than Niagara, and it uses up the

best agricultural land rather than use the money to create real jobs in southern Niagara where it requires servicing to deflect the population growth. I needn't elaborate on housing.

Look at services to people. We've been talking about services to people in this caucus until we couldn't stand the sound of the repetition. And suddenly, in this Throne Speech, the government discovers services to people in the context of using youth unemployment to deal with the aged. Well, what an amazing revelation. Why can't they expand that to services to people in corrections, in mental health, in retardation, in a number of other identifiable social service needs? They've got plenty of surveys and plenty of material to do the job.

In other words, all over this province there is example after example of job-creating possibilities. The government could expand these further by stepping into vulnerable communities such as Kitchener, where Electrohome is losing its electronic parts business because of tariff problems, or Cornwall, where a textile mill is losing the same way because of tariff problems. The government could show verve and imagination. They could create thousands of jobs in Ontario. The first part is the direct tax cut, but then the government should go to those communities which are under pressure, losing jobs or needing jobs, and to the industries that will bear fruit—a Collingwood, a Timmins, a Matachewan, a Kirkland Lake, pulp and paper mills, northwestern development, the gold mining industry, Scarborough light rail transit, construction workers in Metropolitan Toronto, methanol prototypes here and there in Ontario, servicing of land in southern Ontario communities. One area after another is open to the government, and if they had any imagination in job creation at all they would have the jobs as well.

I simply want to say to the hon. minister opposite that this is a theme, an issue, a focus for us which we shall not relinquish over the next number of months; and others will obviously share it, because I think it is shared generally by the opposition in Ontario.

Clearly, Donald S. Macdonald's project is a death knell to job creation. Clearly, Darcy McKeough is travelling down the same road, and it is utterly and unacceptably wrong to maintain a persistent level of 316,000 unemployed in this province when the job-creating possibilities stare the government in the face everywhere and its crazy, narrow, stale, conventional, traditional views of managing the economy do not permit it to intervene in a way which is helpful to Ontario. We deplore it.

The mismanagement in the field of jobs is but one kind of mismanagement of the economy of which this government is guilty. There is the mismanagement of the entire resource sector. At times, outside and inside the Legislature we have dealt with our water resources. We have dealt with our mining resources. The entry of the former Minister of Natural Resources, as I come to mining resources—or the Secretary of the North or whatever his job appellation is—

Mr. S. Smith: Governor of Northern Ontario!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You will be sorry. Be careful what you say.

Mr. Lewis: Is that not fair? I'm not sure. The northern tail on the cabinet dog? How do you say it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just came back from Sudbury.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the fact of the matter is that when one speaks of mining in this context, one wonders what the government is going to do. I've listened to the leader of the Liberal Party ask questions in this area on occasion around prospecting and the opening of new mines. It is interesting that we've come to 1977 and there are no new mines opening and no new mines in prospect. The amount that is invested per year is declining steadily; it was at an average of $23 million from 1967 to 1971, but it's now at an average of $15 million from 1972 to 1976.

Does the former Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), who is about to become the Minister of Northern Affairs, remember his proposal to bring in a Crown corporation for exploration? Does he remember saying that in 1974? He repeated it again that year and again the next year, and then he jettisoned it at the end of 1975. If we had a Crown corporation in place now for exploration and development in the mining sector, we might not be in such difficulty. As a matter of fact, if that minister had accepted a proposal put to him by the New Democratic Party a number of years ago to set up a development fund for northern Ontario based on 50 per cent of the mines profits tax, we might not be in this particular jackpot today; but none of that was done. They put forth a proposal; they abandoned it, they pulled it back. And as a result we are in terrible difficulty in our mining sector.

So we are in difficulty in water. We are in difficulty in mining. We are obviously in difficulty with our forests; and boy oh boy, are we in continuing difficulty with agricultural land for which there is still not a land-use plan adequate to provide legislative protection in the province of Ontario.

The time speeds. I have dealt with the major matter I wanted to deal with, and that was jobs, but I want to say something about agricultural land as I pull natural resources together. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Premier and to the House leader, that all of the guidelines in the world will still not protect those lands which are under pressure in the province of Ontario.

I notice that the Minister of Agriculture and Food last week went to the Bureau of Municipal Research and made a speech in which he said that in Niagara the government had saved 3,000 acres from urban expansion; 1,800 acres of tender fruit land and 1,200 acres of vineyards. Can we believe that? I mean it is just not credible that a minister of the Crown should make that kind of statement when he knows that it isn't valid.

With greatest respect, it isn't valid. What really happened in Niagara is that there weren't 7,000 acres under pressure, there were 8,000; and that, in fact, of grape and fruit land, the government saved only 1,780 acres in the Niagara region; 1,780 acres. I have an internal document from the regional planners of Niagara which shows, just so that it's a matter of interest, that there were 860 acres of tender fruit saved, 820 acres of grapes, 90 acres of good general, 10 acres of potential development of other land; totalling 1,780 acres. In other words, they gave away 5,000 and kept 1,780 to protect, and they did it on the day that they announced their guidelines.

Since then, the population projections for the Niagara region have dropped by another 67,000, according to the report put out by Peter Barnard Associates to the Minister of Housing. Why are they not saving all the land in Niagara when the population data we now have, since their announcements, indicate they don't have to alienate any of it?

Now whether it was Niagara or whether it is the dismal saga of Halidmand-Norfolk—let little be said about that in this Legislature, it is embarrassing enough for the government—or whether it's the landfill site proposed for the Halton region for 500 acres of prime agricultural land, all of that goes down the drain. Their guidelines mean nothing.

There are 500 acres of agricultural land in the middle of Halton, class 1, jointly owned by Burlington and Oakville; in both local official plans zoned agricultural; and the regional municipality is going to use it for a landfill site. So where are their guidelines now? Where are their guidelines now?

Where were they in Niagara? Where were they in Haldimand-Norfolk? Where are they in Halton? Where are they on the Niagara Escarpment?

Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Premier we have been doing some work on the Niagara Escarpment, sufficient that this delicious little memo came out from the Escarpment Commission on March 7, 1977: "To development control staff from C. A. Louis, manager, development control:

"In future, all requests for information from any of the opposition parties—e.g., Frank Lewinberg, NDP research—should be directed to Carolyn Jamieson, our information officer. By channelling such inquiries through Carolyn, we will be able to monitor the same more closely. At the same time, all information will be co-ordinated to provide complete, up-to-date and accurate responses."

Needless to say, since the memo, the responses have not been quite so immediately forthcoming as in the time prior to the memo.

Mr. MacDonald: Freedom of information.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They probably just want to be accurate.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I'm sure they want to be accurate.

[5:30]

Mr. MacDonald: They were too accurate before.

Mr. Lewis: The government wouldn't want to bring in a freedom of information Act which could make it sure; let's wait a year or two while the escarpment disappears—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We just want to protect a little privacy when we do it—like the member from High Park.

Mr. Lewis: I think I'm beginning to warm to this. The fact of the matter is—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you. I just remind members that the escarpment, which John Robarts moved to protect 10 years ago last month; 10 years ago—and then the Gertler report and then the special task force and then the

Niagara Escarpment Commission—and we still don't have a plan for the escarpment. And in the very—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's not quite right; look at the great town of Caledon.

Mr. MacDonald: You'll have your speech later; don't interrupt.

Mr. Lewis: In the very near future we will be able to document for you, Mr. Speaker, how the commission staff and the commission itself, have in certain crucial urban growth developments, recommended strongly against acceptance by this government, as a result of the need to protect agricultural land and other environmental and planning protections, and this government has systematically overruled the submissions—well we will see; I'll give chapter and verse.

Why do you think they boxed us out of getting the material from the commission, Mr. Speaker? I may say that what it shows is that, again, the government's guidelines are not worth the paper they're written on. All of which comes back to the whole theme which I am trying to put together.

Mr. MacDonald: Ask Eric Winkler.

Mr. S. Smith: Six hundred acres in Milton and a parkway belt.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition please.

Mr. Lewis: All of which puts together what I wanted to convey to you, that the conventional mythology about the Tories being good managers of the economy in Ontario does not stand up to scrutiny. It doesn't stand up to scrutiny in areas of financial prophecy, doesn't stand up to scrutiny in areas of job creation, doesn't stand up in areas of natural resource management.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Stephen, you are reaching today; and you know you are reaching.

Mr. Lewis: I may say to the Premier, through the Speaker, he is in serious difficulty around the management of Ontario economy. It is his Achilles heel and I suspect one day it will bring him down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It may bring us down, but it won't bring you up.

Mr. MacDonald: Bring him to order, Mr. Speaker. Don't give the floor back to the Opposition Leader, he's got it; just bring the Premier to order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition will continue his remarks.

Mr. Lewis: I don't seek distractions as often as the Premier does when speaking. I like to rely on the material I have at hand rather than the repartee I can evoke.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You don't have to seek them.

Mr. Lewis: If you will allow me merely to deal with two final matters, I'll move the amendment. They're brief.

Just as there is the whole range of the economy and natural resources, and I'm glad the Minister of Labour is back, there are some simple matters of human resources. I think, as a matter of fact, the government isolated that in its own Throne Speech on page 29 where there is reference to the balance of natural and human resources in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I want to convey to the Premier the really desperate need in Ontario, about which we in this caucus feel most strongly to do something about the Workmen's Compensation Board. As we look at that perilous balance of the natural endowments and the human realities, I want to point out to the Premier, respectfully, through the Speaker, that management is unhappy with the board for a whole range of reasons, some of them related to the kinds of money they pay; others related to the administration of the board. The unions are unhappy with the board for a whole range of reasons, often conveyed with real feeling.

May I say to the Premier, through the Speaker, that this is a recent phenomenon. The Premier will recall that the trade union movement has been almost universally supportive of the Workmen's Compensation Board. As a matter of fact, the trade union movement has been critical of the New Democratic Party when we have criticized the board. But all of that is changing. It's not simply management now. The trade union movement is losing patience and feels aggravated and antagonistic toward the board.

I want to point out to the Premier that a lot of members of the Legislature feel personally aggravated with the behaviour of the Workmen's Compensation Board. There are the difficulties of getting through the bureaucracy, the difficulties of dealing with them individually and the difficulties of the appeal process. If one talks about mismanagement of the economy, think of the mismanagement of that board. May I also

point out to the Premier that the Ombudsman's select committee expressed in its own careful way equal concern about the board and its refusal to share with the Ombudsman data and information that was pertinent to the inquiries being conducted.

In other words, there is something wanting right at the heart of that board. That Workmen's Compensation Board is grinding to a halt. It's simply not functioning as it should function. If I may say to the Minister of Labour, the latest and most vexing example of that is the incredibly insensitive and positively indecent refusal to grant compensation to Aime Bertrand in Sudbury.

I'm not going to rehash the case with her on the floor of the Legislature today. All I'm going to do is to make the point that the scientific evidence on which the government based compensation for stomach cancer, scientific evidence from which it based compensation for lung cancer, scientific evidence on which it based compensation for esothelioma, is exactly the same scientific evidence that has now been adduced and provided for the relationship between laryngeal cancer and asbestos.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Oh no it isn't. You are wrong.

Mr. Lewis: It all comes from the New Mount Sinai School of Medicine and Dr. Irving Selikoff.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, it doesn't.

Mr. Lewis: If I may say to the Minister of Labour, respectfully, she has been wrong before on occupational health, and if I know her she will be wrong again on occupational health.

Hon. B. Stephenson: And so are you.

Mr. Lewis: I say to her with respect that Selikoff's findings on this matter are irrefutable.

I know the pressures the board is under, I know what is happening here, I can understand it. Why it has to happen at the expense of Aime Bertrand, I'll never know. It isn't as if the the government were talking about compensation for thousands of people in Ontario. When we provided compensation for stomach cancer, do members know how many claims have been awarded? Two.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Three.

Mr. Lewis: Is it three now? Now we've got one laryngeal cancer case and there may be one or two more that can fit into the compensable system.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The causal relationship has not been established.

Mr. Lewis: The causal relationship has not been established!

Mr. MacDonald: Does the minister mean they have to die before she will do anything? Does she want them to die before she gets the relationship developed?

Mr. Lewis: That's really quite aggravating. I will try not to be provoked about it but it really is quite aggravating because the minister knows, as I know, that that causal relationship will be a matter of acknowledged scientific history a few months from now, or a year or two from now. It's just this constant reluctance to recognize it when it is real and to run around impugning the studies which make it real.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It is rational responsibility to function in that way.

Mr. Warner: You can't give them the benefit of the doubt.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Oh, yes, I can.

Mr. Lewis: The minister said that to us every time. Every time we introduce an industrial disease which should be compensable, she talked to us about causal relationships; she talked to us about scientific validity. My God, we have adduced scientific validity for the minister which she has never been able to counteract. All she can now say, and all that Dr. McCracken was prepared to say, is that they have initiated a study at the Princess Margaret last November.

Hon. B. Stephenson: What scientific information have you ever given me? None!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: Can I point out something to her as Minister of Labour? The standing committee of the Legislature sat in December at the Workmen's Compensation Board and discussed laryngeal cancer for quite a long time. Does the minister know we were never told about the study that was struck by the board?

Mr. MacDonald: Withholding information again.

Mr. Lewis: Does that not tell the minister something about the board, about the sickness

at the heart of the board, that they should meet with a government body of legislators dealing with an issue and not tell us that they've instituted a study?

Mr. Deans: They hadn't; they hadn't that's the point.

Mr. Lewis: That's sickness. That's the only word I can think about it.

Mr. Deans: They hadn't.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes they have.

Mr. Lewis: I'll tell the minister something else. They now refer to some European study. They won't give us the information on what European study they're talking about. There's something wrong with the board, and there is something wrong—

Hon. B. Stephenson: Their researchers are fearful of harassment.

Mr. Cassidy: Balderdash!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the minister—

Hon. B. Stephenson: Speak to the member for Durham West (Mr. Godfrey). Just speak to him and find out.

Mr. Lewis: I want to say to the minister and the House what it isn't nice to say; but we all know it and we all believe it, so let's say it.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Go ahead and say it anyway.

Mr. Lewis: Michael Starr is not an effective chairman of that board. That board is run by Harding, and Kerr and McCracken and MacDonald. Michael Starr is there purely as the voice, and although I like Michael Starr and I had hopes for his appointment, I wish it were not the case. Because that board, as a result of the top internal administrative control, is riding roughshod over the legitimate demands of working people for whom the benefit of the doubt should operate. All the scientific gobbledegook notwithstanding, it won't help Aime Bertrand. Thirty years! Thirty years from asbestos to cadmium, and the minister can't persuade the board to give him a pension, and Dr. McCracken talks so foolishly, if you'll forgive my saying so, so presumptuously about all of this.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I hope that you will read from Hansard today's question period.

Mr. Lewis: I heard carefully today's question period. I asked about it and was briefed on it, and I certainly hope that's changed. I'm glad my colleague from Nickel Belt is going to deal with this again tomorrow night, because, by God, it's a sick body. It's a really sick body and it needs a reformation badly, and you people shouldn't put up with it. You just shouldn't put up with it.

The law needs changing, the administration needs changing—

Mr. Ferrier: And the government needs changing.

Mr. Lewis: —the whole system needs changing. And the government needs changing. But I knew that all along. That's a sine qua non for the Workmen's Compensation Board.

By way of a personal observation—I'm not usually provoked to this—you're obviously a very able minister, I say to the Minister of Labour through the Chair. You handle yourself well, you're articulate. I understand that. And you master your portfolio—I understand that. But just as I always believed that a doctor shouldn't be Minister of Health, I'm becoming more and more persuaded that a doctor dealing with scientific matters finds it too often necessary to spring to the defence of certain sectors of the scientific community. I don't think that's necessary in the minister's role. I don't think she should need do that. I think in fact she should move to the innovators rather than defending the traditionalists, and that that would serve well in occupational health and serve particularly well with the Workmen's Compensation Board.

I have but one last point I want to make. I want to say something about Quebec, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House leader will be kind enough to convey my words to the Premier, who may not get a chance to read them.

My colleague from Wentworth today got to his feet and associated this party with the Premier's remarks on Quebec, and wherever we can so associate we will, because we think that the initiatives that have so far been taken are pretty good initiatives and we want to keep them going. We'd like to try to make them more precise. We'd like Ontario to play an even stronger role, but a number of things which have been done seem to us to be presentable. I think something has happened in this Legislature. I think there is a kind of consensus developing about it. The leader of the Liberal Party went recently to Quebec. He spoke, I guess, in Ville St. Laurent to the Rotary Club or one of the clubs. He was

good enough to send me a copy of his speech and I read it. It spoke much truth. It said, as many of us have increasingly been saying in the Legislature, necessary things about the province of Quebec. Like others, I speak about it with some regularity here and there because one can't really avoid the subject, nor would one wish to. I don't want to prolong it here, but it is in many ways a terribly discouraging business which becomes more and more intractable.

[5:45]

I visited the province of Quebec, as all of us have been visiting, a couple of weeks ago, and saw a number of interesting people and a range of people.

I spent some time with Robert Cliche, he of the royal commission on the construction industry and a man who is sort of a folk hero in the province now. I spent some time with Claude Castonguay, a man of enormous integrity who left the former Liberal cabinet and author of that social services and health report; an excellent fellow. I met at great length with the editorial bureau of La Presse, eight of their senior editors. I met for a while at some length with the Minister of Social Affairs in Quebec, Denis Lazure, who happens to have been a sort of friend in the late 1960s. I met also with the editor and the associate editor of the Montreal Star. I had a number of strong impressions emerge, which I would like to share very briefly.

First of all, I had the impression that these pilgrimages really proliferate; the movement from Ontario to Quebec and from Quebec to Ontario is quite something to see. Every time you turn around a Claude Morin or a Castonguay is here, or a Lazure is coming to speak. Or Bill Davis, Stuart Smith, or Stephen Lewis and their colleagues in the cabinet and the benches of their parties are moving back and forth. I had the sense that if this had happened more often in the last few years, it would have been rather better today.

I smiled when I saw Claude Castonguay. The interview was hurried at the end because he was just about to meet with John Evans, president of the University of Toronto, who was coming down to pay homage on other matters, on a major conference that he wants to sponsor in the fall.

I emerged with another feeling. I emerged with the feeling of the tragedy it was that there is no focal point in Quebec to provide another federalist option independent of that of Pierre Trudeau. Within Quebec it is still seen as a Levesque-Trudeau exchange, and there is no one in the Liberal Party, no one in the UN, no one in society as a whole - apparently, who can meet Rene Levesque with a different federalist option, because Trudeau's federalist option is suspect in many eyes.

Some people talk of Castonguay. I often thought to myself that these rumours about Chretien going from the federal cabinet to assume the leadership of the Liberal Party in Quebec might not be such a bad idea, because he is a pretty able fellow and presents himself rather differently from those of his confrères in Ottawa. Or maybe somebody will emerge. There is a terrific vacuum there —a vacuum which pains and which is acknowledged everywhere you go. So the debate polarizes ever more fiercely and it causes internally, and externally around Quebec, a great deal of anxiety.

When one is there, one recognizes how everything is so absurdly heightened in the context of the drive of that society, of the ethos of that society. Castonguay was saying and it is the only thing I will report, but it struck me as so vivid at the time, maybe just me because I hadn't thought of it enough. He was saying that when the federal government imposes milk payment cutbacks capriciously or arbitrarily—two or three times in a given year or two—in the province of Ontario it is seen as a debate between the federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) and the provincial Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman); we rail at each other a little, we savage each other a little, and we get over it. But in the province of Quebec it is seen as further conclusive evidence of a kind of federal conspiracy to entrap that province in a discriminatory position.

When we have trouble with tariffs in the textile industry in the province of Ontario, we do battle. The Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) or the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) will stand up, or any one of us, and take on the federal government over the question of tariff policy and over the question of the way the thing works. But in Quebec, when that kind of tariff policy prejudices a fragile textile industry because the economic base is not as diversified and because there isn't the same confidence that Ontario has, it is seen again as another example of Trudeau federalism smothering Quebec's need for independence or quasi-independence. It creates in the society tremendous continuing anxiety and tension.

All of that conveyed to me, particularly by a number of other people I chatted and met with who were kind of friends and

associates, that they are a long way down the road; that that CBC poll was not misleading; that when you are talking about sovereignty with economic association, there is an increasing appeal to a lot of people in Quebec.

That, I think, is why it is so desperately important that Ontario keep the option open—keep the doors open—largely as the Premier has said he will do, and largely as the direction of policy seems to be. I don't know what the answers are. Nobody does. I am as confused and bewildered as anybody else. I do know that we shouldn't be provoked, at all costs—even when Quebec introduces a language policy like that which it has just introduced. It is to play into the independents' hands by reacting too sharply, too provocatively. It is sensible to act with concern. It is probably wrong to invite exactly the kind of backlash which the PQ will at some point, I assume, deal with.

They are, after all, the government. They appear to be a government of some ability. They appear to have a tremendous support as a political party from the people of Quebec. And that must always be remembered because somehow we have to deal with the majority of those in Quebec who want to opt for federalism.

In this Legislature we will have our differences. We have had them before around this issue. We will have them again. But there is, I think, something to be said for acting in concert. As a matter of fact, there is something to be said for the widespread sharing of use. There's something to be said for opening up this forum once every few weeks, if you will, to a debate on Quebec and on Canada, bringing each other up to date with the experiences, impressions, opinions that are gradually forming, particularly in advance of the conference which the Premier intends to hold in June. In other words, our job is not so much to divide, in a partisan way, when common approaches might make an estimable contribution.

The majority of Quebecois still want to hear the voices which speak for unity. Let us not be discordant. I judge we won't be. Perhaps this forum can be turned into an exciting intermittent assembly of those who wish to think it through, collectively, because there are many here who can talk to it with authority and with feeling. Therefore, I simply say that we appreciate the direction things are taking, feel not the slightest self-consciousness in applauding it or acknowledging it, and hope that within the temple of this Legislature it can be maintained under control—not dispassionate, sometimes argumentative, but under control. Because otherwise, we have an enormous amount to lose.

So I end, surprisingly enough, with protestations of good faith, certainly around this issue. Doubtless we may soon be out there on the hustings—that too may be useful, because then it will be an appreciation of alternatives. The Tories seem to be doing marginally well in Ontario—so the polls would say. And that's fine too. That has never cowed us or intimidated us. Those are the momentary realities of politics.

But what I have tried to extend to the government today is a basic position, a position which says: On these specifics we divide in degree and on other specifics we divide fundamentally in kind. You will not get from the New Democratic Party arguments of trivia or personality or irrelevance. We are going to try to keep it pinned to the issues. We are going to try to keep it pinned to fundamental differences of approach. We are going to try to keep it pinned, with as much reason and substance as we can bring to bear, to alternatives. And in that spirit and with that context, I would like to move an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Lewis moves that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session be amended by the addition of the following words: "That while it is recognized that the concerns expressed in the Speech from the Throne, delivered by Her Honour, are genuine attempts to redress grievances resulting from many years of government mismanagement and while it is recognized that those portions of Her Honour's address which dealt with questions of national unity are eminently supportable, nonetheless we must insist that this Conservative government has once again failed to establish priorities and policies which would resolve the following major concerns in the province of Ontario:

"1. The failure to ensure employment, both short- and long-term, with particular emphasis on (a) direct government involvement in major long-term job-creating projects of wide diversity, public and private across Ontario, (b) economic stimulation by the promise of substantial tax cuts, (c) major development and building of diversified housing for low- and middle-income citizens, (d) an intensive programme of secondary and tertiary manufacturing based on our resource sector;

"2. The failure to call for an early end to the AIB, despite increasing public concern that controls are now hurting far more than they are working;

"3. The failure to moderate increases in the cost of living by refusing to recognize that (a) the present property tax formula places an unfair burden on middle, low- and fixed-income families, (b) food prices, energy prices, land and housing costs are above the consumers' reasonable capacity to pay;

"4. The failure to protect adequately our natural-resource heritage, be it water, minerals, forests or agricultural land, compounded by the continued absence of a land-use plan for Ontario;

"5. The failure to call for a complete overhaul of the Workmen's Compensation Board to civilize it, to humanize it, and to make it respond sensitively to many of the people it was created to serve;

"And for all the foregoing enumerated reasons this government no longer enjoys the confidence of this House."

On motion by Mr. S. Smith, the debate was adjourned.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 4, 1977

Quebec language legislation, statement by Mr. Davis 83

Children's services, statements by Mrs. Birch and Mr. Norton 83

OPP salary increase, statement by Mr. Auld 86

Housing programme, statement by Mr. Rhodes 86

Voting qualifications, statement by Mr. McKeough 87

Cancer and asbestos, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Deans, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Mackenzie 87

Capital works projects, questions of Mr. McKeough and Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Deans, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. MacDonald 89

Toronto downtown plan, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Peterson 91

OHC rent arrears, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Good, Mr. Breaugh 91

Drivers' medical examinations, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Philip, Mr. Moffatt 93

Children's services, questions of Mrs. Birch and Mr. Norton: Mrs. Campbell, Mr. McClellan 93

Home buyer grants, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Peterson 95

Occupational health, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Wildman, Mr. Foulds 97

Air pollution, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. B. Newman 98

Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry teachers' dispute, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Samis 98

Glengowan dam, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Edighoffer 98

Children's services, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. McClellan, Mr. Cassidy 98

Home warranty plan, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Givens, Mr. Samis 99

Alleged OHIP frauds, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Dukszta 99

Market value assessment, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Good, Mr. Peterson 100

Hiring of handicapped, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. di Santo 100

Notice of dissatisfaction with answer to oral question, Mr. Laughren 101

Speaker's ruling re petitions 101

Tax Refund Discounts Act, Mr. Davison, first reading 103

Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, Mrs. Campbell, first reading 104

Public Utilities Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 104

Good Samaritan Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 104

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. Lewis 104

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. S. Smith, agreed to 129

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 129

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Davison, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Maeck, L. (Parry Sound)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)

Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 5

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 5, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ADDRESS TO HM QUEEN ELIZABETH II

Mr. Speaker: Just before we begin the business of the House for the afternoon, I beg to inform the House that the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has received a reply from Her Majesty the Queen to the message of congratulation ordered by the House on Tuesday, March 29. Her Majesty's message reads as follows:

"I warmly thank the Legislative Assembly of Ontario for their kind message of loyalty and congratulations on the 25th anniversary of my accession to the Throne. It gives me much pleasure to receive this message, which I greatly appreciate.

"Elizabeth R."

Statements by the ministry.

MUSEUM GRANTS

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, this year we are providing some extra money to help our larger museums such as Black Creek Pioneer Village, the Wellington County Museum and the London Museum to pay for special programmes which attract large numbers of visitors.

This assistance, to a maximum of $60,000 per institution, will be paid in addition to our regular museum grants and will be calculated at 10 per cent of their annual revenue in excess of $60,000.

I will be writing to the chairmen of the larger museums this week to explain the programme so that they can take it into consideration in planning their activities for the coming year.

I think we all recognize that our museums play a unique role in the preservation and appreciation of the cultural and social heritage of Ontario communities. In order to make visitors aware of the richness and variety of our past, some of the larger museums have developed very comprehensive programmes which attract large numbers with a resulting increase in their costs. This assistance, which could add up to $200,000 to our museum grant programme, recognizes our responsibility to encourage and support this local initiative.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The members will recall that last week the Speech from the Throne referred to the government's intention to pursue new regional development initiatives. In particular, it referred to the relocation of significant government operations. Today I would like to announce on behalf of the government, details of this new initiative, which will significantly increase employment outside Metropolitan Toronto. This and other steps which we are taking will reinforce the government's belief that all regions of this province should fully participate in our economic growth.

Before outlining these new initiatives, and to place them in a broader context, I would like to review briefly for the members, the highlights of the government's regional development initiatives in eastern and northern Ontario. Last December 15 I tabled our regional priority budget for 1977-78. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this budget provides for expenditures over and above normal ministry programmes, which will significantly contribute to developing regional economic potential.

During the last four years we have committed almost $100 million in regional priority projects, some of which are partially funded by DREE. This has included investments of some $70 million in northwestern Ontario, which has supported the commitments made by the government in the northwestern Ontario development strategy published some six years ago. This year the regional priority budget will put increased emphasis on projects for northeastern and eastern Ontario as well as continuing our strong commitments to the northwest. In northeastern Ontario we have committed new priority investments totalling $30 million, of which $6.8 million will be spent in 1977-78.

I am proud to say to the members that in this time of tough fiscal restraint the government has been able to expand dramatically

its commitment to the less developed regions of the province. This has been made possible by our determined policy of prudent financial management which has held overall spending in check. In addition to the enrichment of the regional priority budget in the north, I might draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the landmark step which the government recently took in establishing the Ministry of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: You took that step a few years ago too. I guess it is the third time you have taken that step.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It will contribute to developing a strong—

Mr. Nixon: And give the minister something to do.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —economic future in the north as well as provide for closer involvement of northern citizens in the governmental process. The new Ministry of Northern Affairs will co-ordinate the government's activities in the north and ensure that the unique needs and circumstances of the area are reflected in provincial policies and programmes. To support this overall objective the ministry will administer the northern portion of the regional priority budget currently set at $53 million for 1977-78.

At the same time, the government in consultation with interested groups has been reviewing the economic and social prospects of the north with a view to identifying viable and progressive development strategies. A draft regional strategy for northeastern Ontario was tabled in this Legislature last April. Since that time the strategy has been thoroughly reviewed at public meetings convened by the northeastern municipal advisory committee. Taking the results of this dialogue into account, the government in conjunction with the Northeastern Municipal Advisory Committee will be developing a refined economic strategy for northeastern Ontario.

Mr. Martel: You have been doing that for five years.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are also updating the northwestern Ontario strategy in conjunction with the municipal advisory committee for that region. The government supports the growth and expansion of our resource base in order to promote further northern development. At the same time, we are fully aware that development must take into consideration the desires of our native population and necessities of preserving environmental balance. For these reasons, as members know, we established the Hartt commission which will examine a major forest development proposal in the north. We will also be undertaking a review of other development issues in the far north.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to this government's Go East policy.

Mr. Breithaupt: Go west, young man. Go west.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did Michael Gee write that? Is that to Mecca?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. Roy: Are you really serious, Darcy?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We continue to be committed to two major objectives, which are the encouragement of growth in the eastern part of the Toronto-centred region, and the strong encouragement of economic development initiatives in the eastern Ontario region. To support this policy we have taken a significant number of initiatives in the past year. I have already mentioned our actions under the regional priority budget. Another important step which we have undertaken involves the location of the Urban Transportation Development Corporation experimental test track near Kingston. This will involve some $50 million in capital expenditures and will inject $7 million in local pay cheques alone over a three-year period.

At this point I might also mention a number of discussions which we have been having with the federal government concerning eastern Ontario. Some of the members may be aware of the stand I took on the proposed move of Parks Canada from Cornwall to Guelph. I opposed the move and have also suggested that if Parks Canada has to be relocated, that it remain in eastern Ontario.

I have also submitted the case to the federal government that eastern Ontario be made eligible for assistance under The Regional Development Incentives Act (RDIA). Currently only the northern part of Renfrew County is eligible for this assistance. We hope that the federal government will respond positively to this idea.

One additional matter concerns The Agriculture and Rural Development Act (ARDA). Since 1962, the province has negotiated four ARDA agreements with the federal government. This has resulted in $153 million going toward rural development, about half of

which went to eastern Ontario. In the near future my staff, and that of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, will be involved with federal officials in a joint evaluation of the ARDA programme. At this point, I might say that I hope this programme, which has done so much for rural eastern Ontario, will continue on a long-term basis.

Mr. Cassidy: You haven't said anything yet.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I should also refer to the announcement made last Thursday by the hon. Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman). This concerns the relocation of some 100 jobs to the new warehousing facilities of the Liquor Control Board in the regional municipality of Durham. In addition, the province is providing in Durham special industrial development assistance amounting to some $1.7 million for the further development of industrial land.

On behalf of the government, I would now like to announce two new initiatives which will further promote our Go East objectives:

First, we intend to relocate the head office of the Ontario Hospital Insurance Plan, OHIP, to Kingston. This will involve the movement of over 900 jobs to Kingston.

Mr. Kerrio: Nice going, Keith. Nice going.

Mr. Breithaupt: You will need about 28 acres for all the civil servants.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. Order. The hon. minister.

Mr. Breithaupt: This will be a bigger warehouse than the liquor board gets.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Second, with the exception of the office of the minister, the deputy minister, a small central staff and staff needed to take care of essential taxpayers' services in Toronto, the head office of the Ontario Ministry of Revenue will be relocated to Oshawa. This will involve some 750 jobs.

Mr. Breithaupt: Would you make it 751?

Mr. Lewis. Why don't you consider taking the minister too?

Mr. Roy: Have you told Oshawa?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: That gets Margaret out of your hair.

Mr. Lewis: Could you please take the minister too?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, these moves represent new policy initiatives for this province. They involve the relocation of head-office—

Mr. Sargent: Election strategy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —province-wide functions outside of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mrs. Campbell: That's Liberal policy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government is very much aware that such actions may create some difficult human and administrative problems and we do not underestimate them. At the same time, the government is convinced that these steps should be taken in order to advance vital economic and regional development objectives which will benefit all citizens of the province.

Mr. Lewis: You are not initiating jobs. You are shifting jobs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The relocation of the Ministry of Revenue head office and the LCBO facility will provide a major stimulus to the future development of the Durham region.

[2:15]

Mr. Nixon: And the local member's sagging popularity.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Similarly, the location of OHIP in Kingston will provide a substantial and needed impetus to the economy of eastern Ontario. In addition to providing direct economic benefits, we hope that our policy will provide direction and leadership to the private sector to follow a similar path to decentralization. I might note that we have come to this decision after an extensive review of potential candidates for relocation.

Mr. Sargent: You are quite a comedian.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: After our experience with these moves, other Toronto-based government activities will also be considered for relocation. In this era of modern communication and transportation, there is no reason why a number of other government office functions traditionally located in Toronto cannot be administratively efficient if they located elsewhere.

We intend to make every effort to ensure a smooth transition of staff and functions with respect to these moves. The Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Auld), the Minister

of Government Services (Mr. J. R. Smith) and myself, along with the Ministers of Health (Mr. Timbrell), Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener) and Consumer and Commercial Relations, are working to effect this transition over a four-year period. This will involve full consultation with the Ontario Public Service Employees Union and the LCBO/LLBO Employees Association concerning the relocation of staff. It will also include the development of appropriate policies for employees who cannot or do not wish to relocate. In addition, the Chairman of Management Board will undertake a thorough review of existing relocation policies to assess their applicability to a move of this magnitude.

Our staff have already reviewed the potentional impact of these moves on the communities and their industries, and this has been taken into account in our decision. I want to emphasize very strongly that we intend to consult closely with the affected local governments both with respect to the location of the facilities and to ensure that adequate housing and services are available. It is our firm and continuing policy that all people in Ontario shall participate to the fullest extent possible in the growth and prosperity of this province. The measures that I have outlined today represent a bold new step in forwarding this policy.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker, new rule No. 8 indicates that after any policy statement or introduction of a government bill the government shall table a compendium of background information. In view of what the minister said, will there be such background information tabled with the statement?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. On the way over here today I recalled that rule. There are papers. This is the first time I think it might have been appropriate since the House opened. There will be papers.

Mr. Roy: How about Liberal policy?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It won't be a very big paper, I'll tell you, if it is the Liberal policy.

Mr. Sargent: You couldn't wait to tell us.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We certainly haven't got 125 copies. We will be bringing them together and tabling them as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is statements by the ministry and the interjections are inappropriate as well as rude.

Mr. Roy: Sorry about that.

Mr. Sargent: Grow up.

Mr. Speaker: That would be good advice.

CORPORATION TAX

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: As part of a major programme of the Ministry of Revenue to achieve maximum possible simplification in tax legislation and administrative procedures, I am pleased to announce two new important steps towards achieving this goal in the area of corporation tax.

First, beginning immediately, we have put in place a new formal advance tax ruling service for businessmen, providing them with information on how their new investments and ventures will be taxed. These rulings, which will be binding upon my ministry, will materially improve the certainty which goes hand in hand with sound business decision-making. This effort gives further strength to this government's major commitment to the expansion of the Ontario economy and the creation of new jobs in this province.

Secondly, the corporation tax branch has further strengthened its communications effort by instituting two new series of the regularly published tax bulletins which will keep businessmen up to date on the law and the administrative practices of the branch. Along with these bulletins, we have published a directory of ministry staff available to assist in answering questions concerning the Act.

As set down in the Speech from the Throne, these initiatives give form to this government's priorities for ensuring public access to government and "a more open and responsive relationship with the people of Ontario." I am particularly pleased to say that I have had the benefit of expert advice from the private sector in designing these new corporation tax measures.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Later today I will be introducing The Commodity Futures Act, 1977.

The bill implements, with limited modifications, the recommendations of the report of the inter-ministerial committee on commodity futures trading which I tabled in the House in April 1975.

That committee reported increased participation by unsophisticated speculators in this area of high volatility and considerable risk. The report noted the potention for abuse of the marketplace and the proliferation of commodity-related contracts, involving non-exist-

ent or deficient disclosure of costs and risks, misrepresentation of profits and instances of fraud.

The primary purpose of the bill is to regulate, under the Ontario Securities Commission, trading in commodity futures contracts and, in those commodity futures, options on which performance is guaranteed by recognized commodity futures exchanges or their clearing houses. Dealers, advisers and salesmen will be registered.

Bona fide hedging transactions by those who deal in, produce or use the commodity will be exempted. With this exception, under The Commodity Futures Act, only contracts and options entered into on a commodity futures exchange—registered with, or recognized by the Ontario Securities Commission and the form of which has been accepted by the director of the OSC—will be permitted to be traded in Ontario.

The Act further provides a regulatory framework within which any commodity futures exchange that might be established in Ontario would be supervised.

Commodity futures options not traded on an exchange recognized or registered by the OSC under The Commodities Act will be dealt with as securities under The Securities Act. Legitimate commodity hedgers would again be exempted.

The public must be served by honest, competent and financially sound dealers and advisers. We feel that this Act will help to eliminate speculative and manipulative abuses while benefiting both the small investor and the securities industry generally.

SECURITIES LEGISLATION

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Today I will be introducing a new Securities Act as well as complementary amendments to The Business Corporations Act.

This legislation was initially tabled in 1972 for public comment. My predecessor, John Clement, reintroduced it in 1974 in a substantially revised format, again for the purpose of eliciting public comment. Over 50 briefs were received and on the basis of this input further revisions were incorporated into Bill 98 which I introduced in 1975.

Extensive additions, deletions and changes have been made to protect the small investor and strengthen the securities industry at the same time.

I would like to repeat the four basic objectives of the proposed Act as first set out by my predecessor:

1. A systematic ordering of amendments that have been made since the passing of the present Act in 1966;

2. Implementation of the major recommendations of the 1969 report of the Canadian Committee on Mutual Funds and Investment Contracts, the 1970 Ontario Securities Commission report on problems of disclosure arising from mergers, and the 1973 report of the select committee on company law regarding mergers and amalgamations;

3. The development of uniform provincial securities legislation acceptable to other provinces and making redundant the federal draft legislation designed to implement the 1969 mutual funds report; and

4. Development of further protections for individual investors in the securities market.

The Act I will place before this House today will introduce statutory regulations of the mutual funds industry. It will improve the continuous disclosure system by introducing statutory timely disclosure and quarterly financial disclosure. It will define with more precision when securities may be traded without a prospectus. It will revise the takeover bid provisions and it will enhance and define minority shareholders' position in takeovers.

Circumstances in which takeover bid provisions of the Act do not apply have been limited to those takeovers carried out through the facilities of a recognized stock exchange, and bids for the shares of private companies.

Disclosure similar to that called for in takeover bids will be required where an issuer makes an offer to buy its own securities.

The new Act expands insider trading liability to cover all those who buy or sell securities on the basis of insider information.

The new Act will expand on the principle that financial institutions wishing to engage in the securities business as dealers must obtain registration and comply with the appropriate conditions. However, where the transaction is the simple transmission of unsolicited orders for execution through a registrant, banks and trust companies will continue to be exempt from the obligation to register, as will banks acting as underwriters on government or municipal issues.

On the principle that The Securities Act should be the primary vehicle for investor disclosure, matters such as proxy solicitations, which are generally regarded as corporate law, are removed from The Securities Act where they pertain to Ontario incorporated companies. By parallel amendments to The Business Corporations Act, also to be intro-

duced today, matters of investor disclosure are consolidated in The Securities Act.

Because of the introduction of The Commodity Futures Act, this bill specifically differentiates between the types of contracts which fall under the two pieces of legislation.

This legislation reflects the government's adherence to the philosophy of investor protection through full disclosure. It has been long awaited by the other provinces and the investment community.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

CITIZENS' COMPLAINTS AGAINST POLICE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I direct an opening question to the Premier? Can the Premier explain or defend the position being taken by his Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) and, therefore, we assume, the government, on the recommendations of Mr. Justice Morand in his royal commission and the many submissions presented to him that citizens' complaints against the police should be investigated by an independent citizens' tribunal or through that avenue, that that procedure has been repudiated by the Solicitor General in favour of the old position that the police shall investigate the police?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there was a statement in the Throne Speech that the Solicitor General would be introducing a bill. I think the appropriate time to discuss that would be on second reading, when he can share with members of the House the advice, the number of meetings that he's had with the various groups affected, including the police associations, the police chiefs and others.

It's a very complex area, it's a matter of judgement. I think the Solicitor General is anxious to have a bill that would be workable in terms of setting up the structure, and I think that rather than my getting into an explanation or a debate, it would be more appropriately discussed when the bill is introduced and we can do so on second reading.

There are various facets to it that I think the House would like to hear. Certainly, if the Leader of the Opposition has contrary points of view, that would be an appropriate time to state them.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Since the Solicitor General's public position now is a quite striking reversal of his public position of just a few months ago, could the Premier request of him a statement before the Legislature, let us say tomorrow, so that in advance of the legislation whenever it may come—it may be several weeks or months down the road—we will have some sense of what caused this quite surprising and largely unacceptable reversal on his part?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think before the Leader of the Opposition says it's unacceptable—he's a fair-minded individual who looks at these things very objectively and I'm sure he's as interested as we are in establishing a structure that will work—I would suggest that perhaps he might restrain his observations until there is some discussion. My own recollection—I'm only going by memory—is that the bill will be here fairly soon and we'll have an opportunity to debate it. The Solicitor General is at a funeral this afternoon, and I'll speak to him about it; but I really think the Leader of the Opposition might exercise a little patience and restraint—

Mr. Lewis: Why? I didn't reverse the policy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to get into an argument with the Leader of the Opposition because I'm not sure that I ever recall his stating previous to this exactly what his position was in any detailed sort of form.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I say, I don't recall it. He may have.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, may I say that we have always taken the position that the police should not investigate the police in that fashion, and that's been held on both sides of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary: Mr. Speaker, wouldn't the Premier agree that it's highly unusual when one of his cabinet ministers reverses, in an outside announcement, a policy that's already been clearly stated? In order to avoid the kind of confrontation that's obviously about to arise because the government is going to depart from the recommendations of Mr. Justice Morand, shouldn't it be the course of wisdom and better action to clear this up before the bill is brought in? Bearing in mind that everyone has been extolling the wonders of

minority government, if the Premier wants it to continue he had better make peace in advance on this.

[2:30]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has placed his question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm always delighted to make peace in advance; I'm delighted to make peace any time that I can. It is one of my objectives in life, unlike the member for Wilson Heights.

Mr. Deans: You are kind of alike.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think there are too many parallels one can draw, even with the member for Wentworth. However, to get back to the point, I am not sure just what form any statement took that the Solicitor General is reported to have said. I have seen no statement in any personal sense being prepared by the Solicitor General.

We are anxious as a government to have the right answer to this important but complex problem. A great deal of attention is centred on Mr. Justice Morand's report, which is understandable. I think the member for Wilson Heights would also recall that the Solicitor General referred to Mr. Maloney's report when he did something of an investigation—I guess it was for Metro. I don't recall the exact circumstances.

There have been extensive meetings with the police associations, the police chiefs, the police commissions, etc., trying to get the best advice we can as a government to introduce a bill that is going to be workable. It is as simple as that. As I say, we will have ample opportunity here to discuss it at great length.

Mr. MacDonald: You got the best advice from Morand.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for York South, by way of a supplementary has said—

Mr. Speaker: No, he did not ask a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I thought it was a supplementary.

Interjections.

Mr. Breithaupt: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We've had several supplementaries, all getting nearly the same answer. Is this a different supplementary?

Mr. MacDonald: Better not try to answer that.

Mr. Breithaupt: Since the Premier's in a peaceful mood, will he suggest to the Solicitor General that when the bill is brought forward the Solicitor General will undertake that the bill will go to standing committee so that further public input will allow us to have the best legislation that the Premier is looking forward to having?

Mr. Lewis: You can call Mr. Justice Morand before the committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The House leader for the third party is, I am sure, familiar with the new rules that we have agreed to in this House. That procedure now is relatively simple. He doesn't need my commitment to have this done, as I understand the rules.

Mr. Breithaupt: It would be nice to have it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If he isn't confident about the new rules or isn't fully familiar with them, then I would remind him of them and tell him that I'll abide by the rules of this House and that as a result it will go to the standing committee.

INDUSTRIAL DEAFNESS

Mr. Lewis: Would the Minister of Labour direct or instruct the senior officials of the Workmen's Compensation Board to convene the meeting that was promised a year ago to my colleagues from the Sudbury basin and never held on the question of industrial deafness to discuss the levels of payment made for claims, to discuss why so much of the testing must take place in Toronto, and to explain why there is not a facility in Sudbury and why the board is making it so difficult on this question?

Hon. B. Stephenson: To my knowledge there is a facility in Sudbury. It most certainly can be used, provided the staff there is capable of using the machines that are used for audiometric testing. It was my understanding that the Ministry of Health had cooperated with the Workmen's Compensation Board to ensure that that testing could be done. Specific testing for permanent pensions frequently has to be done within specific facilities. As yet there have not been facilities established outside of those which are available in Toronto for a very small number of those with hearing loss.

However, I shall investigate the correspondence which was carried out between Mr. Starr and the hon. member for Sudbury East. I shall remind myself not to read the last lines of any of those letters since they are somewhat disconcerting in their content. It would seem that the use of the English language is something that might be exercised by some of the correspondents. At any rate, I shall peruse those letters and we shall do whatever we can to facilitate such a meeting.

Mr. Conway: Do you recognize the language, Bette?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Do I recognize what?

Mr. Conway: The language.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: I am concerned about the minister's concern over my language. But doesn't the minister think it's time—after a year of promising that a meeting would be held among the Ministry of Health officials, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ministry of Labour and the Workmen's Compensation Board where decisions could be reached—that that meeting, which was promised by Michael Starr, should take place, so that the decisions affecting the lives of the workers who are now industrially deaf could be enhanced in such areas as the testing occurring in northern Ontario and rehabilitation in terms of speech therapy and so on? In northern Ontario there are no facilities for the 800 men who are presently industrially deaf in the Sudbury area.

Hon. B. Stephenson: There are facilities. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen a copy of any letter which promised that such a meeting would be held. I have seen copies of correspondence from Mr. Starr asking that Dr. McCracken be in touch with the hon. member for Sudbury East to discuss the matter.

Mr. Lewis: That's nice.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am aware that indeed those discussions did take place and that the hon. member was fully informed about the activities which the board was carrying out in that area. But I shall most certainly look for a letter which promises such a meeting, because I haven't seen that.

Mr. Martel: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister has got her facts wrong again, because the meeting did not occur. Dr. McCracken did not contact me and the agreement was not in writing. The agreement was as a result of a meeting we held here in Toronto that decided a second meeting would be held after Dr. McCracken went to Sudbury to size up the situation. And maybe the minister should get informed on the facts and worry less about my language and more about the workers.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I do worry about your language, Elie. It's pretty filthy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: What did he say, Bette?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I could give it to you.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

GROUP HOME REGULATIONS

Mr. Breithaupt: Question of the Minister of Community and Social Services, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the results of a recent inquest into the unfortunate death in a group home of James Gray, a 15-year-old boy from Cambridge.

Since that inquest uncovered very lax inspection and enforcement of The Children's Boarding Homes Act, what steps has his ministry taken to improve the inspection and enforcement of legislation governing the group homes, pending the reform that the minister has promised, and can he assure us that homes licensed under the Act now conform to its regulations governing fire and safety?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, following the incident that is referred to being brought to my attention, within the ministry we immediately ensured that the procedure for inspection, particularly with respect to fire inspection, was changed. In fact I learned that it had already been changed prior to that.

At the time that that particular group home had been inspected the procedure that was followed—I'm not sure of the date, but I think that was some two or three years ago at least, if not further back than that—the procedure that had been followed was that a letter was sent out to the local fire chief with the request that the inspection be made and the certificate given that the house met certain standards. The procedure followed at that time was that if the letter was worded such that if there was no response it was assumed to be a positive response.

That has been changed, and before any certification is given there must be a positive response from the local fire chief or inspectors on that particular issue.

Further to that, we have instituted a complete review and, in fact, I have proposals before me now, under consideration, for new levels of fire safety standards to be implemented without delay, as soon as they have been approved, that would apply to group homes across the Province of Ontario—

Mr. **Good:** Talk to the fire marshals first.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —so that we would hopefully be able to eliminate any recurrence of that tragic incident.

Mr. **Breithaupt:** Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How many inspectors does the minister have available to him to cover the 19 charitable institutions, the 45 children's institutions, and the 128 children's boarding homes, and does he feel the number he has is sufficient to do the job?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I can't answer that specific question, but I will certainly undertake to get that information for the member.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: Could the minister tell this House exactly how many of the 70-odd group homes operating outside The Children's Boarding Homes Act with four or fewer children do not conform with local fire, health and safety regulations, or those fire, health and safety regulations stipulated in The Children's Boarding Homes Act?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am sure the hon. member can understand I don't have that information at my fingertips at the moment either, but I will try to find out what information I can and respond to the hon. member as soon as possible.

ARBITRATION PROCEDURES

Mr. Breithaupt: To the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Following the appointment of the Hon. Arthur Kelly as the commissioner to inquire into grievance arbitrations, which was announced last December, is the minister aware that Mr. Kelly is not prepared to hold public hearings on these grievance procedures, and does she agree with that opinion?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the commissioner appointed under The Labour Relations Act in such capacity has the power to decide in which way he or she will carry out the investigation. It is my understanding that the Hon. Mr. Kelly has suggested that his initial foray into this matter will be via letter requesting information and opinion from the relevant groups within Ontario, and that if as a result of that information gathering system he finds that he requires further investigation there are other methods which he will seek to use. I don't think his mind is closed at the moment, but he is not beginning with open hearings. That is my understanding.

Mr. Bullbrook: That makes for a great dialogue.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, since the recent inquiries into bargaining patterns by Don Franks and by David Johnston into hospital bargaining units both involved substantial public involvement and travelling to areas that were convenient for the parties involved, would the minister not think that public hearings would allow a proper dialogue between the interested parties and the commissioner and therefore come to a resolution of the problems more easily once those problems were more clearly and adequately stated?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the former justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario has had a great deal of experience in collecting information for use in making judgements about certain situations, and I would most certainly respect his judgement. I would concur with the opinion expressed by my hon. colleague: it may not be the opinion of the Hon. Mr. Kelly, however, and I would most certainly consider his opinion to be important in this situation. If he asks for advice in this matter we shall most certainly give that kind of advice. Otherwise, I think we shall rely upon the judgement of the Hon. Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I ask by way of supplementary, do I understand the minister to say that it has been the historical precedent of Mr. Justice Kelly to come to his judgements as a result of correspondence?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, that isn't what I said at all.

Mr. Bullbrook: I hope she didn't say that. He normally would come to his judgements on the basis of evidence and dialogue before him, isn't that correct?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I am very grateful to the hon. member for the lesson in law and courtroom procedures, but the Hon. Mr. Justice Kelly has had a good deal of experience in this area in other kinds of examinations than those within the courtroom.

Mr. Roy: So has the member for Sarnia.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am not suggesting that he should use one method or another,

but rather that he has made the judgement upon the basis of his own experience, which I think is considerable and considerably more than my hon. colleague's.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the hon. member have a final supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, I want to know why the minister has to be provocative to me?

Mr. Roy: And he has his QC.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I ask, by way of final supplementary, seriously if I may, does the minister consider it outside her prerogative to advise the Hon. Mr. Justice Kelly that it has been really the modus operandi of her department in other inquiries under The Labour Relations Act to have public hearings?

[2:45]

Mr. MacDonald: But it hasn't been, that's the point.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, it has been.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, we could argue—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Side debates are out of order. Is there an answer to that from the hon. Minister of Labour?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, as I think I said earlier, I am most willing to hear Mr. Justice Kelly's reasons for carrying out the initial procedure in the way in which he has decided. I shall certainly be interested in discussing this with him if he feels it is an incomplete method for finding the information which he feels should be necessary.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Treasurer. I understand he is quite proud to be able to announce something for eastern and northeastern Ontario, and in particular to be announcing a concrete statement of decentralization only 11 years after the government announced that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member get to his question?

Mr. Cassidy: I want to ask how many head offices and how many ministries or major government agencies have been located outside the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto in the past 34 years?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the member knows the answer to that question.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is there a supplementary?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, the answer the Treasurer didn't give is that none has been located outside the Metropolitan Toronto boundary.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. Cassidy: My supplementary is this: As far as I can gather from the minister's statement, the impact this year of his announcement is $6 million to $6.5 million of spending in northeastern Ontario. But the unemployment rate is 9.5 per cent and planning for two buildings in Oshawa and in Kingston—

Mr. Speaker: Now, your question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's a great programme.

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Cassidy: How many jobs will be created this year in Kingston and in Durham from these initiatives and when does he anticipate that employees from the two ministries will actually begin to be transferred?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would read the statement instead of babbling he would find out we said this would take place within four years.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are wasting valuable time here.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is supposed to be a question period and not a debate. Please keep that in mind in your questions. Now we will hear a supplementary question from the member for Grey-Bruce. Does the member for Grey-Bruce have a supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I do. If this is going to take four years to do, why in hell do you announce it right now?

Mr. Speaker: Is there an answer to that? No. All right.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: We didn't get an answer. No answer?

Mr. Sargent: Where is the answer?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: You'll get it in four years.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East with a final supplementary on this question.

Ms. Gigantes: I wonder if the Treasurer would consider asking the Minister of Government Services to make sure that the tendering for moving firms goes to firms from eastern Ontario, since this will be the prime area of creation of new jobs in all his announcements?

An hon. member: You are just transferring jobs, not creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Gigantes: Give our truckers a chance.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Minister of Government Services isn't here but it is my understanding that the decision as to which moving firm is used is a decision made by an employee in the Ontario service and I don't think that's something we would lay down.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Will the minister confirm that the government was on the verge of granting some form of financial relief for municipalities faced with increasing costs related to court-ordered group home placements, but the minister backed off, and his statement yesterday only further postponed the solution to the question?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, there is no truth in the implication that underlies the hon. member's question, and I think any statement on the question of what assistance may or may not be available would be a matter for the Treasurer to respond to.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: Notwithstanding that answer, does the minister himself not realize that the cost to municipalities of court-ordered placements has increased 200 to 300 per cent in some areas during one year alone? In Peel such costs have gone from $79,000 in 1974 to more than $1.2 million this year. When is the minister going to address himself to this critical problem?

Mr. Ruston: Where is that? Where is Peel?

Mr. Sweeney: Is it expensive to live in Peel?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Once again, I would like to assure the hon. member that I'm well aware of the problem, that I have been engaged in discussions with my colleagues about the problem and possible solutions to it. I can only reiterate what I said before, that in terms of any interim solution to the problem, to which I think the hon. member is directing herself at this point, the Treasurer would be the proper minister to direct the question to.

On the question of a longer-term solution I think that, as indicated in the announcement yesterday, the funding arrangements with respect to the local committees, and the authority of the local committees in purchase, assessment and placement, will provide the solution to that problem. Again, any further announcement with respect to the interim solution will not be forthcoming from me but from either the Premier or the Treasurer.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, since I have an invitation to address that question to the Premier, could the Premier answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. minister refer this to the Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Treasurer have an answer for that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't you mean me?

Mrs. Campbell: It was the Premier to whom the minister referred me, I think, and I'm quite prepared—

Mr. Speaker: It sounded like the Treasurer to me.

Mrs. Campbell: He said the Treasurer the first time and the Premier the second.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. We'll allow either one to answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As a matter of fact, to keep the record straight, he said the Treasurer the first time and he said the Treasurer or the Premier the second time. He gave the hon. member an alternative, and I'm very pleased that—

Mr. Good: What is the right pecking order?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member for Waterloo talking about pecking order? I've got

to tell him that he is obviously well down in his party.

Mr. Ruston: Darcy is well down the pecking order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there an answer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The government is quite aware of these difficulties. In my capacity as the member for Brampton I have had some lengthy discussions with the chairman of the great region of Peel as they related to their financial difficulties. This is being discussed by the government and I expect some sort of decision will be coming forward very shortly.

LEAD CONTAMINATION

Mr. Grossman: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. I have a copy of a letter dated April 5, addressed to the minister, from those persons who have resigned from the lead cleanup committee. Specifically, after they complain about the use of lottery funds to accomplish the cleanup—

An hon. member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Grossman: —they go on to request a meeting with the minister.

An hon. member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grossman: My question then is, firstly, can the minister assure those of my constituents who just want their areas and lands cleaned up regardless of where the money is coming from, that the cleanup will once again continue and not in any way be held up by this bickering? Secondly, how will the minister respond to their request that they meet the minister and Mr. Cockburn shortly and that the meeting be held in other than a provincial government office?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I haven't received a copy of that letter. It's dated today apparently, so I haven't as yet received a copy of that letter. To answer the hon. member's question, yes, the cleanup will go ahead and, yes, I would be happy to meet with the correspondent of that letter, but I really can't understand why it should be outside a provincial government office.

Mr. Martel: They trust you, George.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there's some suggestion of using lottery funds for the cleanup, could the minister take a page from the Minister of Culture and Recreation's brochure that says "try us"? Would the minister try us in this Legislature to see if we'll pass legislation to make the polluter pay?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, we have legislation on the books now that will make the polluter pay.

Mr. Sweeney: Like Dow Chemical?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It requires taking court action in all instances, sometimes lengthy involved court action and we're not always assured of success.

Mr. Nixon: So far you have just used it for political purposes.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In this particular case, as I've indicated before, there are three or four companies involved. The amount of money is not large here. They are making—

Mr. Singer: You certainly are a masochist.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —an undertaking that they will contribute towards the cost of this cleanup. None of the studies or hearings has established that they are solely responsible for this contamination and therefore, under those circumstances, it's reasonable to consider this type of an arrangement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is the same question that was asked the other day and the same answer given, so that's the last supplementary.

Mr. Warner: A non-answer.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr. McClellan: This is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Given that neither the omnibus children's bill nor the local children's services committee was adequately defined or adequately described yesterday, and given that they are both essential to his proposed solution to the problems in child-care services, may I ask the minister when we can expect from his ministry a precise statement of details of the role, authority, composition, mode of selection, resources, terms of funding accorded to these local children's services committees, to-

gether with their precise relationship to local government and to existing agencies, none of which things were provided yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Yes, I can't give the member a precise date on that because a number of the matters that he cites are going to be the subject of discussions that will be taking place with local governments across this province over the next two or three months. The new staff from the ministry under the new associate deputy minister is working on these matters at the present time. I will be engaging shortly in ongoing discussions with municipal leaders working on such questions as the composition of the boards and the precise relationship that they will have with local governments across the province. As soon as those decisions are arrived at, then I would be quite happy to inform the member as the information becomes available to me.

Mr. McClellan: Do I understand then, by way of supplementary, that at this point the minister does not know what the details are and he is, in fact, flying by the seat of his pants?

Hon. Mr. Norton: That's not true at all. I think that—

Mr. Martel: Well, it sounds that way.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: We have a very clear idea of what it is we are doing in terms of a policy and the direction in which we are going in children and youth services in this province. In terms of the details, the hon. member can be sure they will be sound and they will be developed in consultation with local governments across this province. They will not be imposed arbitrarily, as perhaps the member on the opposite side would choose to do.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is like consulting with Oshawa now that you have already announced you are going to move the Ministry of Revenue.

Mr. Peterson: Is Darcy writing that junk?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Final question. Is there a supplementary? The member for Kitchener-Wilmot.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Right.

Mr. Sweeney: Will the minister's new legistion continue to include funding through the rehabilitation branch for children with serious learning disabilities? Or is that going to be transferred to the Minister of Education where it rightfully belongs?

An hon. member: He told you that yesterday.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: There are discussions that have been taking place between my ministry and the Ministry of Education with respect to the question of special education for children under those circumstances, and the matter has not been entirely resolved yet to the best of my knowledge. As soon as it is, I will be happy to inform the House.

[3:00]

UTDC FOREIGN CONTRACTS

Mr. Cunningham: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Now that he has admitted that a foreign commercial agent has been used by the Urban Transportation Development Corporation in its efforts to secure a contract in Venezuela, will he tell the House whether an agent will be used in the Israeli deal, or any other deals that the UTDC is contemplating?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that the word "admitted" as used by the hon. member is appropriate. In reply to a question by him I confirmed that the consortium, which includes UTDC and the Hawker Siddeley company, did use the services of a commercial representative as required by the government of Venezuela in the submission of the tender to that government. As to the use of that commercial agent or the knowledge that there was a commercial agent involved, I was aware of it, the directors of the corporation were aware of it, the government was aware of it, and the terms of the contract with the commercial agent were within the terms of reference of the guidelines established by the government of Canada for commercial agents in foreign dealings.

Mr. Sargent: That's no recommendation.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You'd better believe it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Snow: That's your party, Eddie. with regard to what the hon. member men-

tioned about Israel, I am not aware of any proposal being put forth by UTDC in Israel.

Mr. Peterson: Eddie would do it for you.

Mr. Cunningham: Would the minister table the guidelines under which these agents he referred to are operating and which he said the federal government had tabled and provide this House with a statement of their activities on the basis of their participation, just how we compensate them and what the arrangements were in the proposed Caracas deal?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, I will be pleased to do that. In fact, I've asked for copies of all that information and I expect I'll have it in a day or so.

DOWNSVIEW AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Last January, the Minister of National Defence announced that part of the Downsview airport site will be released, and since there is an atmosphere of secrecy around the deal, could the minister please tell us who is making the decision on the location of the site and at what level, and what is the involvement of the provincial government? Would he also tell us if there is any indication of how the site will be used, and assure the House that the provincial government will request of the other parties that the site be used for housing, disregarding other extravagant solutions like the one of an industrial showplace proposed by the mayor of North York?

Mr. Sweeney: If you are reading my press releases, give me credit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are too modest.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I give them both credit; one for writing it and one for reading it.

The involvement of the provincial government, as a result of the announcement by Mr. Danson, is to have been asked, or invited if you will, to sit on a committee that is made up of representatives from the borough, from Metro, from the federal government and from my ministry. We are, of course, interested in what sort of planning will go on in the area. It is certainly our desire that that area will be used for housing and that is the sort of input that we are putting into this committee, that it should be developed as a housing area. We certainly have not been approached —at least I haven't; nothing has come back to me requesting that it be used as an industrial park or industrial showplace. The information I have is that we are considering it only as a housing development.

Mr. di Santo: Since there is an understandable concern on the part of the residents, would the minister ensure that his ministry will request the committee that future meetings will be open to the interested residents in the area?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker. I think this committee is working on a technical level. We go all through this little hoop-jumping every time something like this happens. We're not working entirely in a fish bowl. There's a lot of technical discussion going on. When it comes time to develop that site, I'm sure the hon. member is aware that it will be required to be aired in the borough council, it will be required to have a subdivider's agreement approved, if there is a sale of land involved that will have to be approved, and all of that will be public. They may well have to rezone the land or perhaps even change the official plan.

It seems to me there are all kinds of opportunities for public input but certainly not at this particular point.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the minister can at this stage make sure that the members representing the area in which the airport is located are kept advised as to what the Ontario government is saying, apparently on behalf of all of us, because of the great secrecy with which these discussions are being carried on and because of the impossibility of getting information from the former Tory candidate in Armourdale, now the mayor of North York, or from other people who are involved in this.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I trust the hon. member is aware, and I am sure he is, that the land is presently owned by the federal government. The land is located within the borough and the mayor and council do have some control over that. Our involvement would be as it would be on any other development, that is, interested in the type of planning that will go on, and the type of development that will go there. I don't think we have any secret information other than what has been announced in the press and of which we are certainly aware. We have sat in on meetings discussing the housing development but there are no secret meetings.

Mr. Singer: That is the only secret information you have. You go to secret meetings, yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There are no secret meetings at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I wish to respond again. Just because the hon. member is not there does not necessarily make it secret. It possibly makes it a lot more orderly.

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't the minister admit that his policy will continue to be that no man will be allowed to build the type of housing he can afford?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not really supplementary to the original question. Does the minister have a quick, short answer?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't have any policy such as the hon. member is referring to. However, having read some brochures that he sent to me, I can understand why he leans that way.

FISH LEVELS

Mr. G. I. Miller: I have a question for the Minister of Ntural Resources. In view of the fact that we have some of the finest fishing streams in Ontario in my riding and in view of the fact that the Long Point Conservation Authority's put-and-take trout catch for 1976 was reduced by approximately 50 per cent, I wonder if the minister would look at bringing this up to the same level as before or perhaps higher.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will be glad to look at the problem.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Supplementary: What is the capacity for the hatching of put-and-take trout for Ontario and, secondly, what is the capacity for fish hatcheries in Ontario? Have they increased over the past years or are things normal? Because of the fact that there is pressure for fishing has there been any increase?

Hon. F. S. Miller: We have a major hatchery in the planning stages which I understand will just about double the total production of hatchery fish in the province. I think the easiest answer on the production of hatchery fish is there are not enough. We are not producing as many as are being caught, particularly in the species such as trout where we haven't been able to achieve natural regeneration of fishery stock. I guess in the Great Lakes our emphasis has changed from put-and-take fishing to trying to improve the natural regeneration of fish without having to use hatchery stock. Unless that succeeds, I don't think we will ever be able to afford to keep on supplying fish for one-shot fishing.

Mr. Reid: Will the minister indicate where this hatchery is going to be built, what kind of fry or eggs or whatever it is going to supply and where they will be earmarked to go?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My understanding is that the hatchery that is proposed is at Bath, Ontario. Insofar as being able to tell the member the kind of fish that would be proposed there, I really can't tell him that.

Mr. Reid: Isn't the minister embarrassed at his fish propagation?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My fish propagation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I do better than the hon. member does.

Mr. Reid: That is true but that's not saying much.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: In fact, isn't it accurate to say that the programme within the ministry so far has been a failure in that less than one-half of one per cent of hatchery fish reach maturity?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I think if one analysed the number of fish in any natural reproduction system you'd find a very low percentage of fish reaching maturity. I used to teach elementary biology—

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —and I can only say that one of the basic reasons fish have lots of eggs is because the success rate is low.

HEALTH AND SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. Wildman: I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Algoma only, please.

Mr. Wildman: In view of the fatality which occurred at number four blast furnace at Algoma Steel this morning—

Mr. Deans: The Minister of Natural Resources has finally found his calling.

Mr. Speaker: We can't hear the member for Algoma because of the interjections. Thank you.

Mr. Wildman: In view of the fatality that occurred at number four blast furnace at Algoma Steel this morning, which tragically demonstrates the importance of hearing the views of Sault residents on worker health and safety, and the fact that the members of the executive of Local 2251 to whom the minister spoke last Friday did not understand her to say that she would consider having a hearing in Sault Ste. Marie, as the minister said yesterday in the House, will she now set a definite date for a public hearing on the omnibus legislation to be held in Sault Ste. Marie?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, I will not, because although the leaders of the union in the Sault may not have understood what I said, I did say that if they had difficulty in travelling to either Toronto or Thunder Bay to make their views known, we would seriously consider holding a hearing in the Sault. That I promised to do; that I will do.

Mr. Mackenzie: How come you're the only one who understood this?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Because I was the only one asked.

NON-RETURNABLE CONTAINERS

Mr. O'Neil: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. If the minister intends to reduce the volume of waste resulting from non-returnable soft drink containers, can he tell us why he is permitting non-returnable cans to stay on the market indefinitely while banning non-returnable bottles as of April 1, 1978, which will result in the loss of at least 200 jobs at the Consumers Glass plant in Etobicoke, which I toured this morning, and many other jobs in other Canadian-owned plants and their suppliers in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The decision is now to ban the non-returnable bottle as of April 1978. As I indicated, one of the reasons why we've done this is because there is a returnable bottle on the market; it is available now and has been available for some time. It seems unnecessary, and even ludicrous, that we should also have two forms of glass.

In order to reduce litter, solid waste and the cost of energy we've decided to prohibit the non-returnable glass bottle. As far as the can is concerned, if it was possible, for example, to have such a thing as a refillable can or a returnable can, we would ban the non-refillable cans. However, if the hon. member is worried about employment, I am sure he realizes that it would compound the situation if we banned the can at this time. The option is at this point to put a tax on cans, thereby levelling off or reducing the sale of pop in can containers.

Mr. O'Neil: A supplementary: In the meeting which the minister plans to have with the glass industry next week, will he be in a position to consider a policy which will end government indecision and ambiguity on this subject, treat both non-returnable glass and metal containers fairly and allow sufficient lead time for both the industries and workers to adjust to needed changes to protect the environment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you opposed to banning non-returnable bottles?

Mr. Singer: Which lobby is the strongest?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Come on. Let's hear you say it.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. minister has the floor.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You're chicken.

Mr. Roy: He is calling us chicken.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: To answer the hon. member's question, I think he will agree that there has been sufficient lead time. We have been talking about this subject for years—

Mr. Peterson: It's just that nobody takes you seriously, George.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The question of the possibility of banning the non-returnable bottle has been debated in this House for at least five years. The regulation that was announced a month or so ago gives the industry more than a year's lead time; I would think that is sufficient.

To answer the first part of the hon. member's question, I am prepared, as he has indicated, to meet with the glass workers and to deal with them fairly. Certainly I can't make any commitment that there will be any changes in what we have done or the regulations that exist now.

[3:15]

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: What disposition, if any, has the hon. minister made of the 1,000 signatures which were handed him on this subject last week?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am going through them one by one.

An hon. member: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, that was the final supplementary. A new question.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. Martel: A question for the Minister of Labour: Is the minister aware that the number of cases where workers are having difficulty getting their benefits paid is worsening, and what does she intend to do to improve the resolution of these claims quickly and effectively?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there have been some workers who have had delays in receiving their initial compensation cheques after injury. I am aware that the board is attempting to resolve this as rapidly as possible and has made considerable headway. I am not sure of the delays, precisely, to which the hon. member for Sudbury East refers.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary: Is the minister aware that yesterday alone I had 15 workers in my office? It's a daily occurrence of four, five and six workers with compensation claims not being processed, and the length of time is anywhere from six to 10 weeks.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any large number requires that period of time. Indeed, 91 per cent of all claims which are submitted to the board in one year are dealt with expeditiously, as rapidly as possible, and to the full satisfaction of those people laying claims.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Final supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: You have been reading your own speeches.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Deal with the facts.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: Is the minister aware, despite promises from senior officials at the board that workers would no longer have their benefits reduced without prior notification, that this is going on as much as ever, if not more?

Mr. Reid: It sure is.

Mr. Laughren: And further, that workers' benefits are being cut off without medical evidence to substantiate that being done.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that, and if the hon. member has any cases of that, if he will please let me know the names I shall be pleased to investigate them.

Mr. Reid: Oh, it's going on all the time.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I don't how it would be possible for me to know about it unless, indeed, I am informed of the names and the claims—

Mr. Lewis: You could go to the hearings at the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Roy: It's not fair. You are only the minister; you wouldn't know that.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I would suggest to the hon. member for Sudbury East, he might have been here yesterday.

Mr. Sargent: That wasn't very nice.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That was a final supplementary. Point of privilege?

Mr. Martel: When the minister says I should have been here yesterday, I have a son who is a page and who had an eye appointment with a specialist which was of long standing. I took him there yesterday, for her edification.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I didn't say you "should have been," I said you might have been—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

FIRE SAFETY IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Correctional Institutions. As a result of the five tragic deaths in the fire at Stratford jail, what has the ministry done in implementing the 13 recommendations of the coroner's inquest calling for improved training in regard to fire drills and the use of emergency equipment? In light of the events leading up to those tragic deaths, the ministry and the minister agree that it is time to initiate a public inquiry into the wholly arbitrary use of solitary confinement cells and their non-compliance with health and safety regulations, security requirements and emergency procedures?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I issued a quite comprehensive statement to the media

back in late February or early March—I've forgotten the exact date—in which I indicated that we adopted 12 of the 13 recommendations of the jury. The 13th of those recommendations is one which is not within my ministry's competence to adopt, inasmuch as it relates to another branch of government altogether, namely at the municipal level.

I think, though, it would be helpful to all members were I to bring to this House—and I would tell the hon. member for York Centre that I would propose to do that very shortly—a comprehensive update on the actions that we have taken with respect to fire training of all our correctional officers, and the other steps which flow from this coroner's jury bank of recommendations, with all of which I found myself in basic concurrence. And, of course, we're all anxious to see that that kind of problem does not and just will not arise again.

Mr. Stong: Supplementary: The minister has not answerd my question. I'm wondering what the minister's attitude is towards a public inquiry into the use of the solitary confinement cell and its non-compliance with the health and safety regulations, emergency procedures and security requirements?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I'm sorry, I thought I had directed a comment to that, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that we do require solitary confinement cells to meet, and they do meet, health requirements. To the extent that in any sense they do not, of course, that kind of situation would be remedied. We have to have solitary confinement cells for disciplinary purposes and otherwise.

Mr. Sargent: Tear those jails down. Burn them down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: What does the minister propose to do with those jails that are so old and so rotten that there is absolutely nothing that can be done in regard to bringing them up to any reasonable level of fire protection; particularly, for instance, in Fort Frances?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I understand that there will be an ultimate replacement of the facility at Fort Frances—

Mr. Reid: We've heard that for 10 years.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —but so far as fire protection is concerned, additional air packs are being provided and other firefighting facilities also provided. Training drills are being worked out with staff. All new correctional officers taken on board receive full firefighting training within the first 30 days, and generally everything is being done with respect to the older jails, which this province assumed in 1968 when it took over the responsibility from the municipalities. Of course, where it is impossible to adequately update the jails the province is directing, as quickly as it economically can do so, its attention to replacement of those jails with modern detention centres.

Mr. Sargent: That's a joke, that isn't true.

Mr. Peterson: I have a two-pronged supplementary, because I'm afraid you'll only allow me one, Mr. Speaker. As the minister is aware one of the very serious problems, and probably one of the principal reasons for the deaths, is that many of his ministerial and departmental memos were ignored in the past. The first part of my supplementary is: How does he know that his present memos and directives are being followed in all of the institutions? Secondly, in one particular case there was a message from one of the inmates to his lawyer. The urgency of that memo was not conveyed to the lawyer and there's a possibility, had that situation been different—had the facts been different—one particular person would not have died; and in fact all five may not have died. My question is: What changes has the minister made in terms of communications out of the jails?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, with respect to directives from head office, shall we say, out to the various jails and detention centres, we have instituted a form of acknowledgement of the contents of receipt of the directive—

Mr. Conway: In triplicate, I hope.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —and my staff advise me that with respect to anything of this sort they are also making sure that there is personal contact to make sure that the directive is understood. It was not a question of that particular directive to which the hon. member refers not ever having been received. It was in fact received, but it would appear that its import may have been misunderstood. At least that was the tenor of the testimony given at the inquest.

Now with respect to the lawyer for the one inmate, to which the hon. member refers, I don't have before me the actual chronology of the communication times on that fateful day. But if memory serves me, it seems that around 12:30 or so in the afternoon the

message was conveyed to the law firm and the person at the jail was advised that the lawyer was not there.

Mr. Peterson: That was 9:50 in the morning—

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well it may have been earlier—9:55 perhaps? In any event, the lawyer was not there. The message was subsequently, I am told, relayed to the lawyer's wife. But the lawyer did not return home or back to his office until roughly 4:30 that afternoon, at which time I understand he got the message and evidently attended at the jail shortly after. But by that time the fire was underway and he was unable to get in. From what I have been able to determine, in that respect, the information was passed along without delay, and my officers did discharge their responsibility to communicate the information in the form in which it was given to them, in the form in which the inmate wrote the message to his lawyer; it was conveyed to the lawyer's law firm by telephone quite promptly after it had been picked up from within the jail complex.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No. Order, please. The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Peterson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Your point of order is what?

Mr. Peterson: May I have your indulgence on this particular issue? It is a matter, in my opinion and in various people's judgement, of very—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think if the hon. member wishes further information he might deal directly with the minister on a personal basis.

The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Martel: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Point of order?

Mr. Martel: In view of the answer I received from the Minister of Labour, and the fact I am dissatisfied with that answer, I would like to indicate to the Speaker that I would like to continue that debate this evening on the late show.

Mr. Speaker: So noted.

Petitions.

REPORTS

Hon. W. Newman presented the report of the financial protection task force.

MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the committees of the House be authorized to meet concurrently with the House, as the committees may determine, for the balance of this Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

COMMODITY FUTURES ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of Bill 19, An Act to regulate Trading in Commodity Futures Contracts.

Motion agreed to.

SECURITIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of Bill 20, The Securities Act, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of Bill 21, An Act to amend The Business Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to.

[3:30]

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of Bill 22, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Haggerty: The purpose of the bill is to provide a mechanism whereby the minister can order parties to a strike or lockout to end the strike or lockout for a period of 60 days during which time the parties try to reach a settlement.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Stong moved first reading of Bill 23, An Act to amend The Education Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, this bill defines compulsory school age and special education and it guarantees every child of compulsory school age a right to an education. The bill also transfers the establishing of special education programmes from the discretion to the duty of school boards throughout Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Just before the orders of the day, I should announce to the House in accordance with the provisions of standing order 27(g) and provisional order 4, the hon. member for Nickel Belt has given notice of his dissatisfaction with the response of the Minister of Labour concerning the refusal of the Workmen's Compensation Board to recognize laryngeal cancer as a compensable disease. The question was raised on Monday, April 4. The matter will be debated at 10:30 this evening.

Also, we are aware that the member for Sudbury East indicated orally his dissatisfaction with the answer given by the Minister of Labour, and provided he completes the rest of the requirement—which he has done —then this matter will also be debated at the close of business tonight.

Orders of the day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjojurned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Hasn't he spoken yet?

Mr. S. Smith: Can you imagine what is going to happen after I speak?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Change your mind?

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in the Throne Speech debate, and I think to begin I would like to state what I have already stated outside this House. That is, that on balance we feel that the government's proposed programmes as laid out in the Throne Speech, one of the longest Throne Speeches on record, seems to us constructive and is, basically speaking, acceptable to the Liberal Party.

We will, of course, want to examine very carefully each piece of legislation as proposed to ensure that in fact the legislation itself comes before us and is carrying out the purpose that is alleged to be the intention.

To a large extent I think we all agree that the Throne Speech has been a tribute to the effectiveness of this minority Legislature. We believe that minority government has been working in the last year. We agree with the government in its belief that minority government can work and has been doing so. I'd like to say I believe that the Liberal caucus has played an important role in making minority government work. We have made accommodation without sacrificing principle. It's our caucus, as you know, Mr. Speaker, which has originated many of the proposals which form the substance of the Throne Speech.

Mr. MacDonald: The enthusiasm is a little strained.

Mr. S. Smith: In the last session we forced a substantial rewrite of the farm income bill. I think you know, Mr. Speaker, that we voted against the bill as originally presented and insisted that it be taken back. In some centres, our behaviour in so doing and then voting confidence in the government so that it could carry on through the summer was somewhat misunderstood. But we're proud of the action we took. In fact, the net result was a farm bill that far from being the sham that was brought before us the first time, with about $3 million or so, became a bill which was possibly going to be worth $50 million or thereabouts to the farming people of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: You borrowed the Minister of Agriculture and Food's (Mr. W. Newman's) line.

Mr. S. Smith: We triggered major improvements in education and we're very pleased at the constructive role we played in bringing about improvements in the province's educational system. We fought for and we obtained a re-examination of a decision that could bankrupt the publicly-owned Gray Coach Line. We also initiated and in many ways forced the government to act on the audit of the home buyer's grant, in which millions of dollars of taxpayers money have been given out to persons not entitled.

In the Throne Speech the government has indicated that it will be making further moves on issues that we care deeply about. The Throne Speech mentions the assisting of small business, the continuation of rent review for the life of the Anti-Inflation Board, revamping the system of child care and youth serv-

ices, improving services for the elderly and extending second language instruction in the schools. I think all fair-minded persons know these are issues in which the Liberal Party has spoken decisively and with courage. I'm pleased to see that the government is moving in these directions. We want to do the best we can to assist a constructive resolution of some of these problems.

There is one main concern which we feel is not adequately dealt with in the Throne Speech, and I've mentioned this outside the House, and that's the matter of job creation. More jobs plainly are needed for all Ontarians but there's a particular urgency for young people. We believe government initiatives are urgently required to alleviate what is now a 15 per cent unemployment rate among our youth. It's simply unacceptable to the Ontario Liberal Party that unemployment generally in this province of opportunity should be nearing seven per cent and still rising.

Mr. Cassidy: It wasn't unacceptable to Donald Macdonald.

Mr. S. Smith: We're looking for substantial job-creating measures in the provincial budget next month.

Mr. Cassidy: After a federal election, eh?

Mr. S. Smith: I think you know, Mr. Speaker, we have been critical of the federal budget and we hope for something better from the provincial budget. Just as we have prompted action in other areas of government in the last year, we intend action in this important matter of job creation that might be our next contribution to the effective functioning of minority government; we would like to make constructive suggestions along these lines in the hope that we can be helpful to the government in its deliberations.

Many of the serious issues we encounter today are issues to which we believe Liberalism offers a unique and a working alternative to both the Conservative and socialist options. The decisions facing us today will determine possibly for all time the nature of the land and the society that we bequeath to succeeding generations, and decide we must in many of these areas, particularly the areas of industrialization, urbanization, waste management, wealth distribution, energy dependency and the proces of government itself.

It's so difficult to make decisions nowadays. We have a flood of information available. Experts will show us how everything is pretty well related to everything else, and there tends to be a temptation to procrastinate, to become somewhat paralyzed, to wait for the problems to become overwhelming and then suddenly to act impulsively. In these circumstances, it seems to me that one needs a philosophy, a moral and intellectual yardstick against which to measure each choice.

The fundamental principle of Liberalism is the belief in the dignity and the worth of the individual. We see the state as the creation of man to protect and to serve him, and not the reverse.

Mr. Reed: That's why I ran as a Liberal.

Mr. S. Smith: Liberalism in today's context seeks to give individuals a feeling of importance, a genuine stake in society, the ability to regulate and conduct their own lives and make their own decisions as close to home and as close to family as is humanly possible.

In thinking about this, we must ask ourselves, however, just what it is that challenges and in some ways causes difficulty for individuals and for individualism today. There was a time, in the early days of Liberal philosophy, when I think it was easy to recognize that there was a tyrant that needed to be opposed, that people needed protection as individuals against a tyrant. Then, as time went by, it became more a matter of protecting the individual against a possible tyrannical majority, if we think particularly of the writings of Mill and his contemporaries. Then, through the early part of this century, accumulations of capital in the hands of a few tended to tyrannize and obstruct the possibility of individual development for so many citizens it was necessary for government to move, and government to move strongly and decisively, in support both of the creation of labour unions and also by utilizing the power of government itself to regulate and control the very great accumulations of capital.

Now the matter is even more complex. Now if we stand back and ask ourselves for the last quarter of this century just where the threat to the individual is emerging from, I think most of us would have to agree that it's a much more complex matter. The individual today is finding himself with a feeling of alienation, a feeling of being removed somehow from the ability to control his own destiny and his own future. His own development as an individual is hampered on a number of sides.

First of all, I'd suggest that power and money have been centralized both geographically and functionally in large industrial complexes, and we have, to cope with those, large unions and large governmental bureauc-

racies; and in this, somehow, individuals have to be guaranteed a personal stake in the economy and in the democratic system. People are coming to feel that the organizations in which they labour, in which they live, in which they vote, are too impersonal, are too alien, unconcerned with and unresponsive to them as individuals.

We are experiencing a decline in the traditional values of hard work, striving for excellence, risk taking and voluntarism. These are clearly in decline at the moment, and we believe the answer lies in the decentralization of decision-making, a commitment to smaller units of government, a genuine commitment to small business, to a school system which is challenging to the individual, to minority rights and a belief in the humanization of the work place. I'll have some comments to make on a number of these aspects during the course of my address in this chamber.

[3:45]

When you talk about individuals it's terribly important to look at the general make-up of our population and to recognize some of the important trends that face us in society. Perhaps more than anything else, the most striking trend is the increase in the number of elderly persons in our society. The ranks of the elderly, I guess, are increasing as a proportion of our society all the time; and this will continue for at least the next two decades. I suppose that all of us, if we have not already joined that particular group, hope to some day.

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: There's nothing you can do about it, Bill; Grecian Formula won't do it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My mother is 83 or 84; and I will tell you she would make you feel it.

Mr. Reid: Your hair is as grey as your suit these days.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I worry about you people, that is why it is so grey.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: I can assure you I am completely mystified as to why the Premier has suddenly sprung to life on this particular subject of the elderly but I'm delighted none the less.

Mr. Reid: He thought you said infirmed.

Mr. Bullbrook: It wasn't personal, it was participant.

Mr. Nixon: It's nice to have you drop in, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your own members were asleep and I thought I'd help you out. The member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) was having a snooze.

Mr. S. Smith: I certainly don't need the Premier's assistance in falling asleep, although he has assisted me in this way during some of his speeches.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If you would listen to more of them you wouldn't have the problems you have.

Mr. S. Smith: The large proportion of elderly persons that constitute our population —surely, it's important for us to take cognizance of that and to arrange our services accordingly. Transportation services, for instance, continue to be developed with very little regard for the number of elderly and handicapped among us. Home care services have not been reasonably expanded in keeping with the need for such services.

Let me remind you, according to a recent article, the percentage of institutionalized elderly people in Ontario is approximately nine per cent and that compares with a figure of about five per cent in the United States and the United Kingdom, and an overall figure for Canada of seven per cent. Of course, that figure itself is, to some extent, raised by Ontario's contribution.

Institutionalization of our elderly is a very short-sighted, very cruel and very mean way of dealing with this increase in that proportion of the population. Surely, we need to show a little more imagination in obtaining and creating home care services, visiting services, shopping services and cleaning services so that the elderly can stay in their own home or in the homes of their families.

The tendency in our province, and of course in North America generally, has been for families to form up in their early days of procreation and then go off to live by themselves. The children, in this way, are in many instances denied the benefits of another generation at home—aunts, uncles and grandparents. This doesn't serve either the older people or the children very well. The continuity in life tends to be lost.

One of the reasons for the feeling of alienation that I've noticed in some of my work before entering this realm of politics, has been the feeling that somehow the individual does not see himself, or herself, against the whole background of the life

cycle. I would think, therefore, there are many things we should be doing with a view to getting families to stay together longer if possible. I would think that tax credits for those people who take care of their elderly relatives at home, rather than institutionalizing them, would make a great deal of sense.

I would ask, in a very constructive way, that the government give very serious consideration, both at the provincial and the federal level, to that type of scheme. People find, as some of my constituents find, that they want to keep an elderly relative at home but they don't know what to do when it comes time for a vacation. They want to go away for a couple of weeks and they have nobody to leave the relative with, or they feel that it's a burden if they have to be there all the time and they just can't ever get away.

It seems to me with a little more money, with a little consideration, with the availability of the types of home care services that I have spoken of, it would be possible to have people come in, as it were to baby sit—not to use the term disparagingly—to take care of the elderly person at home.

I feel our society has this youth orientation, which is most unfortunate. We are developing in the community colleges thousands of people who are so-called child care workers. While I do not disparage that particular group of professionals or para-professionals, surely the emphasis should be on developing geriatic care workers. That is the population proportion that is increasing. The number of youngsters is actually decreasing as a percentage of our population. The same goes in the medical schools. We do not have the geriatric specialist, whereas we are still producing pediatricians at a ludicrous rate, given the declining birth rate in the province and in the country.

Many of these things are not the fault of the province and I am not listing them here in order to lay blame or point the finger of blame in any way, but simply to say that we as a Legislature, particularly in a minority situation, can work together to remedy some of these situations, some of these great difficulties, if only the will were there to do so.

Let me say a few words, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of food lands. I think it is well understood by those who have studied the matter that there is really no immediate crisis, in the usual sense of the word, as far as food lands are concerned. There is no danger of starvation in Ontario for now or for the foreseeable future. In fact, even if we didn't have any food land here, I suspect we could import food at a price not utterly outrageous. That is not the point.

The point is that the future demands that we keep available this excellent resource we have—our food land and our productive farmer—that we keep that available for future use. When I say we must keep it available for future use, I have in mind, Mr. Speaker, the fact that any decline in the average temperature, just as an example, could radically change the productivity of our food lands in this province. I have in mind the fact that any change in the price of fertilizer could make very big economic changes in terms of the use of our food lands in this province. I have in mind the fact that food may well be a very important export for this province 20 years from now.

I know that at the moment it is difficult to think of exporting food to the third world and so on because of the fact that they don't have money to pay for it and all the difficulties in transportation, but these may pale in significance 20 years from now. We may well find that food is for us, in a sense —to be a little over simplistic about it—what oil is to the OPEC nations. Why we should therefore squander and waste the resource we have, the best arable land in the province of Ontario, why we should waste that is beyond me.

Let me put one more fact before you and it was touched on in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) yesterday. We should realize, Mr. Speaker, that energy crops may well turn out to be the most important use of so-called food land 20 or 25 years from now or maybe even sooner than that.

Not only wood and milkweed, which are well known energy crops, but many other types of crops produce hydrocarbons which are almost competitive this very day with commercially available gasoline. It's terribly important therefore that we recognize that the energy crops, just as any other crops, will grow best and most productively on the best land.

So long as other land is available it does not make sense to use our prime agricultural land for the purpose of urbanization or for its use by other public agencies for highways, airports, Hydro corridors, waste disposal sites and so on. I think therefore that it's extremely important that we develop a real policy in this Legislature to the preservation of our best food land.

I know that the land is still there despite many types of rural non-farm use. I am well

aware of the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough's) point of view that the rain still falls on the land and the wind is blowing on it and so on. I have heard all that.

Mr. Wildman: A little hot air.

Mr. S. Smith: But in fact when you start dividing up the land with the corridors and with the roads and with buildings here and there, the chances of those small parcels of land ever coming back into proper production are very remote. I think we have to face the realities, therefore, that it's terribly important that we emphasize the preservation of the agricultural land that we have.

I feel that we have to have, first of all, an inventory of all food lands. I think that has been called for in the past and it's shocking that we don't have it now. And that must include, not just soil classifications of many years ago; it must include such matters as heat units, proximity to market, the amount of sunshine and so on. And this must designate not just food lands but recreational forest lands and other special types of lands that are available—wet lands and so on.

Hon. W. Newman: I am glad you are reading from my report.

Mr. S. Smith: We must have an immediate inventory, but in addition to that it seems to me that we require mandatory designation of the most significant food lands. This mandatory designation should be available to be appealed to a tribunal with expertise, but no appeal should be permitted unless it has rigorously been proved that no alternative is available for the particular project or use that is recommended, that no alternative is available on non-food land. In other words, the burden of proof must be on the municipalicy that wants to make a change in its official plan to prove that it has to use that farmland, that food land, and that no alternative is available. It seems to me that we have to be very strict about this.

I do not, at this moment, favour a rigid freeze, but I do feel that we should have a very strict, mandatory designation. I feel that it's very important, once we arrive at a plan which takes into account the preservation of these lands, for the regions, the counties, the municipalities, to have a fair amount of autonomy within the plan to make the kinds of changes that at the present time they have to go to the OMB about.

I think we need a special policy with regard to urban fringe areas; a buffer zone so to speak, between the urban and the rural. I feel that there is an important role as well, of course, for the federal government; and I feel that tariffs to protect our food growers are essential.

The present government has, from time to time, spoken of an interest in these matters, but let's look at some of the examples of their behaviour. Because, you know, by their deeds shall they be known, not by their green papers.

When you look at Niagara and you take the regional planners in that area and the work that they were doing: I've spoken to these planners; I've gone over with them on their diagrams, acre by acre, the land that was included in former urban boundaries, the land that they were suggesting be included in the new urban boundaries. In each instance when I asked them what guidance they had from the government during the planning process the answer was "zero."

When they wanted to know from the government whether the government really felt that the municipal sewage treatment plants had to have the number of houses originally projected in order to make those things viable, they got no answer. When they wanted to know whether or not the Queen Elizabeth Highway would be expanded right in the middle of the northern part of the peninsula where the best land was, they got no answer. When they wanted to know what kind of help they could get in order to redirect growth onto some of the less desirable, less productive lands, they were given no assistance; no dollar figures were mentioned.

They had nothing that they could use as a weapon in their discussions with the small municipalities. They would go as planners to the small municipalities of Niagara, and the people in the small municipalities would insist that they needed some growth to pay for the sewage plant or whatever. They had nothing they could use as a weapon against those people because the provincial government gave no guidance and no support.

Look at the parkway belt exemption. Look at 900 acres of class 1 agricultural land east of Milton, 500 or 600 acres of that already zoned for agriculture and exempted from the parkway belt—these are owned by the Shipp Corporation—exempted from the parkway belt on the basis of hardship to the company.

[4:00]

We have the example of Barrie. If you watched Global television last night you know, Mr. Speaker, that the government—the Ontario Municipal Board to be more accurate

—is hearing an application by Barrie to annex some land in Innisfil township. I think you know that included in that land are about 7,000 acres of class 1 land, the best in Ontario. I think you know that that land is south of Barrie and development there will therefore force additional pressure on that excellent agricultural land yet farther to the south. And more development pressure between Barrie and Toronto is bound to result from this. I think you know that that is where some of our best land is located.

You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer has sent a letter or two to the Ontario Municipal Board—and my colleague the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) has already asked about that particular letter—suggesting that 125,000 people is the population the government desires for Barrie. It is government policy to have that population there. I think you know that the Ontario Municipal Board has now stopped its hearings while it discusses the propriety of that letter. I don't intend to discuss that because I understand it's before the courts.

I think you are also aware, Mr. Speaker that Innisfil township has recommended another parcel of land which would spare a good many thousands of acres of class 1 farm land and which would direct the growth for Barrie onto other land, some of which is much less productive. It would also permit Innisfil to continue as a viable township, whereas if they lose all the land from the middle of the township, as in the present plan in the annexation proposal, I think you know that Innisfil would then be non-viable and either a form of regional government or a total annexation would be forced on the area in the Barrie region.

I feel it is really a very unfortunate day for Ontario that 7,000 acres of class 1 land should be proposed for annexation and for urbanization when there is a very reasonable alternative available. I am not accusing anybody of wrongdoing, I want to be very clear about that; I am, however, less than convinced by the Barrie annexation proposal, in particular because of the fact that the planners who developed that proposal were also the consulting engineers on the proposal for the precise parcel of land submitted by the chief developers in the area who stand to gain by the annexation proposals.

The diagrams for land use that were drawn for the South Simcoe Estates proposal to Innisfil township are very similar to the diagrams for land use drawn in the Barrie annexation proposal. Personally, I was rather surprised to find in the Barrie annexation proposal a passage which says that one of the reasons that particular land should be annexed and should be developed is because it is in the hands of developers and because, as the proposal says, developers usually take the time and trouble to do a study to find out which is the best land for development. When you consider, Mr. Speaker, that it was the same people who said this who were the consulting engineers for the developers, it is an interesting form of praise.

I am not going to go into the list, which you have probably heard before, Mr. Speaker, as to how the matter is being argued in front of the OMB. Let me just say that I am shocked by what's going on there. I think the government should be standing up to save that farm land, not intervening to try to permit its rape. In fact, I await with interest the letter promised me by the Minister of Agriculture and Food, a letter sent from his own food lands division to the Treasury protesting the proposal for annexation.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the Liberal Party agree with you on that?

Mr. Nixon: I'll bet the Treasurer slapped the minister's' wrist about that letter.

Mr. Cassidy: Didn't your party vote against protecting farm lands just a month ago at the provincial convention?

Mr. Roy: Did the member for Ottawa Centre just wake up?

Mr. Ruston: How is his house? Is he still renting it out?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's have some order, please. The member for Hamilton West has the floor.

Mr. S. Smith: I want to turn now to what is probably the most important matter facing us in Ontario, and that's the state of the Ontario economy.

Ontario's economy is sick. We suffer from high unemployment, high inflation, underutilization in our manufacturing industries, stagnation in our mining industry and widespread lack of confidence among consumers and businessmen alike.

Things are not getting better in Ontario. If one looks at our manufacturing sector, one realizes that we are not competitive with the rest of the world. And it's not going to get better. One also must recognize that as the west makes more economic demands on Canada, on Confederation generally, that most of these economic demands in one form or

another, either in the form of high energy prices, changes in transportation rates or a shifting of the manufacturing sector out there, one way or another, ultimately are going to hurt our manufacturing sector.

The negotiations on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, just about to go on, are not going to help Ontario one iota. It's evident that more and more pressure will come on Ontario from the third world, from developing nations, to permit access of their manufactured goods into our country and our province. We are facing a real crisis—a crisis in confidence and a crisis in reality.

Last week's issue of Ontario Finances provides perhaps the clearest indication of the extent to which our economy is underperforming. Because of unemployment and under-employment, personal income tax revenues are $172 million below the budget. As a result of lack of consumer confidence, retail sales tax revenues are $107 million below the budget. The crisis in our mines is reflected in mining profit taxes that yielded only 42 per cent of what they were budgeted for. And the weak markets, high costs and general uncertainty which have plagued our businessmen have resulted in a shortfall of $95 million in corporate income tax revenues for the province.

A fifth of our capacity in manufacturing stands idle. Our economy is in trouble, and there is not the slightest sign of improvement. Businessmen still lack confidence. Of 1,212 Ontario businessmen questioned recently by the Bank of Montreal, 46 per cent planned less capital spending this year than last, 81 per cent expected business would not improve this year. Consumer confidence is also low: Gallup reported that 54 per cent of its Ontario respondents believe that their standard of living is either stagnant or declining.

Despite this bleak economic outlook and despite the fact that we brought all these matters to the attention of the Treasurer during the debate on his so-called mini-budget, the Treasurer persists in his claim that Ontario's economy will experience real growth of five per cent in 1977. If he believes that figure, then he is fooling himself. If he does not, then it's time that we saw an honest figure. The Conference Board in Canada has revised its prediction to a more realistic growth rate of 2.9 per cent.

We believe in the Liberal Party that the most important challenge facing us is to repair our economy. The government and the Treasurer must acknowledge the extent of the problems that we face and then take decisive steps to spur economic growth to take up this slack. It's a sad comment on this government's fiscal mismanagement and lack of foresight that at this time of slow economic growth and high unemployment, the government is trapped by a series of record-breaking deficits and expensive spending habits. In this so-called year of restraint, government spending is up by almost 12 per cent and the budget has been overspent by $55 million. A prudent government, a government which had cut back spending and deficits during times of prosperity, would not now be so limited in its ability to overcome an economic slowdown.

Mr. Cassidy: Like the federal Liberals, eh?

Mr. S. Smith: Yes, absolutely right.

There is no manoeuvring room left. The per capita net debt in Ontario has mushroomed from $185 in 1970, the last year of Mr. Robarts, to $708 in 1977.

Some hon. members: Shame.

Mr. S. Smith: Spending has climbed at an average annual rate of 15.8 per cent from 1970, from $4.3 billion to $11.8 billion. The people of Ontario pay $2.4 million every day just for interest on the provincial debt.

By constant overspending and extraordinary deficits, this government has foolishly restricted the manoeuvring room that it needs now to foster economic growth and reduce unemployment. The inflation which the government spending practices have reinforced has eroded consumer confidence in purchasing power, contributed to high interest rates, and in that way depressed the housing industry and raised corporate borrowing costs. It has created illusory inventory profits on which businesses have had to pay very real taxes.

This party, especially under my predecessor, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), has consistently warned of the dangers of high government spending, but the government has not heeded our warning and Ontario's 316,000 unemployed are now paying the price.

No concern is greater than the urgent need for new job creation in Ontario. Eight per cent of our work force is unemployed. Three hundred and sixteen thousand men and women cannot find jobs in the province of opportunity. Our free enterprise system cannot exist without opportunities for individual enterprise and achievement, and those opportunities begin with a job. To me it is

inconsistent with our beliefs to suggest that eight per cent unemployment is an acceptable price to pay in the fight against inflation. To me it is neither acceptable nor necessary. Every willing and able citizen in our province has a right to employment, a right which has been abridged by the inadequate economic policies of our provincial and federal governments.

Mr. Speaker, let me put it to you this way: Free enterprise is something I believe in very deeply, but that system cannot survive if we bring up a generation of young people who are not given the opportunity to work, who are discouraged from hard work, from investing their time and effort and enthusiasm in using their educations and their talents to produce and to accomplish things. And if young people who are working can't look forward to the purchase of their own home, which for most people is the only stake they have in our economy, how can free enterprise survive?

Surely the need for more challenge in our schools, the need to emphasize hard work and risk taking and competitiveness is all important, but certainly the opportunity to work has to come before anything else. If people are not working, and if all industry is in the hands of just a few large companies, and if people don't sense they have that feeling of opportunity, it isn't going to matter to them a hoot whether those large companies have shares traded on the stock exchange or are owned by the government. It won't mean anything to them, and free enterprise has no chance of survival under those circumstances. Jobs for our young people are essential and the health of the small business sector is essential as well, and I will get to that in a moment.

Mr. Martel: Darcy, you are destroying free enterprise.

Mr. S. Smith: You are right. That is the first true word you have said in some time.

Mr. Martel: Hurray. I congratulate the minister.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Wedding bells, wedding bells.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: How come you are not supporting him?

Mr. Breaugh: It is downright subversive.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. S. Smith: Since the beginning of this year we have experienced layoffs and cutbacks across this province, including: the Ford Motor Company in Talbotville laid off 2,500 workers in January; American Motors in Brampton, 1,200 workers in January; Wabasso in Dunnville cut back its towel plant to 57 per cent capacity and laid off 60 workers; Willroy Mines announced closure of the Manitouwadge mine, eliminating 176 jobs; B.F. Goodrich closing its cellular products plant in Bramalea, laying off 100.

Today there are more unemployed workers in Ontario than the combined total populations of Brampton and Chatham and Oakville and Sault Ste. Marie and Brockville and Kenora. Presently Ontario's unemployment rate is rising faster than is the case in other parts of Canada. Between January and February of this year alone the number of unemployed in Ontario rose by six per cent compared to an increase of 4.2 per cent in the rest of Canada. In the past year the number unemployed in Ontario has grown by 20.6 per cent compared with 14.5 per cent in the rest of Canada. In the last half of 1976, our vacancy rate was lower than the national rate.

We are lagging behind the rest of Canada in the critical fight against unemployment; city by city, as was outlined by the Leader of the Opposition—unemployment in Hamilton, 7.3 per cent; London, 7.4 per cent; Sudbury, 7.7 per cent; Ottawa, 9.8 per cent; and, Windsor, 10 per cent.

[4:15]

Interjection.

Mr. S. Smith: In the construction industry, workers face the grim paradox of record high unemployment and record low residential vacancy rates. In Toronto, unemployment in the construction industry is 34 per cent, yet the desperate need for new construction is obvious from an apartment vacancy rate of 1.0 per cent. In Sault Ste. Marie nearly 80 per cent of the construction workers are unemployed while the apartment vacancy rate rests at 0.2 per cent.

Mr. Wildman: That is what the Minister of Housing has done for his own riding.

Mr. S. Smith: As with the economy generally, the Treasurer has so far refused to recognize the extent of Ontario's unemployment problem. In defiance of all the evidence he clings to his prediction of six per cent unemployment for 1977. The Conference Board in Canada has more realistically predicted seven per cent.

More fundamentally, the Treasurer has indicated that he seems prepared to overlook the frustration, the bitterness, the disillusionment and the shocking waste of human resources represented by the unemployed. On behalf of the 316,000 men and women in Ontario who are this afternoon knocking at the doors of factories and offices but finding no work, I urge the Treasurer to reconsider and to recognize that we urgently need new job opportunities in Ontario.

Particularly, as I said earlier the need is great among young people. Our unemployment rate among workers under 25 years of age is 14.8 per cent. Those under 20—19 per cent are unemployed; 143,000 young Ontarians, more than the combined populations of Brampton and Chatham, cannot find work.

Mr. Bullbrook: That really hits home.

Mr. S. Smith: In my own constituency office I have people with all levels of education—grade nine, grade 13, MAs, PhDs—unable to find work. The bitterness, the hopelessness, the frustration which these people indicate to me is something which is simply intolerable.

I get the feeling that we have broken faith with our young people. We push them through high school and nurse them through various educational opportunities and then we dump them on the labour market to rot like so many surplus vegetables. This is a time when they should be achieving a measure of independence and one in five of our workers under 20 cannot find a job.

We cannot abandon them. The Treasurer, in his budget, must offer hope and jobs to counteract the despair, the fear and the disillusionment of 143,000 jobless young people.

Now let me be clear. There are a few things that we probably should not do. Massive government spending increases would ultimately be counterproductive by once again overheating the economy. Our objective must be to pick up the slack in our economy, not add to the inflationary pressure.

Investment incentives do not make much sense to me at a time of only 81 per cent utilization in our manufacturing industries, because I fear that they will not be used for expansion and new job creation but rather for so-called modernization which, in the short to medium run—and maybe even in the long run—will simply replace more workers with machines.

Several significant job creation moves can be taken without significant spending increase. The Treasurer should consider a cut in personal income taxes to stimulate consumer spending, to restore consumer confidence and to reduce pressure for wage increases as we begin to phase out controls. The tax decrease should be restricted to those under $15,000 annually, those who are under the greatest pressure and who will spend that money.

Steps should be taken to speed up the Ontario Municipal Board hearings on Toronto's downtown plan. Mr. Speaker, you know I've spoken on this in the House, I've asked some questions of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry). It is absolutely inconceivable to me that the Ontario Municipal Board should be meeting in Toronto on the downtown plan of Toronto, with tens of millions of dollars of construction projects ready to go, with 34 per cent unemployment in the construction industry; and if this board should be meeting six hours a day, four days a week, should be taking off the month of July for holidays, should be taking off a week at Easter—this is absolutely inconceivable. This is a time of emergency. Surely more commissioners can be appointed. Surely they can sit longer hours. Surely they can sit five- or five-and-a-half-day weeks. This is a very crucial time in our economy and surely we can get the red tape moving more swiftly.

I feel the government should, through its own channels and through the federal government, be pressing the United States to restore tax deductions for Americans attending conventions in Canada. Six major conventions cancelled their plans to meet in Toronto in the first two months of this year because of of the elimination of the tax deduction. Each convention delegate would bring an average of $250 to spend in our economy. They create largely unskilled jobs in hotels, restaurants and other tourist facilities, and these are very necessary.

In addition to obtaining that change, and I would imagine that the United States might be well disposed toward such representations, the government should also facilitate the construction of a new convention centre in downtown Toronto. A convention centre committee established by Metro Chairman Godfrey is to report this week on means of financing such a centre and on alternative sites in downtown Toronto. The Ontario government should not let that report gather dust like so many others do. In the short term we need the construction jobs; in a longer term our hotels and our tourist industry require a boost.

For young people, special measures and new approaches are required. I'm convinced that we must institute dramatic structural changes to our economy. But to confront the immediate problems I urge the government to consider the establishment of an Ontario youth service, with the objective of spurring employment for young people in both the public and private sectors. To create jobs for young people in the public sector, the Ontario youth service would supplement unemployment insurance benefits now received by unemployed youth. The federal government has already shown interest in greater flexibility for UIC funds and is now participating in a job creation project in Newfoundland, which Ontario should study very carefully. A supplement of $10 per week would create 100,000 jobs for only $50 million. That's no more than the over-expenditure in the Treasurer's own ministry this year.

In order to implement the youth service as quickly as possible, public sector jobs should initially be created in provision of in-home services for elderly people in our society, which as I said earlier would allow them to continue leading independent lives outside institutions. The potential government cost saving is enormous. Ontario youth services could also assist, of course, with home maintenance, cleaning, meal preparation ant so on.

There must be a new approach to apprenticeship in the province of Ontario. The government must move forward to encompass many of our unemployed youth in a new form of apprenticeship so that they can get on-the-job training and so that they can come off the unemployment rolls.

The overwhelming majority of our young people want to work and it's up to us in the Legislature to give them that opportunity.

Let's turn to some other aspects of our economy, Mr. Speaker. The Conservative government has neglected our natural resources in such a shocking and shameful manner that you could hardly believe that they pride themselves on the so-called protection of the wealth-creating part of our economy.

It is inconceivable but true that our fishing industry is now virtually dead; it is certainly dying. In forestry we have the terrible neglect of reforestation, which has threatened our entire forest industry by the year 2010. And in mining there has not been a new mine opened up this year and there is nothing on the drawing board whatsoever.

Mr. Haggerty: That's for the last couple of years.

Mr. S. Smith: We have the Throne Speech promising to increase reforestation. It's just not believable. Consider: In March 1973 the Throne Speech stated, "The House will be asked to approve a programme designed to increase my government's activity in forest management. This expanded programme includes the regeneration of cut-over land." That was in March 1973.

Again, in November 1975 the Minister of Natural Resources stated: "Our forest management efforts must be greatly intensified." But no programme was introduced. Finally, in August 1976 the Ontario Professional Foresters Association held a conference "to present information on the rapid depletion of Ontario's forests and the urgent need for improved management and resources renewal." In 1972 the area of cut-over Crown land was approximately 345,000 acres, of which 178,000 acres were left unregenerated. They were the same kind of figures in 1973. The 1974 figures show 170,000 acres, and in 1975 there were 65,000 acres left unreforested. The industry that has been so important to Ontario, the forestry industry—the pulp and paper industry—is dying because of neglect by the government.

Look at the mining industry. Let me quote from the Northern Miner 10 days ago: "Ontario mining is heading for an eventual decline unless there is a marked change in the province's investment climate and policy towards high-risk exploration ventures." We have asked over and over again in the House when the government plans to move to change the Ontario Securities Commission regulations to allow exploration moneys to be found. We still are waiting for such changes to be brought in, despite the many promises.

Why doesn't the government go and do airborne geophysical survey work in the way it was done in Quebec, because that then provides a spur and a basis on which individual prospectors and small companies can establish themselves and go over the claim areas which are found to be promising from the airborne surveys? Basically, the Natural Resources ministry has been a very weak spot and we hope that the new minister will do better.

Mr. Lawlor: Why not a Crown corporation?

Mr. Cassidy: They don't believe in that.

Mr. Lawlor: That is not free enterprise.

Mr. S. Smith: With regard to small business—and I really hope that those people in the Conservative government who say they care about free enterprise will understand—

small business has an enormous job-creating capacity. It can create jobs immediately, unlike large industries which require quite a long lead time before they can create work, the small business sector can create jobs right away. It has been estimated that small firms can create jobs for approximately a cost of $5,000 per work place, whereas in the larger industries it may require anywhere from $70,000 to several hundred thousand dollars for each work place, depending on the industry.

At present, Ontario's small businesses suffer from a lack of adequate financing. Sources of equity capital are few, often because the rate of return does not justify the risk. Debt financing is hard to obtain. The government must therefore address itself to these problems—not by regulation and control, of which there's already too much, but by measures aimed at self-sufficiency of small business.

Why has this government not declared very simply and plainly that the government will obligate itself to purchase a certain percentage of all its goods and services from the small, owner-managed sector of Ontario's economy? Why has this government not instituted a policy whereby any contract it enters into with large corporations has as a clause the subcontracting of a certain percentage of that work to benefit the small business sector of this province, the owner-managed enterprises of Ontario? That has been done in the United States. It could be done here. Those people, the small business people, can create jobs more rapidly and in a more decentralized manner, particularly in the smaller centres of Ontario.

The government has other measures to take. I urge the Treasurer to consider paying the payroll taxes for each additional worker employed by a firm, in a given year, up to a net gain in manpower of 10 persons for a three-year period.

[4:30]

The matter of housing: I think you know, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals believe that every person in this province who has worked for a reasonable period of time should have the opportunity of purchasing his own home on the open market. Where is this government's commitment to affordable housing? Where, for that matter, is its commitment to any kind of housing?

Housing starts in Ontario declined from 110,000 in 1973 to 79,900 in 1975. Preliminary statistics for 1976 indicate that the total housing starts in urban Ontario in 1976 increased only four per cent over the previous year; while total housing starts in urban Canada, as a whole, increased 15 per cent. We're lagging behind in every sector of our economy.

In 1961, Mr. Speaker, 69 per cent of all Ontario families could finance the purchase of an average Ontario resale home, sold through a real estate broker, and still spend less than the recommended one-quarter of their gross income for principal and interest payments—even in those days when incomes were much lower. In 1971, 58 per cent of families could still finance the average resale house. By 1974, only 24 per cent of families could afford to do so, and that figure is even lower today.

Now we have the wonderful programme that the Hon. Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) has announced, in which the AHOP and HOME programmes are going to be combined. He announced yet another programme of this kind—where the programme applies only to new housing selling below a modest amount established by the federal government. This ranges from a maximum of $47,000 in Toronto to a maximum of $34,000 in many other municipalities. I think you know that under this programme all purchasers receive a loan reducing the effective mortgage interest rate to eight per cent, which loan must be repaid at the beginning of the seventh year.

The rare purchaser who qualifies for the maximum subsidy in the first year will receive a rude awakening when he must repay the loan. One senior trust company executive has calculated that mortgage payments would jump from $160 per month to $440 a month a few years later, leading to difficulties in obtaining mortgages under the plan due to fear of foreclosure. We have not seen that refuted. In fact, it's interesting that the provincial government hasn't shown any long-term payment schedule that would allow the new programme to be judged intelligently.

The former Treasurer, John White, announced that a provincial plan was being prepared in 1974. We're still waiting for it. No overall provincial plan has yet been released. This lack of provincial leadership has encouraged uncertainty and speculation and has, I submit to you, been one of the factors in the growing cost of housing and the reduction of the production of housing in Ontario.

What about the great land banking scheme? My heavens, those schemes in themselves ought to be enough to bring down a government under any normal circumstances. After years of criticism by Liberal MPPs, the Minister of Housing has admitted that much of

the criticism of the massive land banking programme was valid. He has stated that the remaining 23,000 acres held by the ministry will now be sold at market value, according to the Globe and Mail of March 8.

We agree that the minister should abandon this ill-conceived and ill-administered programme; however, the Liberals would ensure that the land needed for housing would be sold below market value as quickly as possible in order to reduce the price of serviced lots generally; and land not required for housing would be sold to farmers in order that it be put to its most productive agricultural use.

You know we have a situation like this in Hamilton, Mr. Speaker—and I have spoken on this before. We have in the Saltfleet area and in the mountain area thousands of acres owned by the government, directly or indirectly. They allow these housing lots to come on the market in dribs and drabs, one at a time, just as the most proficient speculator in Ontario would do. They set it at market value, or very close to market value —and there are some instances where the government actually led the market value. In that way those who would build houses for any of the assisted home ownership programmes find that they are restricted to building houses of inferior quality in order that the total price, given the arbitrarily set price for the land and the price for the house put on the land, be within the limit set by whatever the assisted home programme happens to be.

If the government would have the heart, the decency and the intelligence to flood the market with serviced land, and arbitrarily set the price lower, depress the price of the lots used on these assisted home programmes, a better house could be built for the same purchase price. These things would not then turn into slums, as is a risk some years from now, but would in fact be the best quality housing available.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What about the private construction industry?

Mr. Breithaupt: You are not helping it.

Mr. S. Smith: The Minister of the Environment has roused himself to ask me about the private building industry. The private building industry is quite happy to build high quality homes on those lots, but they are forced to put up a house worth, for instance, $19,000, because the lot itself is valued, for instance, at $20,000 and the total price can only be $39,000 or $40,000. If the government would value the lot at $15,000, they could put on a house worth $24,000 in terms of building and sell it to the owner and the owner would get much better value for that; but this government is so frightened that the poor fellow who buys that house will make some type of windfall profit. I wish it would show the same fear about windfall profits in the Barrie area where tens of millions of dollars are going to be made by certain individuals.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: How do you know?

Mr. S. Smith: What is the government worried about? A few thousand dollars of house value that might accrue to a poor person who buys an assisted home in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Amalgamation doesn't mean urbanization.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That's the new man.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: You have got all your heavy hecklers over there I see.

Mr. Breithaupt: Just one.

Mr. S. Smith: A Liberal government would encourage reasonable expansion of existing communities instead of building expensive new towns on productive farm land.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to address just a few remarks on the matter of children's services, particularly in various non-institutional placements which we might collectively refer to as group homes. I think you know that starting back in May of last year we on this side, and I in particular, went after the report of the ministry that we knew was in existence and turns out to have been in existence for about two years now—a report documenting the chaos and the shambles in the children's mental health services and the children's group home services generally.

Finally we are getting a little bit of action from the government. We are pleased to see that. There are three good things that the government is doing. One is the appointment of Judge Thomson, and we certainly applaud that appointment. He is an excellent person and we certainly wish him well in his new duties.

The second reasonable thing is to bring all the group homes under one ministry, and we have been recommending that since last May or June.

The other good thing is that committees are being set up to take care of assessment and placement co-ordination in each community. We think that's a good idea, depending on how the local agencies are involved in the make-up of these committees.

There still are a number of questions, however. Firstly, will the local government still be expected to pay an ever-increasing amount of money toward the cost of court-ordered-children's boarding home placement? The local communities have had to pick up an extra tab in this regard, while the province has escaped from certain of its own responsibilities.

We also want to know whether there will be a case audit, so that we have some idea of the children presently in our vast facilities, whether they really need to be there and whether they are obtaining the kinds of services best suited to their particular problem. The report admits very clearly that there has been neither rhyme nor reason in many of these placements.

I also feel that the government has not dealt with, and I hope they will, the matter of labour conditions among the workers in the field of child care. Many of these people are among the most underpaid, overworked people in Ontario, and surely they deserve better consideration.

In our own policy paper, which we draw to the government's attention, entitled Care and Treatment of Disturbed and Troubled Children in Ontario—Proposal for Change and Reform, we make some recommendations in this regard.

We also feel it's necessary for the provincial government to come to grips with the matter of zoning for group homes. Many areas in built-up municipalities are resisting group home operation because they feel that other areas are not taking their fair share, and that certain areas are being loaded down with excessive numbers of group homes. Whatever the reasons for these objections, the provincial government has a role to play by calling together all the municipal organizations, the municipal governments, and seeing to it that each municipality takes its share of non-institutional placements.

A few words on education: I feel very proud of the contribution that we made in the Liberal Party on the subject of education, and I am pleased to see that there have been some movements in the direction that we have outlined. I feel that the tragic destruction of any form of stiff challenge, the destruction of a sense of hard work and competitiveness in our system, which I must lay right at the feet of the Premier during his days as Minister of Education; that all that has been a tragic loss to Ontario.

But we are still waiting to hear from the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) just when he is going to start to introduce standards of measurement, standards by which you can measure attainment. Pupils need to have a periodic basis of measuring their development, and parents need to have realistic views on the ability and progress of their children. Teachers need to know about the success or otherwise of their teaching methods; administrators and taxpayers need to know about how their system is doing.

We are still waiting for province-wide standards—and dare I use the word examination—so that in fact there can be structure put into the curriculum of our public schools; structure which is very much necessary and which at the moment is available only, apparently, in certain school boards and in some of the private schools and some of the separate schools of this province. We await movement in that regard.

I would like to draw my remarks to a close by taking a few moments to discuss the matter of national unity, the crisis in Confederation. Back on December 16 I had the honour to address this Legislature and to make a number of remarks which stand and which, unfortunately in many ways, proved to be rather prophetic. In fact I am very troubled about what I see in front of us, although I must tell you that deep down I remain optimistic that our country can survive this crisis as a stronger and more unified country.

I must tell you that I do not have a conception of Canada which would be nine unilingual English provinces and one unilingual French one. That is not a conception of Canada that means very much to me. I would consider that an admission of total failure on a world scale.

I feel that it's important, first of all, that I make it clear that I ally myself and my party with the statement made yesterday by the Premier on the question of the proposed Quebec language charter. I agree also with the leader of the New Democratic Party when he noted in his remarks yesterday that it is important on such a major issue as that proposed charter that we try to speak with one voice.

[4:45]

The proposed charter is a very disturbing document for those of us who believe in a united, bilingual country. Surely what we are all seeking in Canada today is not an abridg-

ment of official language rights, but rather a widening and extension of rights and services.

It seems to me that there are some major issues that we need to address. The first is to ensure that, as I have been saying over the past few months, our own house is in order regarding the provision of official minority language rights. The second is to make clear to Mr. Levesque and his colleagues that he cannot have his cake and eat it too. I do not believe that he should be permitted to beguile the Quebec population into believing he can take Quebec out of Confederation and yet continue to reap all the economic advantages which Confederation brings.

Recently I spoke in Quebec, at the invitation of a French-speaking service club, and I should like to relate to the hon. members some remarks I made about what Ontario is doing, and to underline the further steps that the Liberal Party believes we should take.

I noted when I was there that during the course of my recent travels across the province of Ontario, Ontarians were asking what they can do provincially—on a provincial level—to help the cause of unity. My reply was and is that there are two things: The first is to show understanding of Quebec and an openness toward the French fact in this country. Secondly, I believe we should seek to ensure that all French-speaking Canadians feel first-class outside as well as inside Quebec.

In my view, Ontarians are responding positively to these approaches. I told my Quebec audience that it was important for them to realize that much has been accomplished in the last decade to improve the provision of bilingual government services throughout Ontario. While I was not satisfied that the progress was as great as it could have been, still there were today, at both the federal and provincial levels, a far greater range of bilingual services than those of 10 or 15 years ago.

Finally, I stated that I will strongly support the Premier on any initiatives his government undertakes to expand and improve the provision of bilingual services. By dealing fairly and justly with our respective language minorities in each province, I stated, we would demonstrate a tolerance and decency which would set an example for the world.

I want to congratulate the Premier, Mr. Speaker, on continuing to move up the level of Franco-Ontarian rights and services in Ontario, even though there is provocative action in the form of the white paper by the Parti Quebecois in Quebec to move their minority rights in a downward direction. It takes courage not to respond to that kind of provocation from the Quebec government; it takes courage. And it is prudent to remember that the government there is not speaking for the average Quebecker when it curtails the rights of the English-speaking minority. It is being, I think, deliberately provocative, and I am pleased that the Premier has shown the courage to continue the movement in Ontario toward more minority rights, not fewer.

I think it's important that we move very swiftly; and as I've said before, it is important that we come up at least to the level of what the anglophones in Quebec enjoy. I think it is very important to recognize that rights are rights; and I agree with the Premier that they should not be limited by what some other province happens to be doing for its minority.

Rights should be expanded because they should be expanded, not simply because of what is happening elsewhere. But it is important politically that we bring our own francophone Ontario minority up very quickly, so that Mr. Levesque cannot use the excuse that certain rights and services are absent in Ontario as an excuse for taking them away in Quebec.

I think Mr. Levesque has gone even further with his white paper.

I agree with the Premier entirely that even though we may lack certain services and certain rights in Ontario, at least a francophone family from Quebec can send their children to a French school. Certainly English schools should be available, as the Premier said, to Canadians who move into Quebec from other provinces. There's no question about that.

I think it's also important that the people in Ontario should understand that we still do have a fair amount of catching up to do. With all the publicity given to the white paper—a paper which I deplore—people may believe that in fact we already have a very high level of service and rights available to our francophone population. It's important that we admit that we still have a way to go, but that we're working hard on catching up.

I appreciate the government has done a great deal at the elementary and secondary levels of education. I appreciate they're going to try to resolve the Essex county situation. I think, however, that we must move with more dispatch on French-language post-secondary education. When you consider the post-secondary opportunities in the

French languge that are available in Ontario, they certainly need improvement. Also French-language health and related services and French-language court services all must be expanded as rapidly as possible.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the Premier will find both opposition parties are ready to respond affirmatively to solid initiatives in these areas. I can assure the Premier, and I hope that somehow or other he does hear of these remarks today, that he will have my wholehearted co-operation in his efforts to remain determined to expand the rights and the services to our Franco-Ontarian population and to expand the teaching of French to those in the English-speaking community in Ontario. We believe it should start at least in grade one, and we hope he'll move in that direction.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we feel the Speech from the Throne contains many positive indications of movement in the right direction. We feel minority government has been working reasonably well for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: That's not what your speech said.

Mr. Mancini: Go back to sleep, Michael.

Mr. S. Smith: We feel the government deserves to have its opportunity to bring in a budget, a budget which must address itself to the fact that Ontario's economy is very sick, is really ailing, and there is a desperate need to provide jobs, particularly for the young people of Ontario.

We will support any reasonable initiative of this government towards those ends. We have tried to be constructive right from the start. We intend to continue being constructive, and we hope the government of Ontario will take those actions necessary to ensure that Ontario remains a genuine province of opportunity.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. Bullbrook: What a let-down this is going to be.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Thank the opposition for the applause, Jim.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I must say I thought I would have stopped the applause more rapidly than that.

Mr. Kerrio: Take it any way you can get it, eh?

Hon. Mr. Auld: However, I thank you and begin by congratulating the hon. members for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. Johnson) and London North (Mr. Shore) for their excellent contributions to this debate.

In the Speech from the Throne, Her Honour outlined the many important programmes which the government will be undertaking.

Mr. Sargent: Important?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I should like to take a few minutes at this time to describe how the work of the Management Board will assist in carrying out those programmes. The primary objective of the Management Board in co-ordinating the implementation of government programmes is to ensure all the necessary budgetary personnel and administrative systems are in place so that all programmes can be carried out in the most efficient and effective manner.

Mr. Sargent: What is your name?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Let me begin by describing the role of the Management Board in controlling government spending. The special issue of Ontario Finances released last week, effective March 31, reporting on the fourth quarter performance of the 1976 budget, indicates we have been successful in our efforts to keep expenditures within the original budget plans. The revised outlook of $12,565 million is in fact $11 million less than the original budget plan of $12,576 million.

Mr. Cassidy: That is what Darcy said, too, but your budgetary spending is up. This is misleading.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Management Board was able to achieve this goal primarily as a result of the government's firm resolve to control expenditures within the spending levels announced by the Treasurer in the 1976 budget.

Mr. Cassidy: You are dissembling and camouflaging—

Mr. Sargent: That is the same speech you gave last year.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member should read what I said.

Mr. Cassidy: He didn't see the speech until he got up in the House.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. There are altogether too many conversations being carried on.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Our task was made somewhat simpler by the commitment of all ministers and deputies to the control of expenditures—

Interjections.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. members give the courtesy of listening to the hon. member for Leeds? There are too many conversations going on in the Legislature at this time.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You are always demanding more spending, so what are you criticizing him for?

Mr. Cassidy: Your budgetary spending is out by—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: More and more.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: You are doing cartwheels and somersaults to try to say no.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Our task was made somewhat simpler by the commitment of all ministers and deputies to the control of expenditures—

Mr. Sargent: You are giving your budget-debate speech. This is your Throne-debate speech.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and their co-operation in the reallocation of resources to meet unforeseen spending increases. I mentioned earlier that it was the board's responsibility to see that the necessary systems were in place to ensure efficient administration. For this reason, we introduced a new budget control system in 1976-77, consisting of, first, a commitment control system for capital expenditures and certain operating transfer payments; second, an intense monitoring of expenditures, and third, an early in-year review of open-ended programmes to identify signs of expenditure increase.

The increased emphasis on expenditure control has meant that within the revised expenditure outlook for 1976-77 of $12,565 million, Management Board has been able to accommodate a total of $372 million in unanticipated additional spending, without increasing the government's total spending level of $12,576 million as announced in the 1976 budget. Most of the additional expenditures resulted from increased requirements for the operations of hospitals and senior citizens' facilities, for firefighting, community arenas, home renewal grants and various other programmes.

The improved expenditure controls, in place this year, permitted Management Board to fund these increases through offsetting constraints totalling $383 million, which affected almost every ministry. I am pleased to be able to assure this House that it is with a similarly firm resolve we intend to continue our efforts in the coming year to control expenditures and to keep in-year spending increases to a minimum.

While on the topic of expenditure control I should like to resolve any misunderstandings that may exist with respect to the appropriate distribution of expenditures within the fiscal year. The Provincial Auditor's report on 1975-76 includes an analysis of total government expenditure by ministry and by month. Overall, 13 per cent of the province's spending took place in March 1976, the last month of our fiscal year. In some ministries higher percentages were experienced, up to 30.7 per cent in one instance. It is unfortunate if such statistics are interpreted as having some sinister connotation. Governments have been depicted as engaging in year-end spending sprees in an attempt to use up unspent allocations.

Mr. Conway: To say nothing about an election.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The facts clearly show that substantially all of these apparently heavy March expenditures are nothing more than reflections of events in the normal course of government business and of the government's accounting system. In fact, the comments appended to the Provincial Auditor's table describe some of these factors both in general and for specific ministries. None of his comments implies that a less than responsible approach was taken to year-end spending.

[5:00]

The relegation of a larger proportion of the year's expenditure to the month of March as opposed to other months, arises from three basic features which are built into Ontario's system. First, under The Financial Administration Act, payments made in April which pertain to goods and services received by the government in March of the preceding fiscal year are to be recorded as expenditures of the last month of the preceding fiscal year—March. This obviously is an addition to expenditures normally processed and paid within the month of March. Thus, the normal month's expenditures are for about 30 calendar days of business. However, in contrast, March expenditures represent up to two months spending for goods and services pro-

vided or rendered up to March 31 of that year.

Mr. Conway: He's sounding like Marvin Shore.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Second, consistent with the first point, the first provincial payroll in April normally includes pay in respect to the previous month and is thus charged to March expenditures. This results in the March salary cost including three payrolls rather than the normal two and could add as much as $42 million to the month's salary expenditures. And, of course, it has a similar contra effect in April.

These first two features would suggest that the expenditures for the month of March should be somewhat higher than average and that those for the month of April should be lower than the average monthly expenditure. This is indeed the case, and is borne out by the statistics presented in the Provincial Auditor's report. It shows that for the month of March 1976, 13 per cent of the provincial spending took place, while only 5.8 per cent took place in April 1975, the first month of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976.

Finally, certain expenditures, including some transfer payments, by custom or by formula tend to be heavier in March than other months of the year. For example, the government's 1975-76 payment of $24.7 million in respect of unfunded liability was made to the public service superannuation fund in March 1976. In addition, almost one half of the $32.5 million farm tax reduction programme for 1975-76 was recorded as March 1976 expenditure.

It seems clear that given these three factors the expenditures in March of any fiscal year are bound to be higher than those of other months. This is a totally normal situation, implies no mismanagement and is consistent with official government accounting policies.

The continuing emphasis on spending constraint has meant that the overall increase in government expenditures has barely kept pace with the rate of inflation. Given the ever-growing number of people who must be served by existing programmes, this has presented Management Board and the operating ministries with a severe challenge. On top of this, the board has had the additional problem of finding the resources to implement new programmes. Inevitably, this has led us to employ innovative management techniques which relate benefits to cost and measure the efficiency with which results are obtained.

As I told this House before, the Management Board is increasingly using management by results, or MBR, as the basis upon which we make decisions about the resources required to operate programmes and monitors how these resources are used. The key elements in MBR are accountability and control. Under MBR, ministries are required to quantify the results which they expect to achieve from their programmes. After the board and the ministry have agreed on an appropriate level of funding and results for a particular programme, the ministry is held responsible to make periodic progress reports to the board. I am pleased to report to the House at this time that more than half of the government's 1977-78 estimates are on the management-by-results programme and the ministries have firm plans to increase this substantially during this next year.

Now let me comment briefly on the issues raised in the report of the Auditor General of Canada as far as the government of Canada is concerned. Members will recall that he was severely critical of the federal government's system of financial management and control and that the Auditor General called for the creation of a Controller General of Canada to restore good resource management in that government. In light of the publicity which this criticism has received, I want to assure this House that a similar situation emphatically does not exist in Ontario. Through the introduction of MBR the government has already taken action to ensure that there is no danger of its losing control over the public purse.

I mentioned Management Board's interest in improving the processes for the allocation and control of public funds. I want to refer specifically to one which appears to offer great promise. I'm speaking of zero base budgeting. Under this approach, very briefly, programmes are described in terms of the different levels of output and funding at which they can be operated, and the budget is established by ranking these units in order of priority. This technique was developed less than 10 years ago in the United States and since that time has received increasing attention by businesses and governments throughout North America. It has apparently been adopted by 11 state governments in the US and will soon be introduced, we are told, within the US federal government. In addition, hundreds of businesses in Canada and the US have recognized the benefits of this approach to budgeting and have implemented this system.

Zero base budgeting makes particular sense in Ontario since it is a logical extension of MBR. It ensures that all programmes receive

systematic scrutiny and that decisions on funding priority are made in terms of defined results to be achieved. Several pilot ministries have been selected to actually test the feasibility of zero base budgeting. During the next year, ministries will be asked to cooperate with the board in refining the technique with a view to introducing it as the basis for the preparation of the 1979-80 estimates.

Let me assure hon. members that the management systems within the Ontario government are under constant review by the Management Board. This review extends to the actual operations of all ministries. In fact, regular cyclical operational reviews are undertaken in ministries and agencies for the purpose of evaluating operating efficiency, management controls and compliance with administrative policy. Management Board will continue to emphasize and upgrade its operational review programme. We in the Management Board have, I believe, made a special effort ourselves to provide an example of an efficient, lean government organization. All of the expenditure-control-related activities I have just touched on, and more, are carried out by a total staff of only 81 people in the Management Board secretariat.

Let me spend a few minutes on the management of the public service. I would particularly like to bring to the attention of this House some of the changes that have occurred in the last short while concerning the employees who serve the province of Ontario, the Ontario civil servants. The main thrust of the management of the civil service over the last few years has been to provide each ministry with the authority to make decisions affecting employees in keeping with good personnel management practices. In this regard, a systematic delegation of responsibility to ministries for classification and staffing is continuing. The commission continues to provide broad guidelines for application by all ministries, and will continue to monitor the application and practices. We believe this is in keeping with the accountability of all resources with which ministries are charged.

In previous addresses, my colleague, the Treasurer, and I have announced a series of staffing restraints. During the fiscal year 1974-75, complement was held to zero growth. The first cut in the complement of the Ontario civil service—that was a cut of 1,500—was made on April 1, 1975. This was followed by a further cut of 1,741 announced on July 1, 1975, and a further cut of 1,000 complement effective April 1, 1976. This total complement cut covered in these measures was 4,241.

In terms of actual civil servants, there were on staff as of March 1, 1975, 65,108 civil servants. On March 1, 1976, these were reduced to 63,883, and by December 31, 1976, to 63,210. The net reduction in civil servants within the period March 1, 1975, and December 1, 1976, has been about 1,900. The difference between the complement cut and the actual classified strength reduction is accounted for in the elimination of vacant complement in the ministries.

Much credit is to be given to the employees of the Ontario government for not only managing this programme of reduction so successfully, but also for being able to cope with increasing demands with fewer people and fewer dollars. In order to achieve the government objectives, tighter controls were placed on staffing actions, not only for civil servants but also for the unclassified staff. In my statement to the House of April 13, 1976, I outlined additional control measures which were implemented by the government to control the size of the unclassified staff. This additional control has been effective. The unclassified staff of March 1, 1976, was 15,039. On December 31, 1976, it was 14,811. And on February 28, the latest date for which I have figures, it stood at 13,744.

The staffing controls on both the classified and unclassified service implemented by this government has encouraged a greater internal mobility so that the reductions have been made at minimal disruption to the people and to the programmes involved. In recounting these restraints, I want to re-emphasize that these reductions have not been a mere reduction of staff level. They have been combined with a comparable control over the salaries and wages appropriations. This action was taken to ensure that staff reductions would take place and that any monies saved would not be used for other purposes.

I might also point out that the salaries of our senior civil servants were frozen for the period October 1974, to January 1977, and only then were increases granted and these were within the AIB guidelines. In addition, the senior management structure, which includes directors, executive directors, assistant deputy ministers and deputy ministers, was reduced by 65 positions.

In the continuing effort to make use of fewer and fewer employees, the government has reviewed its system of staffing with a view to eliminating credentialism—that is, requiring educational credentials that are not

absolutely essential to the functioning of the job. This, combined with increased emphasis on staff training and development, and the staffing controls referred to earlier, has contributed to the general mobility and flexibility of our civil service. Efforts in this area have only begun and further reviews of our staffing system will take place along with increased emphasis on staff training and development.

One example of our desire to fully utilize existing human resources has been the progress of the affirmative action programme for women Crown employees. Working in close co-operation with the chairman, commissioners and staff of the Civil Service Commission, the executive co-ordinator of women's programmes and the women Crown employees office moved closer to consolidating effective career programmes for women through a series of seminars, courses and policy proposals.

The second annual report of the executive co-ordinator, women's programmes, which I expect to table in this House on Thursday, outlines in detail the many activities which took place during 1975-76. This momentum was continued duing 1976-77 with a number of initiatives such as the introduction of women into management courses, the publication of a bridge job guide and further research into employment issues of concern to women employees.

[5:15]

In co-operation with senior appointments and compensation, the executive co-ordinator of women's programmes undertook a series of in-depth career interviews with over 88 women who had been identified as having the interest and immediate potential for movement into senior management. These interviews will help to ensure that these women are actively considered as senior vacancies occur and that they will form the basis of special developmental programmes in the future.

Following the resolution of several equal-pay-for-equal-work complaints, the commission, the women Crown employees office and the employment standards branch of the Ministry of Labour ran three equal-pay seminars for regional supervisors. Several women took advantage of the commission's part-time project, whereby management positions may be converted from a full-time to a regular part-time basis.

Following the April 1976 joint union-management conference on women in the Ontario public service, the commission studied and responded to the recommendations in the conference report. The introduction of the commission's career counselling centre replaced the WCEO career counselling service for women. During the year, the WCEO published a career planning workbook which is being used by the commission and is in general distribution to women employees.

I am confident that the coming year will prove even more productive. In order to ensure continued commitment to and momentum of the affirmative action programme, Management Board recently approved an updated directive on affirmative action which all ministries and Crown agencies will be expected to implement. I shall provide hon. members with more details on the directive on Thursday, when I table the executive co-ordinator's second annual report.

While I have so far stressed the work we've done in terms of overall management of the civil service, I want to be very clear about the importance with which we hold our relationship with our employees. In this regard, the staff relations programme will continue to work towards the objective of maintaining good relations between the government and its employees. The harmonious trend of relations during the past several months augurs well for the coming year. For example, once the problems associated with the first round of bargaining under wage and price guidelines were behind us, our relationship with the union improved considerably.

Public servants gave virtually no support to the October 14 day of protest. Only 15 of some 54,000 bargaining unit employees are known to have been off work without satisfactory reason on that day. All 18 salary contracts were settled in direct negotiations within the guidelines and before the expiry date of the agreement in all cases. Our day-to-day dealings with the union have usually been without rancour. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the executive director, staff relations division, have held periodic meetings with the president of the union and senior officials to discuss subjects of mutual interest, and here again the atmosphere has been mutually supportive. In fact, I joined them in a meeting with the president and one of his staff this afternoon on a matter which I think we've resolved satisfactorily.

During the latter part of 1976 and the early part of 1977, the union expressed grave concern over the transfer of responsibility for certain public services from the Crown to community-based boards or agencies. They were concerned about the possibility of loss of salary and benefits by the public servants

who were transferred and also about the fact that they faced the prospect of a significant loss of members. A number of meetings have been held with the union on this subject, several of which involved me. Assurances were given to the union that the needs of the employees would be given full consideration in any future transfers.

In December, 1976, OPSEU submitted a brief to the Premier asking for a number of changes in The Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act. Among the changes requested —in fact the union referred to it as the most urgent change—was the addition of a successor rights section which would provide some measure of protection for the employees and the union in transfers of public services to private sector employers.

After discussing this particular request with my colleagues in cabinet, I advised the union that legislation would be introduced in the current session of the Legislature to provide successor rights similar to those provided by the Ontario Labour Relations Act for private-sector employees. A draft bill has been discussed with the union and will be introduced early in the session. And this, I can assure the House, is considered a major development by the union.

While I am satisfied that the public service of Ontario is generally efficient and effective, I also believe we should always be on the lookout for ways and means of improving our effectiveness.

Interestingly enough to me, some organizations have achieved notable success in this regard by involving employees to a greater extent in the determination of their own work practices and procedures. The end result has been a better quality of service and a more highly motivated work force.

With this objective in mind, we have initiated discussions with union officials to consider the idea of a number of pilot projects to test out the merits of this approach. I shall of course be pleased to report to the House on our progress in this experiment.

I hope that this brief outline of the work of Management Board will provide this House with an understanding of our commitment to continually improving the administration of government operations.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker I want to participate in this debate. I would relish the opportunity to chase a few more things around than what I actually shall, but I think it important that we deal in specifics in this debate and I want to confine myself to the area of housing in general. I want to do so because I think it's an important matter that is receiving less and less of a priority from this government. I think it is one where they have attempted a great number of programmes and policies and attempted to do things and in fact spent a great deal of money, and never really have been successful in finding very many answers to anybody's problems in the field.

I want to deal with it too because it has many aspects to it. Housing originally, I suppose, was or could be confined to the concept that if someone—a person or a family—needs shelter, they ought to have a decent place to live. We could talk about affordable housing, we could talk about decent housing for ordinary people, we could talk about the needs of an ordinary working man and his family or a working woman and her family to have a place to live—some kind of proper shelter.

That's true and that's probably the single most important factor in thinking about what you should do with the housing programme. But I think there are few people involved who really limit it to that kind of a thing. That may be their priority item but there are a number of other things that are involved in the whole housing field. Not the least of these is the number of jobs that are produced by building a house, because the house means a number of things related to that. It means goods and services provided to the people who live there. It means a sidewalk in front of it and somebody to do the lawn and somebody to pave the road and somebody to build the furniture. In fact it has a massive effect on the economy as a whole.

Not to be simplistic about it though, there really is that fundamental part of the economy that is governed by what happens in the housing field. It has a wide variety of services, and right now we might look at the building trades people, who are in desperate need of jobs, and part of the solution to their problems would be some incentives in the housing field—some effective way to have those people go to work building houses. This seems quite a logical thing to do with plumbers and electricians and masons.

There is in the local economy a rather large effect on taxation, particularly if you have spent some time in the municipal field as many of us have. You will realize the kind of funny irregularities that flow with massive housing starts in an area. The initial flow is

probably quite good because there is some influx into the local economy of building, of investment, of some jobs that are there. One also realizes that the taxation problem is not quite that simple, that if we allow massive housing starts in any given community in any given year we pay for that in subsequent years because there are associated costs in massive development.

There is the entire field of a kind of associated production, because if one goes to most housing sites today one will see that what goes into a house is not necessarily built on that site. A lot of it is trucked in—from beams that are put together in some other production facility to the carpeting, the electrical appliances, the light bulbs and such installations, the painting and decorating and the furniture that's brought in afterwards. A lot of our production industry, as well, is strongly tied to whatever happens in housing. If we stop building houses we dry up a lot of production facilities throughout Ontario.

Another major aspect is this whole concept of how we use our land: what's suitable for housing; what should be retained for farm land; what should be retained for recreation land. To run that the other way: A very important thing is that when there are more people living in housing in a given area, their need for the use of farm land in terms of producing food, or for recreation land for the things they do outside their working hours, becomes of increasing importance. In a small, rural community people might not have thought very much of a need for park land; it might not have been a priority item, because all around them were fields, woods and farms—the kinds of things that urban dwellers don't see. But if we increase the housing activity in that rather small rural area, we find that people immediately begin to think, "There isn't as much farm land around here any more. There isn't the recreation land that we need. We've got to have some park land."

There are all kinds of problems related to land use. There are also all kinds of problems related to transportation, which one can see around the entire Metro area, where there has been a greater emphasis on housing in those regions surrounding Metropolitan Toronto but that has not been followed by a very powerful transportation programme. That leads us into great disputes about whether people should use cars, GO trains or buses to get to work in the city, because in economic terms they've been forced to buy a house that is well outside the city limits. So transportation becomes an increasing problem.

All of these things are related to that one particular field we could call housing. All of them are very serious and, unfortunately, I'm afraid they're all areas in which this government has not exactly distinguished itself over the past decade.

I think we should investigate some of the traditional Tory approaches to the field of housing. Essentially, over the last number of years they have dealt with kinds of incentive or "carrot" programmes, mostly aimed at builders and developers and, to be a little more specific about it, mostly aimed at selling off existing stock. That may or may not be such a terrible thing if it were put into the context of a rather complete housing programme. But in isolation, and as a prime tool, it's not been a very successful thing.

For starters, when it is a sales programme, a gimmick to get rid of existing stock, that denies the question entirely as to (a) whether the existing stock was necessary in the first instance or (b) desirable and (c) what happens when the sales gimmick runs out, as we've seen a number of times. They haven't exactly been wonderful programmes in terms of getting people into houses, though they have been reasonably successful at draining an existing stock.

What we have yet to see from that particular approach, though, is what happens four, five or seven years down the road, when someone who got into a house by the skin of his teeth—maybe by a government grant—finds he is in a house put up by a builder who has cut corners in every area. We begin to see what happens when that house moves into its second generation of owner, and what happens when a rather flimsy thing is put up, when the people who bought it in the first instance, and who may not have been able to afford it without the government grant, may not have been able to maintain the premises as well as someone else might have. There are some difficulties with that, and we've yet to see all of the ramifications involved in that.

This government for a number of years has had a stranglehold, and still does, on all of the plan processing for houses, because whenever you want to build a house in Ontario you soon find that you have to go through the planning process. Normally there is about 16 to 18 months of rather serious confusion, and there is a lot of red tape involved. It's a rather obtuse situation where no one is quite sure why they're doing these activities; they simply know that's the law of the province of Ontario; that's the regu-

lations in the province of Ontario; that's the way things go.

[5:30]

The interesting thing is, although a large amount of that is done at the municipal level, the final signature, the control of all that, remains here at Queen's Park with the Minister of Housing. We have seen, in a few of the plans, some price agreements. This seems rather strange, since most people, both buyers in the housing market and those who are builders and sellers in the housing market, agree that the emphasis on the problem in housing today is not essentially that there are not a lot of houses to buy, but essentially that the price is too high. That one area seems to have received the smallest amount of attention from this government.

Those few forays into price agreements have been dramatic ones, and they have been kind of high-profile public relations programmes consisting of large blue signs in front of a project with the trillium on it and a minister or some dignitary coming down to cut the ribbon and making sure that everyone understands that the Premier has sent the cheque and signed it. They received a lot of publicity. They have not had a major impact on the market, that's for sure.

What we've seen, though, when the House was not in session, is a complete dismantling of whatever programmes might have been in existence and, in their place, not very much. Maybe this was just a simple assessment of what they had going for them. There are some embarrassing things. Government, having at one time convinced itself that land-banking was a sensible proposition, promptly proceeded to display an amazing ignorance of what land banking is all about. It promptly proceeded to buy thousands of acres in the wrong place and bought it without knowing what it intended doing with it. Now it has the land, and doesn't know how to get out of that situation. It prepares lists to be put out to builders and developers, but is not terribly sure that that actually is the list and is not terribly sure that it's prepared to make concrete proposals.

The minister, I noted in one press release, said he was going to send it all back to the private industry, and promptly retreated, "well, we're not going to put it all back. We'll put parts of it back. It will be some kind of a blend." So very unsure of themselves. And yet it is true, undeniably true, that in Ontario today the government of Ontario owns a substantial piece of real estate, in many forms, through many ministries, not the least of which is the Ministry of Housing, but simply can't decide how to go through with that.

It's also true that it had a Home Ownership Made Easy plan, which was a workable notion, which had some administrative problems, to be sure, which never really did quite fulfil its potential, but had elements in there to actually make an impact on the market. There are those who would say—and I guess I would be one of them—that the reason the entire programme was abandoned is that it was on the verge of making an impact.

We looked at the little list that was released last week of property that the government not only owns but the Ministry of Housing bought precisely for the purpose of land banking, or for the HOME programme. We could see that the government of Ontario actually owns sizable pieces of real estate in almost every area of Ontario where there is a housing price crisis. That land undeniably could have been used to build homes for people with lower incomes.

But two things are now missing. One is a willingness on the part of the government to actually do that, and it's strange that, having acquired the property in those crucial areas, it now decides to abandon that particular programme. The second thing that's gone, of course, is any mechanism to get that on the market, to build and develop actual houses on those actual sites.

In its place we are left with one last, rather tenuous programme, something called an AHOP-HOME programme. There are some funny requirements about this, not the least of which is the minister did not see fit to put a substantial amount of money in that, suggesting in his first press releases that he was prepared to allocate something like $2 million as a budget for this particular programme. There may well be more at a subsequent date, but $2 million to this government is not a great emphasis on any particular programme.

One of the odd things about the federal programme that this government has decided to tie into is that although it has a minimum income restriction, it doesn't have a maximum income restriction. So that same game that we have seen time and time before, where millionaires apply for first-time home owner grants can apply in this situation as well, because there is no upper limit. There is no assurance that this programme will actually go to those people who are having financial difficulties. This programme, in fact, could be utilized by anybody who wants to go and buy a house and sees the sign and signs the

agreement. There is a minimum restriction, but there's not a maximum restriction.

It's odd that if this is the last, sole remaining programme in place to help people who need financial assistance in acquiring a home of their own, it would not at least attempt to deal with that problem alone, and not put out another open-ended programme. It's a strange piece of business.

Another strange thing was the government's admission that the Ontario Housing Corporation was not exactly beating the world down with success—that it's had a number of problems, not the least of which was probably a conceptual problem initially. It, I think, recognized quite simply that it never had performed in a way that was satisfactory to the needs of Ontario. That it never really had been an effective thing. The odd thing though is that instead of beefing up the operation, instead of cleaning up the act, the minister chose to shuffle it all off to the municipalities.

Now there is an argument to be made that the municipalities are there locally and probably can acquire property, develop it, and actually get the units up much better than OHC ever could. The stumbling block of course, is money. Where do the municipalities, with problems with their own tax bases now, get the funds to actually carry out these programmes?

And, of course, the claim usually is that the municipalities are not willing to do that. But it's my experience that that is simply not true. The municipalities are quite concerned about housing problems in their own area. I know that mine is. They are quite anxious to participate in the building and developing of new housing types for people with lower incomes who need assistance.

The problem is, of course, that the municipal tax base is rather strained right now as it is and it's going to be difficult to see much of an emphasis coming from the municipalities. The government can argue that it does assist municipalities to do that. I suppose it might be considered to be simply a matter of degree.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, when you're looking at a mill rate and your people are yelling and screaming about the price of water and the price of sewers these days, it's going to be very difficult to convince people on a municipal tax base that they ought to get themselves involved in programmes which have traditionally been carried out by the government of the province of Ontario.

The low-income programmes that were previously in place to assist people on rather fixed incomes or who receive smaller amounts of money have been by and large dropped. And this may prove to be some difficulty.

When the minister announced this new federal-provincial programme, he really said that people earning between $5,000 and $9,000 could now realistically expect to buy some kind of a housing unit. I've looked at the details of the programme and it strikes me that it aims at that mark, but I think it misses it substantially.

For one thing, the expectation is that in four or five years' time when those programmes run out, the people will have raised their economic level to such a height that they will be able to carry it on themselves without any real difficulty. I'm not convinced that that's a realistic expectation.

It would be my estimation that somebody who needs that financial assistance now and is in that wage bracket is, largely, unorganized. It would be my estimation that his income has not changed dramatically over the last five or 10 years, and that it's highly unlikely that it will change enough over the next five or 10 years to allow him to carry that particular thing.

In short, I think that there are going to be a substantial number of people who win the opportunity to participate in this particular programme and who, five years from now, will find themselves in great financial difficulty. I am concerned that they will be buying units which are not by any stretch of the imagination top quality units, that they will have maintenance problems with them afterwards and that they will have income problems when these bonus programmes from the federal and provincial governments run out.

One area that really has not been particularly explosive in Ontario is that of things like limited dividends. Federal funding is a little on the short side and I haven't heard the province of Ontario even speak to that problem for some time now. Municipalities such as the city of Windsor, which wants to do this kind of thing, finds that, yes, it can be done but it's terribly difficult and the funds are extremely limited. It would have been an area, I would have thought, where if the government was going to turn these things over to the municipalities it'd have been extremely anxious to see that they had a fighting chance from day one.

I would have thought too that the government would have looked at the whole idea

of co-operative housing, of alternatives, of letting people use their own human personal resources as well as financial resources, to provide themselves with housing. Again, there are funding problems. The amounts allocated by the federal government are restricted. There is a great problem in having people who are trying to put together a co-operative project get any assistance from either the federal or the provincial level of government.

There is no ministry in the province of Ontario which is set up to deal specifically with that problem. There is no expertise in terms of planning, in terms of financing provided to people who want to put together a co-operative project. There is no offer of provincial land held by the province of Ontario for someone to put together a co-operative project.

One would have thought, having acquired the great socialist notion of the land bank, that the government would have been quite prepared to move to the great socialist notion of a co-operative, and that in fact it would be quite prepared, if it doesn't know what to do with all that land that it has acquired, to make it available to groups to provide co-operative housing.

Let me move to the whole area of a new phenomenon in Ontario that is a growing problem in specific areas; that is condominiums. Their share of the market in certain parts of the province of Ontario is rather substantial. Something like 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the market for resales or new sales in Metropolitan Toronto, I am told, are condominiums. That is a lot. That is an impact. The province of Ontario reacted by setting up a task force to investigate this problem. I want to speak very briefly and probably a little miserably about the task force.

First of all, I think there is the basic problem that those people who set up and designed the laws and regulations governing condominiums in Ontario very specifically have been asked to say that they were wrong, they made mistakes and they didn't do the right thing. That is a very difficult thing for any civil servant to do. That is tough. In fact, I would go as far as to say that it is probably an unfair thing to do.

Mr. Moffatt: It is tough for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to do.

Mr. Breaugh: Let me put to you, Mr. Speaker, another problem which I found rather unique. I went to one of their hearings where I suggested we were having some difficulties. I presented them to the committee from a member's point of view. I said: "One of the things you ought to do is you ought to come to the region of Durham and talk to those people, those individuals—not the corporations, not the associations, but the individual buyers of condominiums. Talk to them and hear their problems."

I got a most peculiar answer. Yes, they said, they would. Then they wouldn't. Then they would and then they wouldn't. Finally it was left at that, that they wouldn't. Why wouldn't they want to? Logically, if they were investigating problems with condominiums, it strikes me at some point in time they would want to talk to somebody who actually bought one of those things, maybe somebody who wasn't involved in a great corporation or association, just a poor little individual fellow or woman who bought a condominium. They said: "No, we are sorry, we don't have time to do that. We have to write this report. We don't have time to listen to people. If we do that for you, we will have to go all over the place."

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That is nonsense and you know it. They spoke to thousands.

Mr. Breaugh: You should talk to your parliamentary assistant, the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Ottawa only has the floor. Order.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Stick to the facts.

Mr. Warner: That committee is a disaster.

Mr. Breaugh: If you want to throw him out, Mr. Speaker, I'd help you.

Since we have had an interjection, let us move to that part of the market that deals with rental accommodation, a substantial one. Roughly a third of the people living in Metropolitan Toronto live in some form of rental accommodation. I think it only fitting that we deal with this whole matter of rent review. And, of course, we won't call it rent control, we will call it rent review because we don't want to offend anybody. We certainly wouldn't want to prevent the extension of it. But let me offer some ideas to the government.

This government has said repeatedly that it is in love with, firmly committed for ever and ever to the federal anti-inflation programme. If its connection is so strong why doesn't it take the little six per cent num-

ber that is supposed to pop out in year 2 and apply it to its rent review programme? It seems to me to be an extremely logical extension of its previous position. If the government thought eight per cent was fair, for whatever reason, in the first year, but mostly I am told because it came from the federal anti-inflation programme, it strikes me that it ought at least try for once in its life to be a little more consistent and take the six per cent number that pops out in the second year.

Let me ask why, very legitimately I think. Why doesn't the government even look at the problems that are in the administration? Why doesn't it address itself to this problem of allowing for some form of group bargaining? Whether or not it wants to go the whole route and say the tenants can actually bargain a rent with a landlord, which might be a frightening thing, at least it could go to the sensible idea that we really don't need to have 95 hearings on the 95 units. Maybe we could find some other mechanism that might get there.

Let us look too, because it is closely allied to the rent review programme, at the changes that we made in The Landlord and Tenant Act which are quite good. There is only one hiccup in the process; that is, what happens when the law has been violated? What do you do? Do you call the cops? Well, no, they don't want to see you. Do you get yourself a lawyer? That is hardly an appropriate mechanism for most tenants. There isn't anything there. Should there be some form of local rental officer, landlord and tenant officer or bureau to which tenants can turn when the law has obviously been violated?

From my point of view, from my perspective, that seems to be one major flaw that is there. The law is fine; the basic problem has at least been addressed in some measure by the government, the mechanism to make it work has not been.

[5:45]

The kind of problems that emerge are little threatening letters and notices from landlords, little problems, a little browbeating, little withdrawal of services—a number of things which are, in fact, illegal. How does the poor tenant living on the fifth floor on Spadina get his or her rights enforced under the law? Well, that's another matter, isn't it? That's something like Reed Paper or Dow Chemical or a number of other people to whom certain laws apply in certain areas and laws in other areas not apply.

In my experience, in those areas where there is some form of a tenants' federation or tenants' association, the law is being followed. It has some problems in it—but it is roughly being followed. For those who don't have that support of a group, though, the law is not being followed. That's where real problems emerge.

Let me go to some of the traditions of the government of Ontario in dealing with housing. It has traditionally reacted to problems. It has not ever established a tradition of leadership. We really don't have any firm policies on the use of land, any really firm policies on the provision of services. There is one set of rules if you are doing normal servicing for a housing development. There is another set of rules that the government of Ontario decides on—as it did under its Ontario Housing Action programme. You have little government civil servants trying to convince members of local council that they ought to spend a lot of money; and they not only ought to spend it; they are told, "Here's the cheque to do it. All you have to do is set aside your normal planning process."

Never mind the objections from some other minister. Never mind the local conservation authority. "In this instance, and for this purpose, you set it aside. And the reason you do that, of course, is that here is the cheque from the minister." A very difficult thing to try to justify. Different sets of rules for different folks. The initiative has clearly been to the private sector, not to the public sector. And, Mr. Speaker, if you ask people in municipal governments, who are trying to provide some form of housing, you will see that there may, in fact, be a programme but it is not a very active one. There really are no incentives or initiatives given to local municipalities to provide things.

I am constantly amazed that almost all forms of housing agreements deal with everything else except price agreement. On those few occasions when we've got into those things, we haven't done it. That's the basic problem—the basic problem that has been ignored ever since this government was in power. It is probably the most important single factor in determining whether or not someone can or can't get into a house. They like landscaping, they like paved driveways and they want a fireplace and they want a second bathroom and all that, but it always comes down to the one thing—can they afford it? Can they get into that? Can they qualify for the mortgage? That seems to be the one that receives the least attention—

oddly. I can't really understand that particular position at all.

The end result from that entire programme, though, is that for both the buyer who wants to get into a house and for the builder who wants to sell the house, that is a crucial item. It's the one that has received the least attention—except when there happens to be a surplus or a glut on the market, or when there happens to be a crisis situation. The third occasion is when there is an election imminent.

The production of time agreements is a matter of some difficulty too. Under the Ontario Housing Action programme there were some agreements struck with developers to produce certain units at certain prices within certain time frames. But we really are dealing with reaction time in large measures. We really don't assess what the needs of a particular community are, what is available. We don't address ourselves to the concept of whether or not there ought to be rental accommodation put up, whether we should go heavily into condominiums, whether we should associate ourselves with federal and provincial programmes.

Now, the argument I suppose from the government's side of the House would simply be that you do that through the local municipality. And that's probably true to a degree. But what we are talking about here is, certainly, at least a shared responsibility; and, if we are talking about a shared responsibility, we would want to say that the province of Ontario, itself, ought to be the top dog in that shared agreement. And that means not only just calling the shots, as it does now, but funding the thing, providing the programmes, providing leadership instead of reaction. It doesn't do that.

I cannot, for the life of me, figure out why this government spends so much money on reports, on needs, on forecasting and then refuses to do that. When it has all that information at its beck and call, it promptly decides to dismantle its entire system, and does so systematically and rather brutally. I guess, though, that the problem is a philosophical one as well as a political one; that there is that point in time, you know, when the government does a number of things and gets to the point where it can actually make an impact, when the public sector could actually have some substantial influence.

That, of course, poses a problem on the other side of the coin that there may be those in the private sector who aren't too happy with that. But I think the government did clearly arrive at that point, probably in the last three years, when it could have, had it chosen to, made an impact on the price of a house in almost all parts of Ontario. It decided at some point in time I guess that that really isn't a good thing to do—it had to get out of that. I don't know why.

I'm amazed too at how this government has not been reluctant at all to intervene in the marketplace. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you talk to those people who are marketing houses, building them, developing them, plans of subdivision and whatnot, they'll give you an earful about government intervention.

So this government has not hesitated to intervene in the private sector at all. In fact it's been very busy there. But it seems to have been busy in all the wrong places. It seems to have put its great emphasis on the insignificant. It seems to have concentrated on building up a non-functioning bureaucracy of sorts. In all of the areas that you can think of where government intervention has taken place, particularly in the planning process, it's there all right, but it really isn't doing anybody any good.

You can talk about building codes; of course, there are inspectors who go around, but if one looks at the code itself it's surely insufficient for the needs of most people who want to buy a house. Particularly if they want to keep it and use it for some time.

So the concept of intervention is clearly accepted. There's no problem with that. It just seems to be insignificant intervention, useless intervention, counterproductive intervention. You talk about sales incentives being good things—and that kind of programme we've run around here for the last four or five years. Those are surely thorough interventions into the market. I mean the government is not really doing anything for anybody, except perhaps mailing out a cheque just before the election to see that they understand the public relations value of that kind of thing. And it has concentrated again on dumping existing stock, on buying out problems, of saving developers. There really are no bargains in that kind of an approach for anybody. Not for those who buy and not for those who sell.

In rental accommodation which is another aspect of where the government is going to intervene and what it's going to do—it talks in administrative terms of how the rent review programme was set up initially, how it functions now and will function in the future. The government sees that there is a lot of difficulty there and goes back to how it was set up by an outside personnel agency over a short period of time, specifically saying that

it was not to be an ongoing programme but was for a specific time frame, and that it sees some difficulties in how it was set up. I for one would like to hear the minister responsible, whoever it might be at that particular time, address himself at least to that when he provides for the extension of rent review.

I want to discuss too this notion that rent review ought to be attached to a time period. Surely that's a nonsensical thing. Surely we ought to be talking about tying it to something like a vacancy rate. Surely we ought to say that if two years from now or 18 months from now or 24 months from now, the vacancy rate in Metropolitan Toronto is as bad as it was before rent review began, the rent review is going to have to be there.

That is accepted right across the entire industry. You can't talk to a developer, somebody who is renting the units, a real estate person, or a tenant, who doesn't admit that. It has got nothing to do with what day it is, it has to do with the vacancy rate. So if the amendment is moving to target areas, if it's moving to some form of discussing an extension of rent review in the province of Ontario and it is saying that at some point in time the rent review process will flick off, then it ought to take itself out of existence when the problem is cured. And the problem will not be cured by time alone. If there are not sufficient apartments for rent, if the government believes in that free market economy routine, and it says that it ought to just let the thing roll, then it has to recognize that the problem is vacancy rates. If it is going to say, "At the end of a particular period of time we'll end rent review," that makes no sense at all. If you say, "We will end at a particular point, when we have hit a target rate of five per cent vacancy in Toronto, or 3.5, or four, or 4.5 or 4.2 or 2.9" or whatever it wants to do—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When has it ever been 3.5 per cent in Metro—ever?

Mr. Germa: You are condemning yourself. You are responsible.

Interjections.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I can't take credit or fault for past sins of this government. But if the government wants to do something sensible it'll address itself to the problem and not to the matter of political survival. I'm not really putting it down for trying to survive politically, but at least it ought to recognize what the problem is.

Mr. Warner: That would be novel.

Mr. Breaugh: Perhaps they ought to address themselves as well to this whole idea of putting approval powers at one level where it can be effectively done. In fact, municipalities do the work now and the minister simply approves. The minister ought to give some thought to that, as he has, without question, and as he has made proposals to the region of Niagara, to the region of Durham, to hand over to them approval powers, retaining some rights, of course, to have OMB hearings or to have the minister formally sign the document or whatever, but he has never done it. I think again it's a case where the government knows what to do but is unwilling to do it. I think there should be a considerable monitoring of the supply and demand situation that is at work in the economy. But it doesn't do that.

I think the minister ought to look at the very realistic problems of The Landlord and Tenant Act, and he ought to see that there are a number of rights that are left unprotected, that it is an adversary struggle and that very often those people who are tenants, they're not at the top of the economic scale, they very often have a number of related problems, they're not really in a position to insist on their rights. They're not really set up, either economically or socially, or in some cases they can't even speak the language, to go to battle with the landlord.

They depend on some form of protection from the government, and though the law might be there that doesn't necessarily mean that they're going to get the protection of that law. I've talked to people even just in the last few weeks who didn't have a language problem and didn't particularly have an economic problem, but certainly had that problem that they were afraid to insist that the law be obeyed.

That's an unusual concept in Ontario, but I have to say that in the field of rent review, in the field of problems with The Landlord and Tenant Act, it's true, undeniably true. If there is an association there or a little muscle behind them, they can get it—sometimes. Not as easily as they should and perhaps not in the way that they should, but it's feasible for them. If that's not true, if it's one lonely tenant dealing with one landlord—and sometimes it's the other way around, a landlord dealing with someone else—there is no mechanism to see that the law is obeyed in that particular field.

In the field of condominiums, I understand there will be presented to this House in this session a review of that condominium legislation and some changes proposed there. I

want to just very quickly run over some of the areas where I would anticipate some substantial change.

I think, without question, the government must deal with this matter of whether to register a unit before it goes to sale, because if one reads the signs it does say unequivocally "Condominium for sale" and if we understand the process, it may or may not be a condominium for sale. It may be a condominium project that one can buy into and when the project is registered, one can actually execute the sales agreement, but that may be a long way down the road. In between time, buyers pay something called—and this is a rather lovely name—"occupancy fees." People think they're paying rent. They find out it's not subject to rent control. That's another interesting thing. They see that it's an Assisted Home Ownership Plan, probably with a HOME programme tied into it, and they think, "My, that's very good, and I can certainly afford that." They move in and they find out that doesn't start until the project is registered and in the interim they pay occupancy fees, bless them all, and they can be set, of course, by whoever owns the project. It's not subject to rent control. It can last for as long as it takes to get the project registered.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It is. Occupancy fees are rent.

Mr. Breaugh: It's an interesting little wrinkle that people who think they will be able to buy into a condominium probably at $100, or $150, or $200 a month, find out when they move in that they are subject to occupancy fees of whatever rate there might be.

I see, Mr. Speaker, it is 6 of the clock. Would you like me to adjourn and resume at 8?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member has further comments to make we'll just recognize the clock now.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 5, 1977

Re Address to HM Queen Elizabeth II 135

Museum grants, statement by Mr. Welch 135

Regional development, statement by Mr. McKeough 135

Corporation Tax, statement by Mrs. Scrivener 138

Commodity futures trading, statement by Mr. Handleman 138

Securities legislation, statement by Mr. Handleman 139

Citizens' complaints against police, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Breithaupt 140

Industrial deafness, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel 141

Group home regulations, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Breithaupt, Mrs. Campbell 142

Arbitration procedures, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Bullbrook 143

Regional development, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Cassidy, Ms. Gigantes 144

Children's services, question of Mr. Norton and Mr. Davis: Mrs. Campbell 145

Lead contamination, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Grossman, Mr. Kerrio 146

Children's services, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. McClellan, Mr. Sweeney 146

UTDC foreign contracts, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Cunningham 147

Downsview airport development, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. di Santo, Mr. Singer 148

Fish levels, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Reid, Mr. Foulds 149

Health and safety legislation, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Wildman 149

Non-returnable containers, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. O'Neil, Mr. Lawlor 150

Workmen's compensation, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Martel, Mr. Laughren 151

Fire safety in correctional institutions, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. Stong, Mr. Reid, Mr. Peterson 151

Notice of dissatisfaction with answer to oral question, Mr. Martel 153

Report, financial protection task force, Mr. W. Newman 153

Motion re committees of the House, Mr. Welch, agreed to 153

Commodity Futures Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading 153

Securities Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading 153

Business Corporations Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading 153

Labour Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 153

Education Amendment Act, Mr. Stong, first reading 153

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Auld, Mr. Breaugh 154

Recess 181

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K.; Minister of Correctional Services (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)

Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 6

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 5, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1977

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Speaker: When we rose at 6 o'clock the hon. member for Oshawa had the floor. He may continue.

Mr. Breaugh: We were dealing at the adjournment with problems that people are having with condominiums. I want to run through some others. Registration in my area is probably the most difficult problem to face and causes the most hardships. That is a bit unique to the region of Durham because of some disputes that have arisen between developers and the municipality.

The second area I want to cover is the problem of managing condominiums. This is a rather new field and we are suffering considerable growing pains in that area. There are a number of people who have bought into condominium corporations that are having great difficulty with management contracts and in particular, are having great difficulty with management contracts that are run by the initial developer.

Even a number of people in the development field themselves who are still building condominiums are coming around to the point of view that there is such a great conflict of interest involved in that, that people who build condominium projects should not enter into management contracts for the duration or for the first five years, which would be a normal thing.

There is the problem in condominiums of taxation, of their being assessed too high and of the steps that the government has taken to redress that not being fair. There is the problem of municipal services that are not provided, and yet in a number of cases people are still paying full tax rates for them, although there are across Ontario a number of municipalities who have addressed themselves to that problem and have come up with some answers.

Perhaps one of the most common problems we run across with condominiums is very simply that the standards for the construction of them are really not sufficient for the needs of the people who buy in there. They buy the thing thinking that they are buying a home. They are not prepared nor do they accept the same kind of problems they might have run up against in an apartment. These essentially are small convenience items of noise, where one puts the garbage, how many entrances there are and how far it is to and from the parking lot. Construction standards in condominiums are virtually non-existent. It's my view that they ought to be considerably tougher than they now are. I want to point out to those condominium corporations who assume a project which is perhaps not quite up to snuff: after it is registered all of those problems, which may have been the problem of poor construction, belong to the people who purchased into that particular thing.

Perhaps one of the reasons why we're having such difficulty with construction standards in condominium projects is that for many developers what they can sell—simply because that's all that people can afford—are condominiums; they cut a lot of corners. In luxury condominium projects—where construction is done to a higher standard—there does not seem to be that problem. But in the ordinary ones that you see advertised in the weekend papers, there seem to be a raft of difficulties coming out of those.

I think it would be highly advantageous if we moved to a standard sales agreement that explains to people, very clearly, what they are buying when they buy a condominium. There are more and more people in condominium projects—and it is a distressing fact—who were not aware that they were buying anything other than a home when they bought the thing. They were surprised afterwards to learn that they not only bought a housing unit, but they bought into a condominium project, that they are part of a condominium corporation, that there are rules and regulations which they must abide by, that there are restrictions on what they can and can't do with their own personal property. That, I think, should be spelled out very clearly in the sales agreement.

Along that line, another major problem is the matter of legal advice. I'm finding very

few lawyers who understand what a condominium is. In most instances they are processing those sales agreements as they would the purchase of any other housing unit; and, of course, that's not the case. People run into difficulty and they go back to the lawyer. The lawyer, frankly, does not know—and, in most cases—is unwilling to say very much about it. In many cases I think it's no secret that a good many lawyers greet clients at the door and say, "How are you? We're glad you could afford to buy a house. Come back and see me in three days." And that is the last that the lawyer himself actually does on that sales agreement. The work is very often done by a legal secretary and not by the lawyer himself. The fee is charged, I think, rather ill-advisedly, for legal advice that's non-existent.

If the government doesn't want to legislate change in respect to the form of legal advice a lawyer must give to a client when he buys a condominium, it should at least chat with the Law Society and inform them of the problems that are ensuing from people who use a lawyer in buying a condominium, but who do not understand what they are buying or what they are getting into. It strikes me that is the very least that could be done.

Another major area is that there are, of course, many people practising law who went through law schools at a time when there was no such animal as a condominium; they haven't done any updating of themselves since, and aren't in a position to provide legal advice, even if they wanted to.

Another major concern is the area of consumer protection—no question about it. When you buy a condominium in Ontario it is "buyer beware." That's a principle which is long standing in this society, and it really needs to be changed. There are those who say that there are consumer protection laws in the province of Ontario. But no one who has ever had to attempt to use those laws really believes that there is effective consumer protection in the province of Ontario.

There is a growing group of people who have taken their condominium association or corporation and formed it into some form of a regional association. This way the condominium groups—the corporations themselves—can discuss the kind of ongoing problems they're having with people who belong to a condominium down the street or across the road or in the same city or region.

Of course, when you stop to think about it, how sensible is it to expect a group of people who may never have seen one another before in their lives, to go together as part of a condominium corporation, expecting to function, and function well, from day one? It's not really a very realistic approach to it all.

The condominium associations that are forming in various regions across the province of Ontario offer some hope on two major grounds. One is—just people helping other people, learning from other people's errors and learning from their experience and expertise. The second thing, I would hope, would be that some form of provincial association for condominium owners would emerge and be used by the government to monitor the situation almost daily.

This government has taken the attitude that we've had a Condominium Act for some time. It revised it in the early 1970s. It hasn't really substantially responded to the needs that are changing, that are different, and that are emerging on a much larger scale than they ever have before in the province of Ontario. It hasn't really responded to those needs since that time—and there is a need to. There is a need to move quickly into certain specific areas, some of which I have outlined. There is also a need to monitor that process on an ongoing basis.

In summary, I want to say—and I don't think it's unfair—that the Tory approach to housing is very much like the alcoholic who is taking the pledge for the 15th time. You know good intentions are there; you know the right idea has been expressed; you just don't have a great deal of faith that it will ever be carried out.

The record is one of mismanagement and abdication; the record is one of ignoring major problems until a great public foofaraw emerges and then trying to cool the fires. That is a problem for a government that is faced with a mismanagement problem, that can't seem to get its act together, that can't seem to decide what it is and where it's going and how it is going to deal with the problems. It avoids, in large measure, any significant measures that would solve the people's problems. It is on the verge, right now, of influencing the housing market in the province of Ontario: it has the land, it even has expressed policies and some programmes that might address themselves to those needs. And while it is on the very verge, it abandons it all. It just kind of jumps ship. That's a tragedy, because things could be done.

It's a tragedy that we spend so much government money researching this issue and then discard the results. We all get those documents from the Ministry of Housing floating across our desk. We know they've done the projections. We know they've done

the research. We know they've done the planning studies. We see all of that stuff crossing our desk. We also know that this government is not prepared to act on it. That is a tragedy. It is one thing not to know and to act out of ignorance. It's quite another thing to know what you should do and then just refuse to do it; that's precisely what has happened here.

Not the least of the problems facing people who are living in houses in Ontario today is this division of responsibility. If you lived in a house, you would think that your wiring would be the responsibility of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes); but it's not. If you were a tenant, renting accommodation, you would think that the Minister of Housing would be responsible for your problems; he's not. You would think that the Minister of Housing would have some say having to do with mortgages affecting the price of the house and the amount you pay each month; he doesn't.

This division of responsibility is a very clever ruse which really means you're not just a home buyer; you are a consumer, a renter, a tenant or a number of other things. The Minister of Housing remains silent on those critical problems of the day and is left rather free to float around in proposed new programmes which will not work. They won't work essentially because nothing else they've done has worked and because there is the problem of mismanagement, of ignoring what has to be done.

In fact, the crucial distinction to be made is that this government is really devoted to a hard-line philosophy; and that's strange. It's not that it won't intervene in the market, because it does that all over the place; rather, it hard-lines it right at that point where the consumer, the person who buys a house or lives in a house in the province of Ontario, has a need. Where he needs the government to respond, at that point it jumps ship. At that point it can't make that decision. At that point it decides, "We'd better get out of this," because it might actually change things; it might actually influence that.

I recognize I am putting forward an opinion that is perhaps one-sided in the sense that it looks at it from a consumer's point of view and hasn't emphasized the point of view of those people who develop and build houses. The interjection of the province of Ontario into the housing field has been minimal and is getting less. They have moved in there, not in a positive way to provide leadership but in an obstructionist way, to provide a reaction to a very growing problem. The end result has been insignificant. It really is mismanagement. It is mismanagement to the point where it is legitimate to ask in this House, do we have a Minister of Housing? We don't.

Mr. Reed: Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a particular thank-you to all those brave souls who came out here at this particular hour of the evening when, in fact, they probably knew I was speaking at this time. It's an exercise in hardiness, and I am very glad they're here, so I'll do my best to keep my remarks as brief as possible.

I realize I may be ruled out of order on this, but it's a pleasure as a Queen's Scout to acknowledge the cubs and scouts who are in the gallery tonight.

Mr. Speaker: You are right; you are out of order.

[8:15]

Mr. Reed: I've been ruled out of order. My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I'm particularly sorry that the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) is not here tonight. She was in my riding a couple of weeks ago, and in a speech out there she informed the partisan crowd that my best performance in the House to this date has been as Santa Claus at Christmas time. I wanted to inform the Minister of Labour that if she would take the trouble to appear in the House more often she might hear some of my albeit lesser but more frequent performances.

Mr. B. Newman: Constructive ones.

Mr. Reed: I'm also sorry that Premier what's his name isn't here tonight either.

Mr. Shore: He is with your leader.

Mr. Reed: I expected he would come out tonight. The last time he was in my riding at the gold-plated dinner, where they were desperately trying to raise money to unseat me in the next election—

Mr. B. Newman: No way.

Mr. Reed: —he had somehow forgotten my name during the course of his speech. Last weekend at the opening of the new Sheridan campus out in Brampton he did remember my name because I was standing up along the wall and about three or four times during his speech he made reference to me over there. At one point near the end of his speech, he said, "The one thing I've always wondered, Julian, is why you in, I suppose, the more colourful words of Charlie Farquharson didn't defecate to the Tories."

He knows, and most of the people in this House know, that I am an avowed free enterpriser.

Mr. Angus: Shame.

Mr. Hodgson: Come on over.

Mr. Reed: The point I would like to make is that the government of this province should not assume that it has some divine prior ordainment on the free enterprise system. When one looks at how the government handles free enterprise, one realizes they do have a handle on certain things. They have a handle on the bigger is better philosophy. They have a handle on the large corporate entity. They have a handle on something, where the NDP have difficulty separating from them too, that is, the business of centralization.

Mr. Shore: Where is your handle?

Mr. Reed: Don't say too much. The place where they miss tugs at the very roots of the economic foundation of this province, that is, the free enterprise system as it has been expressed through the small businessman, the entrepreneur—

Mr. Hodgson: You are talking like a Conservative.

Mr. Reed: —the real free enterpriser in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Wiseman: Come on over.

Mr. Reed: I really wouldn't have said anything about the free enterprise system tonight if I hadn't been goaded into it by the Premier (Mr. Davis). Then later I received this letter from a constituent. I have to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that this letter and the accompanying brief were actually sent from a constituent of mine to the leader of the New Democratic Party. But he hasn't seen fit to deal with it, so I'm going to have to deal with it tonight. I just wanted to cite an example of how this government treats the small businessman.

We have a businessman here who has applied to the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. I'm glad the minister is here at the present time because he's had a runaround from the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for the last few months. Here is a man who wants to expand his business; he wants to represent the epitome of free enterprise. Yet the ministry states through one of its officials that the Ontario government is primarily interested in tourism and that's why he advised the man to go to the federal people. He even offered to help him make the application to the federal government for money but hasn't followed through. It's just one of the sad examples of—

Mr. Haggerty: There's a job for the member for London North.

Mr. Worton: Here is his chance.

Mr. Reed: —how we treat true free enterprise in the province of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, I think we have all agreed that, with certain reservations and limitations, minority government isn't working too badly. I liken it to a big freight train that is very slowly starting to move and where the Liberal Party is putting down the rails ahead of the engine.

Mr. Moffatt: There is a wreck about to happen.

Mr. Hodgson: Your problem is you haven't got an engineer.

Interjections.

Mr. Reed: I really don't want to be provocative and steal the Premier's thunder tonight, but I just have to point out to this House that most of the major moves and the major progress that have been made by this minority government have been made by the pressures put on by the party that has held the balance of power and that is the Liberal Party. But, Mr. Speaker, we still have a long way to go.

Interjections.

Mr. Reed: My, what a distance we have to go.

Mr. Angus: You better believe it.

Mr. Shore: You finally found your place.

Mr. Reed: The leader of the official opposition mentioned to this government in his speech yesterday the opportunities that are available to the government, opportunities to forge ahead now into new areas, areas that are necessary for the future economic base of Ontario. I just want to make mention of one of those opportunities.

I just happen to have in my riding the distinction of having one of the larger choices of garbage sites—they call it sanitary landfill—near the town of Milton. Sanitary landfill and the old town dump philosophy were with us at the turn of the century and all we have done is we have centralized the town dump and we have made it a little bigger. Of course, the pollution gets a little more concentrated when we make the dump bigger

and we pack the garbage in tighter and we make more garbage as the years go on. There is a solution to all this, and the solution was put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) yesterday and I give him due credit for that. What he was doing was restating what I had said to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) in London the week before.

Mr. Martel: I bet you he borrowed from your speech.

Mr. Shore: You congratulated him there.

Mr. Reed: I had pointed out that there was an opportunity here for the first time, and the first time to do it economically, to get on with the technology of the development of solid waste recovery, and in a new area—not from the point of view of compacting and separating and shredding and re-inventing the wheel the way the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) is doing up in Downsview at the present time, but getting on with turning garbage into a useable resource and one that can be economically viable and one that can prove cost recovery. One of the ways of doing that is through the processes that produce fuel. In the case of the Leader of the Opposition he mentioned the process of making methalon. There are all kinds of technologies available around North America and so on, but it is unfortunate that Ontario is really the last to get out of the town dump mentality.

Mr. Hodgson: They are further ahead than any other place in North America.

Mr. Reed: No, they are not further ahead than any other place in North America. I will take the member personally, if he will put up the money—

Mr. Hodgson: Yes they are.

Mr. Reed: —and we will go out to the city of Seattle and we will see what they are doing with the production of ammonia using garbage in the city of Seattle. We are the last people to make these moves. So I suggested to the Minister of Energy—

Mr. Moffatt: Can a Crown corporation do it then?

Mr. Reed: —understanding the constraints that are on capital spending, and I approve of constraints in this era of repeated deficit budgeting, I pointed out to him the opportunity for the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of the Environment to join hands and to pool their resources and use the garbage to get into a new energy source for the province of Ontario. It remains to be seen whether that is going to happen, but we can no longer go on putting garbage into holes in the ground in this province. We have to stop it and we have to stop it right now.

Mr. Hodgson: Put it up in the sky there.

Mr. Reed: We have the opportunity—

Mr. Moffatt: We have got garbage but free enterprisers don't want it.

Mr. Reed: We have the opportunity to produce saleable products, and let me tell the member something—

Interjection.

Mr. Reed: —that very soon the free enterprises will be competing for the garbage of the province of Ontario. So we've got that problem.

Interjection.

Mr. Reed: I have another particular problem in my riding, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to allude to. It was a problem that my Conservative opposition at the time decided was the reason for my election. It was the Niagara Escarpment Commission. The Niagara Escarpment Commission runs diagonally through the riding of Halton-Burlington. It cuts it right in two, and it creates an awful lot of trouble for an awful lot of people. Do the members know that on the Niagara Escarpment you really can't put a fence post in, you can't build a garage, you've got to have the colour of your house approved and the colour of your roof and the rest of it? If you want to—

Interjection.

Mr. Reed: —yes, want to give in. Of course, we can take the gravel and so on out of the Escarpment and we can deface it, but people are subjected to a bureaucracy that they have never been subjected to before in their lives.

We've been told by the NEC that as soon as the master draft plan is completed everything will be well. We'll all know exactly where we stand and so on. This draft plan was supposed to have been completed a year ago, and we still haven't got it. And that's the second of these major problems that are in this riding. I wonder, the way bureaucracies work under this administration, if we will ever get it.

Mr. Nixon: Going to have to change the government.

Mr. Reed: We get put off month to month to month, and now they even get annoyed when I phone up and ask, "Where is it?"

Mr. McEwen: You will have to lay the tracks for that one.

Mr. Reed: Mr. Speaker, my riding has not escaped the tragedy of unemployment. We've had one coating mill closed permanently in the town of Georgetown. We have another coating mill that is closing 50 per cent of its operation down and I fear for the balance.

Unemployment is a result of a combination of factors. But not the last of these are the illusions that are created by government in the minds of people concerning jobs and concerning incomes. And one of the chief illusory inputs into this tragedy is the deficit budget. My former leader campaigned on that issue during the last election. Members know what he said—remember the slogan?—"We can no longer afford a Davis government." That's come true. Because we've had deficit upon deficit now for—we are up to over $2 million a day just to cover the interest. And that's a bubble that is going to burst, because now we are in an economic situation where we should have enough reserves so that we can go into deficit if we need to to stimulate the economy, and we are in real trouble. So this is another of the areas that we have to tackle in all earnestness through this session—

Mr. Haggerty: Marvin should be right at home with those comments.

Mr. Reed: —and the session to follow.

Mr. Good: Read him your speech of last year.

Mr. Shore: Good stuff.

Mr. Reed: Without taking too much time of the House, sir, I have—

Mr. Hodgson: Lots of time.

Mr. Reed: —one more item that I would like to deal with for a few minutes. And it is the subject which is rapidly becoming the most important single economic input into the economy of North America. It's the subject of energy.

Energy is something, Mr. Speaker, we took for granted for many years with the discovery of coal and the discovery of petroleum later on, and that great flow of abundance that came to us at such low, low prices. Even today, when we flip the switch when we go home we still expect that the lights are going to come on. We expect that when we pull up to the gasoline pumps we are going to get gasoline in our cars. And we gripe a little when the price goes up but we still expect it is going to be there.

But everybody knows the situation in this country, and we know that the discoveries of new petroleum sources of the lower cost variety have not come as expected to Canada. Even the so-called Delta reserves have only proven to be about 10 per cent as reliable as expected in the first place in terms of petroleum. We found a quantity of natural gas there, fortunately, but we're not getting the petroleum.

[8:30]

So we're going to be turning within a five-year period to the tar sands and to OPEC oil. Maybe we'll get a little life extension if we find a few more potfuls of liquid gold in the low-cost areas, but we're not going to find many more. This brings on not only an initial problem but it brings a great challenge to the province of Ontario, for you know that in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, we are energy intensive because we are the industrial heartland of this country and hope to remain so. We are also energy deficient and at the present time are importing over our borders 80 per cent of the energy we use. That's old news, I realize, and I may be talking to some of the converted here anyway.

But the point is that it's something we cannot ignore and it's a fact of life that's going to become more and more prominent as the years go on. I might say that I am disappointed and shocked at the absolute absence of an energy policy by this government. They don't know where they're going. I expected good things from the new Minister of Energy, as a matter of fact, but he stood up in the House last week and launched a political diatribe, and that's the best way you can describe it. There is no policy there.

We know that when we get tar-sands oil coming in here at a cost per barrel of crude of between $17 and $20, or if we have to buy OPEC oil at $15 or $16 or $17 a barrel, we're going to have gasoline at $1.30 a gallon. That gives us some cause for concern, I hope. But it also gives us a challenge and it's a challenge that can be met in the province of Ontario.

I want to reassure everybody that I'm optimistic about the energy future of Ontario, if only the government will come to grips

with the reality. In Ontario, what we have to do is prepare ourselves for the advent of a new energy age—renewable resources. It's the renewables that are going to make the difference and are going to sustain the economy of this province.

I don't say that in the light of the NDP's position. I've debated this with some of their people who feel that it's going to require some dramatic change in lifestyle and we're all going to have to live in the dark. I don't believe that for one minute. I believe that dollar economics will determine the change to renewable resources, but the government of Ontario has a responsibility to bring those technologies on stream and to help them come on stream.

Of course, one of the things that I'm particularly pleased with in the Throne Speech is the first statement in the history of this House that renewable resources had to be developed in the province of Ontario. I can tell the House that I will support every move the government can make to make that development a reality. We're probably already a decade behind, but if we don't begin now, and we don't put all our efforts towards that end, we're going to be in deep trouble within five years.

Yes, we have a long way to go and I want to say that I am privileged to be here during this time to do my small part to serve that progress. The government and my party can be sure that I will support every effort to see that these problems are overcome and this province is once again on a sound economic foundation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oriole.

Some hon. members: Resign.

Mr. Cassidy: Dispense.

Mr. Germa: Dispense.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Throne Speech this evening, particularly on the occasion of this being the silver jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen, for which due recognition was paid in this House at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker, if I might for a moment, before launching into the subject matter of the Throne Speech itself, I would like to draw attention to the Queen's silver jubilee booklet that was made available to all members of the House. From reading same, it cannot help but impress one with the endurance, the commitment, the dedication of this person to the well-being of the Commonwealth as we have known it in the past and as it exists today. I guess there is no one individual who has contributed more to the unity of the nations within the free world than has the monarchal system and in particular, the present monarch. And so that I add to, not only my collective congratulations that were expressed in the House several days ago, but again I feel compelled to extend my own personal congratulations to Her Royal Majesty, the Queen.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that comment has been made by both opposition parties on the length of the Throne Speech that was presented. At the same time they have mustered enough courage, if you will, to virtually compliment the government on the programme that has been outlined in the Throne Speech, thereby recognizing that not only has the speech been one of length, but one of substance, containing many programmes that obviously the members of the opposition recognize as being legitimate programmes that this government is prepared to bring forward to better serve the citizens of this province.

One of the major features in the Throne Speech and one which the opposition parties have been monitoring for some period of time is the government's intentions with regard to the continuing protection to people in this province who are finding themselves living, through choice or necessity, in rental accommodation. Some concerns have been expressed as to whether the rent review programme as it has presently been placed in the law books would be continued by this government or terminated, as was provided for in that self-same statute.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is fully aware of the success of this programme and how it has, in fact, in many respects relieved the people living in rental accommodation of the anxieties with which they're confronted associated with the uncertainties of increasing costs and the affordability of the living accommodation wherein they find themselves. As a member of an urban riding within the Metropolitan Toronto area, having perhaps one of the largest components of rental accommodation of any of the ridings within our fair province, I am perhaps more fully aware than many of the great importance of this government continuing to recognize the need of and support for people living in rental accommodation, whether it be in high-rise apartments or town houses or whatever type of setting. So that certainly I hasten to support the programme that we're bringing forward in the form of an extension of the existing programme—one that has not only

proven successful, but that will continue, I'm sure, to meet the needs of a large portion of our population living within the urban communities.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech, I think, honestly and candidly points out the difficulties that do revolve around the rent review programme; because paradoxically, while it has met the needs of tenants in this province, at the same time it has had a negative effect. The negative aspect of the programme, as stated in the Throne Speech of course, relates to the lack of new rental housing accommodation that has come forward since implementation of the programme; and it is this paradox to which this government is going to address itself during the current session and endeavour to bring forward programmes that will offset this aspect of the programme that leaves us, at this point of time, with the programme winding down—if it had been terminated in July of this year—leaving us at a point where there would be less new rental accommodation on the market than there was when the legislation was first enacted.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that one of the inhibiting factors to the private sector in being encouraged to build new housing has been the restrictions, as they have seen them built into the legislation, as they affect their ability to operate freely in the marketplace and to realize a reasonable return on their risk venture capital. The fact of the matter is that many of the investors in commercial real estate, in residential income real property, have found it more suitable to in fact invest those moneys in securities, long-term notes and bank deposits, which yield nine, 9.5 and 10 per cent, rather than to risk their capital in programmes that have controls imposed upon them whereby they're not assured of obtaining a reasonable return on their undertaking.

Mr. Makarchuk: Think of the write-offs.

Mr. Williams: Then it seems, Mr. Speaker, that to encourage the building industry to get back into this market some flexibility may have to be considered in the area of the rental rates that may be charged and that will be acceptable to this government, and in particular to tenants, while giving the building industry some greater degree of flexibility than presently exists. This is certainly a problem that the government has to grapple with and to provide solutions for.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's not only the rent review legislation that has tended to inhibit somewhat the activity in the private building sector. There are other factors, which taken together have in fact created situations whereby many of the major builders and developers are now actively pursuing their business activities in other jurisdictions. Companies that traditionally have had the bulk of their construction activity within the province of Ontario are now operating more actively in other provinces, and a number of the major building companies are establishing themselves in the United States land development market.

[8:45]

The construction companies that have moved to the United States in rather significant numbers in the past year or two state their reasons for doing so as perhaps fourfold. One, of course, has been their concern about the somewhat restricting rent control legislation. Secondly, of course, they have pointed to the high cost of financing their projects; this is readily identifiable and easily understood when we see the prime rate for mortgage loans in this country running in the 11 to 12 per cent area as contrasted to eight to nine per cent mortgage loans for the same type of undertakings south of the border.

Another factor that I think has continued to discourage people from obtaining equity in real estate by buying their own home is the continuing refusal of the federal government to consider implementing the same tax relief that again is provided in the United States, where tax exemptions are granted to home owners on the interest charges payable under their mortgage loans on their property.

Mr. Haggerty: What's the matter with your government doing it?

Mr. Williams: This has to be one of the most encouraging aspects of home ownership as far as attracting people to that area is concerned. Certainly this type of tax exemption would be a very substantial form of relief to a home owner, and it is one that the federal government has continued to—

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will you keep your private conversations down? I would like to hear the member for Oriole.

Mr. Makarchuk: You are the only one in the House.

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: It appears that the federal government is insistent on maintaining this

posture, which is unfortunate because it indeed has contributed to inhibiting people from leaving rental accommodation and endeavouring to put equity into real estate in the form of purchasing their own home.

Mr. Germa: How about the first-time home buyers?

Mr. Williams: Another area that has concerned the development industry is the bureaucracy and red tape that confront the industry.

Mr. Samis: You sound like the member for HUDAC.

Mr. Makarchuk: Eddie Goodman can straighten that out.

Mr. Williams: The people in the public sector, the elected people at the municipal and provincial levels, and indeed at the federal level, all seem to have contributed to building up a bureaucracy that, in fact, has proved to be counterproductive in terms of assisting the citizens of this province to buy affordable housing on a fairly expeditious basis.

When I first entered into political life as an elected municipal representative in one of the outlying boroughs of Metropolitan Toronto, I recall that in those days if an application for the development of land by way of a rezoning application took more than six months to process from the time of presentation to the council to the time of approval, it was considered to be an undue length of time that could not be justified and, in creating the delays, actually contributed to the increased cost of the housing that ultimately came on the market after approvals were ultimately given and the homes built. There is no question that time is money, and so long as municipalities and governments impose controls and procedures that unnecessarily create these delays, then the person who will bear the financial brunt of those delays will not be the home builder or the developer; it will, in fact, be the consumer. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the builder has to pass along his costs if he is to continue to stay in business and realize a reasonable return on his investment.

There is most certainly a need and a responsibility on government to impose appropriate controls on land use development, whether it be under The Planning Act, whether it be at the municipal level by way of zoning bylaws or official plans. These are appropriate and responsible measures of government to ensure high standards of development that provide some degree of uniformity, that provide basic and essential services to people who are buying their homes, whether for the first time or as repeat buyers; but in so doing and acting upon this responsibility, I think governments at all levels have to recognize that even these controls and delays can be carried to excess.

This is an area that the building industry has pointed its finger at for some period of time, pointing out that now it can take anywhere from two to three years from the time a housing project is proposed to the time of construction being commenced.

We all know, with the state of the economy such as it has been over the past two or three years, that each year lost in such an undertaking increases the cost of the end product by anywhere from one to two times. Again, it is the consumer who pays the cost.

Another area of concern, of course, has been the general public attitude to growth and development, where both extremes have been brought to bear—those who propose a no-growth posture, to those who suggest there should be no controls and we should go gung ho to ensure that more housing comes on the market much faster than has been occurring heretofore.

I think perhaps of the two extremes the one that has dominated the local scene has been the no-growth attitude—the suggestion that new development and growth is not in the best public interest, that it contributes to environmental pollution. Certainly in this context sometimes the two are equated one with the other; although, I suggest, inappropriately.

I can think of the many instances in Metropolitan Toronto, the city of Toronto in particular, where there has been a very negative attitude displayed by the local government to any further growth or development within the city to the point where, in fact, even if that position was relinquished or modified to any significant extent today, there would appear to be no takers in the building industry who would want to come back into Toronto to start building.

Turning to those who oppose further growth or development to try to meet the housing needs of our community—or the commercial, industrial needs—by negative opposition and by unnecessary delays being brought about by continual objections, the public sometimes has perceived these reformers, as they are sometimes called, as doing the community a service. Yet, on the other hand, when you come to the end result

and the housing isn't there, and the cost of rental accommodation increases because of lack of new facilities, then I think one has to really assess whether the opponents to any growth and development have worked in the best interests of the community at large.

There is, I suggest, a heavy responsibility on all of us at the provincial and at the municipal level to rethink our attitudes in this regard. I think it is imperative that a new air of confidence and co-operation has to be developed between the private and public sectors, to encourage the private sector to become more active in the marketplace, notwithstanding some of the other difficulties —such as the basic economic times that we are confronted with—notwithstanding that situation to encourage the private sector to get back into the marketplace, to come back to Ontario and to participate as fully as it has done in the past. Certainly it is the intention of this government to offer every encouragement in this regard. Most certainly we will continue to provide responsible controls, but we must find ways and means of finding more expeditious means of seeing that these controls bring forward balanced housing into the marketplace.

I'd like to refer to that part of the Throne Speech which encourages more government activity in the area of small businesses. I have been most impressed with the manner in which the Ministry of Industry and Tourism has assisted industries in this province, both large and small, in their development, their growth patterns, and in assisting them in their administration, directing them to areas of the province where there was greater opportunity of employment, where there would be a more balanced marketplace. I think the ministry has provided great assistance in this area. However, I think more can be done in this area, and, in fact, this has been so stated in the Throne Speech.

[9:00]

One of the concerns that I've had expressed to me on a number of occasions by the people in the business community is that while the Ministry of Industry and Tourism through its industrial division has provided great assistance, perhaps more than enough emphasis has been given to the companies involved in the export-import sector of our private sector.

Mr. Kerrio: Is the member for London North (Mr. Shore) listening to that?

Mr. Williams: Most certainly the government has given great support, through the trade missions that have gone abroad, to finding new marketplaces for the Ontario industries. The minister, in making his reports on an annual basis, has clearly demonstrated the success of government involvement in the private sector to encourage more export, which is of course one of the basic and key ingredients of the economic viability of not only Ontario but of this nation. To provide greater impetus in the marketplace as far as the domestic industries are concerned, I know will be well received, and at a time of a troubled economy be more than welcome by the small industries.

I listened with interest earlier to the comments made by the member for Halton-Burlington (Mr. Reed) when he was talking about some of the environmental problems, particularly as related to the vexatious problem of waste disposal. At that time, he seemed to indicate that the days of the conventional means of waste disposal were passé, should be put aside and that we should be moving into these new directions of waste recovery programmes. However, if the member had participated in the estimates debates at the last session of the House when this very troublesome subject was discussed at length, it was, I think, made abundantly clear at that time that there is in fact a time-lag that exists in bringing on stream of these new, more sophisticated waste recovery programmes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the hon. members keep their voices down. It's discourteous to the speaker.

Mr. Williams: While a waste recovery programme has been suggested by the member for Halton-Burlington as being the ultimate solution to our waste disposal programme, he has not accounted for or spoken to the most difficult aspect of this whole programme, which is the intermediary period.

Mr. Kerrio: The government doesn't have any programme at all.

Mr. Williams: At the present time, we have the conventional sources available to us, which relate to the landfill projects of which he spoke, and we also have incineration as the other alternative. If I can use the Metropolitan Toronto area as a classic example, at this point of time there is in excess of two million tons of garbage accumulating each year within the Metropolitan Toronto area.

An hon. member: Right here.

Mr. Williams: That garbage at the present time has to be either incinerated or disposed of in a sanitary landfill site.

Mr. Haggerty: In somebody else's backyard.

Mr. Williams: At the present time, within Metropolitan Toronto, with a population in excess of two and a half million people, we have a total of three operating incinerators. We have two operating within the borough of North York. We have the Commissioner Street incinerator, which itself was refurbished at some substantial cost of $9 million to bring it up to acceptable environmental standards.

Mr. Haggerty: Is it producing electricity?

Mr. Williams: One of the two major landfill sites within the Metro area, the Beare Road site, has been basically completed and closed down. The Factory Road site is close to completion. Last year the government did give approval to the opening and operation of the new Pickering site, which is the only alternate site available and operating at this time. In the meantime, the government has taken initiatives to provide the more sophisticated type of equipment, such as illustrated by the Downsview facility which was referred to a few moments ago.

But the erroneous suggestion was made that this type of new sophisticated facility, with a high degree of waste recovery component attached to it, will be the end-all solution to our problems. How erroneous that assumption is. We need only look at the Downsview facility as an example of the error in that observation. In fact, as new and as sophisticated as that facility may be in recovering over 600 tons of garbage a day under the recovery programme, yet in excess of 800 tons of garbage a day are compacted and sent to local transfer stations and then sent from there to the existing landfill sites. In other words, more than half of the input into that facility is still being disposed of in the conventional way.

Studies that have been undertaken in European countries would bear out the fact that total waste recovery is not achievable. Most certainly the new facilities that are coming on stream, the type that has been proposed at the west end of the city, the "watts from waste" project that has been talked about so frequently, certainly would be a move in that direction. But here, too, one has to consider the huge capital cost involved in bringing these projects forward, not only the time lost but the heavy capital cost involved.

Mr. Lewis: You are making an argument against recycling?

Mr. Williams: That particular project in the west end is one that had been proposed and supported by this government; yet the majority of the cost would have to be borne by the local municipality, in this instance the Metropolitan Toronto government.

Mr. Lewis: That is always the way it is with this government.

Mr. Kerrio: Let Hydro do it; let Hydro do it, John.

Mr. Williams: In any event, again the recovery of energy from that project would not be the total disposition of the waste that would be consumed in that facility. A large part of it would still have to be disposed of at local landfill sites.

A great deal of emotion, of course, emanates around the topic of landfill sites, or garbage dumps to use the vernacular if one wants to have the emotional impact in discussing the subject. No one wants a garbage dump in their own backyard; there is no question of that. On the other hand, the fact of life is that some type of conventional facilities of this nature, either new incinerators or new landfill sites, have to be provided in the immediate future to bridge that time gap between the bringing on stream of new, more sophisticated incinerators which have the waste recovery component built into them, or Metropolitan Toronto is going to face a crisis such as it has never been confronted with in the past.

Mr. Lewis: Ah, they have been saying that for three years.

Mr. Williams: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, new landfill site facilities are not provided to bridge this five-year gap. It's estimated that the bulk of these new projects, such as the Downsview facility when it is brought to its full capacity, are still two or three years down the road. Planning of the central Toronto project is not off the drawing board, it will take two or three years more to plan the details of it, and another two or three years to build. All of these projects that are being talked about, even if they move forward, it would at the very least take three to four years to bring on stream.

By the same token, the existing landfill sites have virtually been totally utilized. There is a great deal of controversy now surrounding the Maple site as being the

closest potential new site within reasonable distance of Metropolitan Toronto. Whether, after the environmental assessment and review of that site, we find it is, in fact, acceptable for use for that purpose from an environmental point of view, remains to be seen. Whether it is that site or whether it is one of a number of other possible locations within the proximity of Metropolitan Toronto, some new landfill site facilities will have to be provided within the next one or two years.

Mr. Lewis: On agricultural land.

Mr. Williams: There is no doubt about that question. No matter how you present the argument, no matter what approach you take to the subject, that is a factor that cannot be put aside or avoided. The longer local governments, governments at all levels, avoid that reality the more difficult will become the problem. The bridge period must be dealt with and it must be dealt with now.

On the landfill sites that are talked about, certainly those who oppose them in principle paint a very unpleasant picture with regard to them. Yet every day of the week, thousands and thousands of people drive past probably three of the most recent landfill sites that were developed and completed within the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto. Today, those lands are not recognized for what they were. They are usable lands. They are lands that are used for recreational purposes. They, in fact, are three sites that flank the Don Valley Parkway. Whether it's in the winter or summer, you can see children tobogganing down the hills, which prior to them being converted to landfill sites were holes in the ground that were totally unusable for any purpose whatsoever. They were restored to a useful purpose and at the same time met an immediate need in accommodating solid waste material.

No matter what the opposition members will propose in the way of alternatives, that basic problem will continue to be with us. The two together—the new techniques along with the conventional—alone will solve and come to grips with the total problem.

Another matter of concern, Mr. Speaker, and one to which I think the budget addresses itself, is the area of tourism—

Mr. Ferris: The budget? Which budget? You are on the Throne Speech.

Mr. Cunningham: We don't have the budget yet.

[9:15]

Mr. Kerrio: It is okay, we will straighten you out any time you go astray.

Mr. Williams: I said the budget, I meant the Throne Speech, of course. Thank you very much.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Maybe it's last year's speech, you can't tell.

Mr. Williams: Most certainly, next to the farming community the tourist industry is the one that is more subject to the vagaries of the elements, the natural elements, the weather, than other industry and as such is perhaps one of the most hazardous businesses that one would want to involve oneself in. As such, our Ministry of Industry and Tourism has offered, through the Throne Speech, to provide additional supports and initiatives to that sector of the economy, and rightfully so. I'm encouraged to see that the ministry will be offering further assistance in these areas.

An area that has been of some continuing concern to myself, as a member within the large, urban, Metropolitan Toronto area, has been the matter of transportation. Certainly this government has to be commended for its achievements in this area, particularly in the area of support, financially and otherwise, of public transportation. I can certainly well illustrate how the progressive transportation policy of this government will benefit my own area. In approximately a year's time an extension of the GO Transit system will provide new rail service from Richmond Hill down to Union Station through the heart of my riding. This new undertaking and facility is being eagerly anticipated by my constituents. They look forward to the day when they will be able to drive their cars to parking stations located at the Finch-Leslie area—

Mr. Kerrio: And catch a Greyhound bus.

Mr. Williams: —or located at the Sheppard Avenue-Leslie Street area and thereby take one of three commuter trains to the Union Station in the early morning rush hour period—

Mr. Cunningham: You are uptown looking for downtown.

Mr. Williams: —and to use the same service on the return trip in the evening.

Mr. Samis: What time is it?

Mr. Ferris: When does the bus leave?

Mr. Williams: The expansion of that programme from the conventional five-day work week to weekends and holidays will be

assessed on the basis of consumer demand and usage after the initial service is initiated.

I am also gratified to see that the Don Valley Parkway extension, which had terminated at Sheppard Avenue, is now, through the initiative of this government, nearing completion in its extension northward to the northern boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto.

The extension of this facility has been long needed, particularly when the existing road facility had acted as a conduit into which the traffic from areas as far away as Sutton and Aurora had been coming down to the centre of the city using four-lane roadways from Highway 7 down to Steeles Avenue and then funneling into a two-lane country concession road from there on down to what has been up until now the top of the Don Valley Parkway. That constriction of traffic has imposed an intolerable burden on the movement of private and commercial vehicles in the northeast sector of Metropolitan Toronto, and as such, the completion of this extension will indeed be welcomed both by commerce and industry as well as by the citizenry who live not only within my riding but beyond the northeast sector of Metropolitan Toronto.

If I might, I would like to come to what I consider to be perhaps one of the most significant aspects of the Throne Speech and one upon which both opposition party leaders have dwelt at some length. It relates, of course, to the state of the economy and responsible financial planning. I found it interesting to listen to the leaders of the two opposition parties taking the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) to task for his forthright and candid presentation the other day of the three-quarter report on the state of the budget.

Mr. Lewis: What three quarters? It was eleven-twelfths. Get your facts right.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's only money.

Mr. Williams: I think it's regrettable, in fact, that the budget of last year and its virtual fulfilment would be selected as a target for outright condemnation and that there would be no acknowledgement given to the fact that the budget has largely been fulfilled as far as the predictions are concerned. The unfortunate aspect, of course, has been the shortfall in the projected revenues, which is regrettable and has brought to bear additional hardships.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It was predictable.

Mr. Williams: What I think has been accepted by and large by the citizens of Ontario was the need to do what the government did, notwithstanding the heavy criticism at that time by the opposition parties; and that was to bring in a responsible budget which put forward the concept of restraint in the public sector. The wisdom of that decision has proven itself. While it may have been politically unpopular to impose significant financial constraints, nevertheless the objectives brought about by the imposition of that programme have been achieved in large measure.

It has been indicated quite clearly by the Treasurer that there will be a continuation of responsible restraint in this time of economic difficulties, which extend far beyond the boundaries of this province and of this nation and which, in fact, we find existing throughout the free world. It was interesting to note the solutions that were put forward by the opposition parties for curing the economic doldrums that we continue to experience. The opposition parties are no longer so critical of a programme of restraint in the public sector, because I think they have come to recognize that the public at large has accepted and commended the government for that position.

Mr. Breithaupt: They have not.

Mr. Williams: By having shown that leadership in restraint, it has made it more tolerable for the private sector and individuals at large to exercise restraint themselves. Most certainly this government has shown more action than perhaps any other government with regard to not only talking about fiscal restraint but implementing restraint in a very meaningful, responsible fashion.

An hon. member: That's why we have unemployment.

Mr. Williams: It has been suggested—notwithstanding the success of the approach that has been taken by this government—that this government should not try to continue to co-operate with the private sector in the sense of encouraging it to take on a more positive attitude toward the expansion of facilities, toward being more productive. Indeed, are we to act upon the suggestions that were put forward by the opposition the other day that any incentives by way of tax to industry would be inappropriate and wrong—that we should not be offering any further tax relief as inducements to industry to get back on the tracks? The fact of life is—and this is what the opposition parties continue to ignore—the productive part of our society

is in the private sector, and until there is productivity—

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean, the productive part of our society?

Mr. Williams: —there will not be the generation of capital or money—consumer dollars to permit the individual citizens of this country—

Mr. Philip: How productive is it for you to fly around in your own airplane?

Mr. Williams: —to enjoy, and continue to enjoy, the standards of living which they have come to appreciate.

Mr. Ferrier: We have to pay taxes in spite of it.

Mr. Lewis: You may be the single most unproductive member of the private sector. Don't attribute it to others.

Mr. Kerrio: Are businesses thriving in spite of your government?

Mr. Williams: What I think is most interesting, is that the opposition parties, and in particular the official opposition party, continue to carry on a performance that provides no degree of credibility to the public, simply because that party continues to refuse to deal with all elements of our society that have to be dealt with in order to bring a resolution to our problems. They continue to zero in on and blame industry for the woes of our society. They continue to attack government for its supposed excesses or lack of action, but not once will the opposition party—

Mr. Warner: Why don't you resign?

Mr. Cassidy: Good idea.

Mr. Williams: Not once have I heard any comment made by the opposition party with regard to the other third element in our society, which is so vital and important today, and that is the labour sector—

Mr. Philip: At least from the select committee.

Mr. Williams: —because without the three working together we cannot bring resolve to our problems.

Mr. Ferris: We surrender, John.

Mr. Williams: We have government, we have industry and we have labour; and so long as the opposition party will not address itself to finding responsible activity in the labour sector—

Mr. Kerrio: Are you going to let him run out the clock?

Mr. Williams: —as in industry, then there will never be a complete solution found to the problems. There has to be a co-operative effort made by all three if we are, indeed, to turn around our economy and bring ourselves to a healthier prosperity than exists today.

Mr. Ferris: Great speech, great speech.

Mr. McCague: You've got lots of time, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Take your time, John.

Mr. Breithaupt: Thanks for your help.

Mr. Williams: I think it would be refreshing and enlightening to have comment sometime, during the sitting of this House, from the official opposition with regard to the posture of labour in our society.

Mr. Wildman: Why, does it not sit up straight?

[9:30]

Mr. Williams: The absence of any dialogue in that particular sector—

Mr. Samis: You make John Bulloch sound like a flaming radical.

Mr. Williams: —is most noticeable and destroys their credibility. They continue to single out those people in society who are not involved in organized labour as being the wrongdoers in our society and—

Mr. Wildman: The unorganized workers of this province are downtrodden.

Mr. Williams: —yet do not have the audacity and candour to comment at least, if not criticize—

Mr. Samis: We worry for the people of Oriole.

Mr. Williams: —things that they see labour doing or not doing that are in the best interests of society as a whole.

Mr. Wildman: Give us an example.

Mr. Williams: And surely, Mr. Speaker, surely, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Wildman: Where do you stand on chocolate workers?

An hon. member: How about Neilson's chocolates?

Mr. Williams: —no one sitting in this House can assume that one of those three major factors in our society is completely devoid of any responsibilities or shortcomings. I think we have to fairly and honestly assess all of those sectors—

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: —the business sector, our own sector in which we are involved and the labour sector. It indeed would be refreshing if the leader of the official opposition would get up in the House and make a critical comment. It may be a positive one but I have yet to hear him get up and make—

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: —fair comment on that very important element of our society, because labour today is the—

Mr. Samis: This is the greatest non-speech since Themistocles U.

Mr. Williams: —biggest business that we have in this province.

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: I suggest that it is bigger than government.

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: I suggest that it is bigger than industry as a whole collectively.

Mr. Samis: You are absurd.

Mr. Williams: And as such, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be refreshing if the Leader of the Opposition would take the initiative to offer some co-operative suggestions between industry and labour rather than continuing to singularly single out the corporate sector as being the violators of all that is good and righteous in this province.

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: It would indeed be refreshing to have a new approach taken in that regard.

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: That would be an interesting experience.

An hon. member: I think you are ready for one, John.

Mr. Williams: So perhaps, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Tell us about the impending industrial revolution.

Mr. Conway: You make Frank Drea sound coherent.

Mr. Williams: And, of course, that too is of interest, to find the old clichés coming about time and time again in this House—about the industrial revolution and—

Mr. Conway: Are you the reason for Lorne Maeck's bill?

Mr. Williams: —the fact that we are living in the 19th century. We keep hearing these clichés from the official opposition. They seem to place a great deal of merit in the fact that the strike process is current—

Mr. Conway: He is fit to be Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Williams: —and is in fact finally, in this day and age—

Mr. Wildman: He is north of Queen's Park.

Mr. Williams: It's incredible, Mr. Speaker, to—

Mr. Conway: That's a good word; that's a good word, John.

Mr. Williams: —find that our socialist friends are so far behind in trying to find new ways and means of turning about—

An hon. member: I wish we could catch up to you.

Mr. Williams: —industrial labour, diminishing the industrial strife that exists in this nation—

Mr. Wildman: Are you in favour of industrial democracy?

Mr. Williams: I believe it was one of the leading American labour leaders who suggested four or five years ago that the strike process was archaic and had long ago served its useful purpose.

An hon. member: So have you.

Mr. Williams: New initiatives indeed have to be taken to prevent this nation from becoming what it has become, a nation with one of the highest incidences of lost labour man-hours because of the strike process. This cannot continue to exist—

Mr. Samis: Read the Star last night?

Mr. Ferris: Look at all the time you are wasting.

Mr. Williams: This cannot continue to exist if this country is to remain economically healthy and sound.

Mr. Conway: Or you either, John?

Mr. Williams: And, Mr. Speaker, in order to perhaps make the point, I would like to turn, if I might, to an address that was made by the president of one of our major manufacturing concerns, Westinghouse Canada Limited, an address that was made on March 8 of this year, when he was addressing the Financial Executives Institute of Canada in Winnipeg.

Mr. Breithaupt: An unimpeachable source.

Mr. Williams: There are some very sobering comments that were made in this address, so much so that I think they bear commenting upon this evening.

Mr. Conway: Make it a summary.

Mr. Samis: Just read it; don't comment.

Mr. Williams: It perhaps will highlight why, today, the talk about parity with our US workers is no longer discussed in this House, because at the very outset of his speech Mr. Marrs stated, and I will quote:

"I would say that we have become so preoccupied in this country with the redistribution of wealth that we have forgotten how to produce that wealth competitively. Canada has become the highest-cost producer in the world. Wages in manufacturing are now 65 cents an hour higher than in the US. Twelve years ago they were 50 cents an hour lower. Taxes are amongst the highest in the world."

Mr. Wildman: You levy the taxes over there.

Mr. Williams: "Despite the abundance of resources in this country, Canadian manufacturers pay world prices for materials. There are no longer any indigenous cost advantages for manufacturers in Canada; we have not only lost whatever advantage we once had, but are now at a competitive disadvantage."

Those, indeed, are sobering thoughts that come forward from that observation.

Mr. Lewis: I am certainly glad we have them in Hansard.

Mr. Conway: You make them all so believable.

Mr. Williams: We most certainly know that this is indeed one of the major reasons for our economic difficulties at this point of time. We do not have the same productive capacity. What productive capacity we do have is over-priced. Canada is a nation of exporters, and if we cannot compete internationally then a very substantial part of our economic base is eroded. Without that economic base, of course, our own economic and social well-being in this province is indeed placed in jeopardy.

The president of Westinghouse, in speaking further on this difficult topic, pointed out that—

Mr. Conway: Is there any end to this, John?

Mr. Williams: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Conway: Is that your bed time?

Mr. Eakins: You're doing good. Keep it up.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Marrs suggested three significant and possible solutions to the problem. He pointed out, firstly, that Canada is now supporting a higher level of services with a lower level of manufacturing activity than any other industrialized country. He then poses the question as to whether, indeed, it is in Canada's best interests to allow the trend of the past 15 years, away from the production of goods and towards services, to continue.

Mr. Wildman: We agree with him there.

Mr. Williams: We must have greater encouragement in the manufacturing sector of our economy.

Mr. Davidson: You can't even draw a crowd in your own benches.

Mr. Samis: Look at Harry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Marrs did also point out that there may be advantages to our working our way back into the international marketplace by perhaps seeking wage parity with our US counterparts, which indeed is a reversal of the trend that has existed in previous years.

That, of course, Mr. Speaker, would be a much more difficult thing to attain than what was being sought several years ago when we were endeavouring to bring the income of the labour force up to the level of the labourers in the United States. Indeed, we are in a dilemma; we have over-priced ourselves. Both industry and labour have over-priced themselves.

Mr. Eakins: You are doing well, John, keep it up.

Mr. Williams: Government has tended to over-price itself in its excesses of spending.

Mr. Samis: What government are you a member of?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Williams: This government has come to recognize that it has been one of the contributing bodies in the public sector that has brought about this difficulty. We were one of the first to acknowledge it and one of the first to respond to that situation by bringing forward constructive, meaningful measures in the form of fiscal restraint and restraint in the expansion of government service.

Mr. Breithaupt: Only a billion in the hole.

Mr. Wildman: The electorate recognized it last election.

Mr. Williams: I think because this government has taken this initiative that there has been a degree of encouragement in the private sector, and also in the area of labour. But there has to be a continuing degree of responsibility displayed by the leaders of labour, by the captains of industry, in working co-operatively with this government if we are to succeed.

I stress again the need to consider all three of those components and not isolate ourselves and try to unrealistically place the blame at the feet of only one of those three sectors of our society.

So it appears that we have before us an ambitious government programme, as outlined in the Throne Speech; one which, as I indicated at the outset, appears to have received perhaps more positive comment from our opposition parties than can be remembered in recent history.

Mr. Riddell: Do they use you to drive us insane?

Mr. Cassidy: We are reconsidering after your speech.

Mr. Lewis: You didn't ask him to go beyond 10?

Mr. Eakins: John, did you say vicious?

Mr. Williams: No, I didn't. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is encouraging to see an indication of support from the opposition parties to bring about—

Mr. Wildman: The longer you talk the less support you have got.

Mr. Williams: —the implementation of this ambitious government programme. There indeed is a need to proceed expeditiously to implement this programme, and that can surely only be achieved by the utmost co-operation from the members of both opposition parties. They have assured the government that this co-operation will be there. However, just as they have been perhaps suspect of the content of the Throne Speech until they see the legislation which will bring that programme into existence, so too, I think, we remain sceptical of the opposition parties—

Mr. Davidson: The long-awaited legislation.

Mr. Williams: —to see whether in fact they will participate in a constructive fashion in the business of the Legislature.

Mr. Ferris: In the fullness of time all things will unfold to us.

Mr. Williams: So Mr. Speaker, it is, I think, with a degree of optimism that I conclude my comments on the Throne Speech.

Mr. Breithaupt: Ours, not yours.

Mr. Williams: The optimism being founded, again, on the very positive programme that is being put forward by the government of the day, and one which, I think, with the co-operation of not only the opposition parties but industry and labour, can bring us through this economic period of crisis.

Mr. Speaker, it has indeed been a pleasure to have commented on the Throne Speech and I have appreciated this opportunity. Thank you very much.

[9:45]

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Warner: The Minister of Housing should stick around.

Mr. Davison: John, if you could listen to the previous speaker, you can listen to the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner).

Mr. Warner: I didn't even say anything and he left.

An hon. member: That's nothing new.

Mr. Kerrio: He should resign.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I'll do the best to share the time properly so that my colleague in the Liberal caucus can get started this evening.

An hon. member: Stand up!

Mr. Warner: Would you know the difference?

An hon. member: Not if he had a hair cut.

Mr. Warner: Following the Throne Speech, it was commented by someone that a royal commission should be established to find the 10 people in the province to whom the Throne Speech did not apply. On the contrary, I think we need a commission to talk to the 323,000 unemployed people to whom this Throne Speech does not apply.

One of the segments that is hardest hit by the unemployment situation in our province, and for whom this Throne Speech does very little, are the new Canadians, particularly those new Canadians who are within Metropolitan Toronto. I think we should understand that when someone comes to this country from somewhere else, they have difficulties in adapting not only to a new language and a new culture, but to a new lifestyle—in some cases coming from a rural area of their country to an urban area in our country—and that often they have been exploited in terms of jobs.

These people have been taken advantage of because they do not speak the language well, because they do not understand the customs and because they are normally employed in non-union places with no one to protect them. They are the people who are most frequently the injured workers. They are the people who go to the Workmen's Compensation Board seeking redress for their grievances. They are the people who normally do not have a strong voice on their behalf on a daily basis.

I say quite frankly that the responsibilities as applied to how this society opens its doors to new Canadians rest not only with the provincial government but certainly, and firstly, with the federal government. Surely the responsibility for new Canadians does not end at Toronto International Airport. Such being the case, I don't understand why this government cannot continually go to Ottawa with proposals as to how the federal government can involve itself directly and importantly in helping the new Canadians who are trying to settle in our community. I don't understand why that isn't done.

I don't understand, for example, the reluctance of this provincial government to take English as a second programme and to involve itself very directly in the funding as it's needed, not only in the schools but in the communities and on job sites.

There are some very good models to follow. The University of Windsor, for example, has been operating courses on the line at the auto plant in Windsor. The University of Toronto does a similar thing at the GM plant in Oshawa, offering university-level courses to workers. That kind of model has already been put into place. The universities know how to handle it; they know what they're doing. I don't understand why we can't extend that to teaching English as a second language. It's entirely possible, but it requires some direction by this government and a commitment to English as a second language.

I don't understand why we can't have the proper kind of teacher training so that teachers who go into the schools will understand the new Canadian communities and the kind of job that has to be done in the classroom is more than just the teaching of academics. It has been the experience, and the government well knows it has been the experience over the years, that for numerous reasons we end up with an inordinate number of new Canadians in vocational schools. This is largely because they are streamed off on the basis of reading scores; not academic ability, simply the ability to cope with the English language.

How does one overcome that? There are several ways. One is, as I have already mentioned, attacking the problem of teaching English as a second language directly in small classes and hiring those teachers directly. If the provincial government feels that it is too big a cost to bear they have a legitimate case to put at the doorstep of the federal government. But for goodness sake do something.

I think this government should seriously consider how it can bring in instruction in the first language of the student. Why the students should be forced to try and cope with that new language, be it English or French, without having the advantage of at least some time spent in their first language, I don't know; but it occurs.

If the government wants to work in the communities with those new Canadians so that they can learn English as a second language then surely it can do some very elementary things. I outlined a very simple kind of illustration that took place in my area in Scarborough, in Agincourt, where a volunteer group canvassed the community, found those mothers at home who wanted to

learn English as a second language, got space in the local school, asked the people when they wanted to come to school, and taught them the type of English they wanted to learn; that is sufficient to go to the grocery store, to communicate with their neighbours, to carry on some sort of normal function within their community. That was done inexpensively and to the gratitude of those new Canadians. That kind of effort needs to be put forward by this government.

The whole problem of new Canadians, as they have tried to adapt themselves to our community in Metro Toronto and have tried to be part of the Canadian society while still retaining their language and their culture, is that it has been focused through what the media has termed "racism"; that has been the focus of the issue. It is unfortunate that that focus has taken place, but it is there nonetheless, and we have to deal with it, and I think pretty directly.

There are two direct ways in which this government can deal with it. One obvious one is that the courts should be very tough on those offenders who are involved in racial assaults. That should not be tolerated, and those people should certainly be punished according to the utmost of the law. It isn't being done; it should be.

I think it is consented, and I suspect that many government members would agree, that there are some problems with the police force—in particular the Metro Toronto police force. It is not without some sort of history to it all, I understand that. It is not without the tension involved in carrying out the duties of the police force, I understand that. But for a variety of reasons there are racial biases built into some of the members of that police force. There is not a proper mix of ethnic background for the police force itself. That is why, at the very point when we are having racial problems, and we know that some of those probelms are connected with the police force, we get the reversal by the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) that we cannot have citizen boards, that we are going to continue with the police investigating themselves. Such being the case, perhaps there is little hope that that police force can go through the kind of change that it needs to go through.

It is not without co-operation from the ethnic community. New Canadian groups have approached the police on various occasions and offered to put on educational courses for those policemen to try to learn more about the language and culture and heritage of the various ethnic groups in Metropolitan Toronto. I really wish that the police force would take the offer because it would go a long way toward helping with the problem.

No one could possibly go through the Throne Speech without talking about the Workmen's Compensation Board. Mr. Speaker, I want to leave the government with some of the frustrations that I have in trying to help those people who come into my office. I say quite frankly, at the time when I was elected in September, 1975, I came here with a very open, unbiased opinion about the Workmen's Compensation Board. I expected that the Workmen's Compensation Board was precisely what it said—it would compensate workers for injuries and it would give workers the benefit of the doubt. I expected that. I expected that when cases came before it, they would be dealt with judiciously and fairly; and they are not.

My experience has been a frustrating one. Today, a year and a half later, I find that the board does not co-operate. I find that some of my constituents are forced onto welfare rolls while awaiting a decision of the Workmen's Compensation Board. They are unable to work. The constituents who come into my office, Mr. Speaker, are often people who cannot seek employment elsewhere, and while they are waiting for the Workmen's Compensation Board to make a decision several months pass by. They run out of funds. They are forced onto the welfare rolls, a humiliating and degrading kind of experience for those people.

And the cases drag on. I find that I have been inheriting cases that are four and five and six years old. People who have gone back time and time again to the Workmen's Compensation Board, who are injured to the point where they can no longer work and yet receive no help from that board. And to add insult to injury, I sit here in the House hoping that this is a forum to discuss those problems and find a minister who will not acknowledge that there is one single problem with the board; a minister who defends that board beyond any point of credulity. I think it's about time that either this House straighten up that board or the minister resigns from her post.

An hon. member: Watch your language.

Mr. Martel: Don't swear. She will get mad.

Mr. Warner: I will carefully control my language.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Who would you put in her place?

Mr. Warner: Let's start with the member for Oriole. His enlightened view would fill the place nicely.

Mr. Conway: I nominate the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Wildman: I nominate the member for Oriole.

Mr. Warner: Approximately 100,000 of the 323,000 people who are presently unemployed reside in the city of Metropolitan Toronto. And the hardest hit of that group are the construction trades with an approximately 35 per cent unemployment rate—

Mr. Philip: Dump truck operators.

Mr. Warner: —and that construction group is comprised mainly—not entirely but mainly—of new Canadians. Again, they are the hardest hit group of the unemployed.

And yet there is room for the government to move other than reshuffling. The announcements today were rather astounding, not that I don't believe in decentralization. That's something that should have happened a long time ago. The world does not begin and end in Toronto. It never has and it never should.

But decentralization is more than reshuffling. The government reshuffles workers from OHIP offices in Toronto to some other office in eastern Ontario and thinks that it solves an unemployment problem.

Mr. Eakins: Send them up to Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. Warner: That's silly. It makes about as much sense as the reshuffling that went on amongst the cabinet. Mr. Speaker, it is very much like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic.

If the government is really serious about jobs, then it is going to take an active role in the Metroplan issue. It is going to be involved in that critically, involved in meeting with the local officials of each of the boroughs and of the Metro Toronto government. Because Metroplan talks about decentralization. It talks about jobs, and housing and transportation. It talks about direct employment. It talks about fostering growth in a very real and meaningful way instead of shuffling things around.

Yet instead of an active involvement from this government, what we get first is the cutting back in funds for public transportation—not the capital funds, but the operating funds. And we still have the commitment to the building of expressways in this city. And make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the grand plan is still there. The Fred Gardiner ideal of surrounding this city by expressways, by criss-crossing the city with expressways, is still alive and well in the hearts and minds of many members opposite. There are a few missing links, one of which is the Scarborough—

[10:00]

Mr. Wildman: Over there; the missing links are over there.

Mr. Davison: The member for Oriole.

Mr. Warner: Not making any personal references to members from Oriole.

Interjections.

Mr. Warner: The Scarborough Expressway is a missing link, as are the extension of the 400 and the cross-town expressway. Not for one minute are any of us over here deluded by the fact that the government has talked about public transit to derail us from what is the true initiative still there—the building of those expressways. It's not needed. It's not wanted, it should not happen.

Mr. Philip: Esther Shiner is really the Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Warner: When you talk to the labour unions, as I have and we do—I don't know if the members opposite do, but I doubt it.

An hon. member: You don't even know where you are.

Mr. Warner: But when you talk to the labour unions, what they say first is, "We want to be involved in socially useful projects, like building the LRT in Scarborough, and not building an expressway." You go back and see them, you talk to them.

Mr. Kerrio: He is being very unkind.

Mr. Warner: As is my custom, I send out a questionnaire to my constituents on a regular basis and the one that is presently in the process of being answered—

Mr. Kerrio: What did it say? Tell us.

Mr. Warner: I have approximately 500 to 600 responses, and the major response that is listed on there is unemployment, and the second major response is property taxes.

Mr. Eakins: What is the third?

Mr. Warner: People want to know what this government is doing to them. They want to know why their taxes are going up. They want to know why the tax system cannot be

sensitive to income. They've never had those answers from this government. What they get instead is an attack upon the Children's Aid Society, the YMCA, other useful community projects, small businessmen in the community. Yes, small businessmen, who are going to be asked to pay another 21 per cent in their property taxes, while the distilleries will have a decrease of 40 per cent in their taxes.

Some hon. members: Shame.

Mr. Warner: The government then turns around and says, "Ah, but wait. The tenants in this province will get a break in property taxes."

Mr. Wildman: That's why they didn't allow beer at the ball park; so the 40-ouncers could go instead.

Mr. Warner: The government turns around and says the tenants will get a break in property taxes. That's part of the Blair commission report. What it doesn't say is how the tenants will get a break in their taxes. Those tax rebates will likely go back to the owners. Let's see if they're passed on to the tenants. I doubt it; I doubt that it will help at all. Since some members of the government opposite are looking for constructive suggestions—

Mr. Philip: Not construction suggestions.

Mr. Warner: Constructive suggestions—I'll lay out one again. The government over there introduced some very useful legislation last year that allows the Metro government to designate lanes for the express purpose of buses, taxis and cars with designated numbers of passengers. It is one of the approaches to transportation, one of the desperately needed approaches. But it was done simply as putting it on a plate. There was no follow-up to it; no suggestion as to how they parallel that with rail service, as to how they will help the municipalities with the rail transit that's needed or improving the bus service. You have to do more than just put things out on a plate, you have to follow it up with some action.

Mr. Eakins: What's your priority, David?

Mr. Warner: The other little item that's come up, and my colleague from Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) mentioned it earlier today, is the whole problem of condominiums. What is so annoying to me and to the residents in my riding who live in condominiums is that a while back the government told them not to apply for reassessment on their condominium. "Don't do that. Everything will be ironed out in the future." But then, lo and behold, rebates were issued to those who had applied, and those who had taken the government advice not to apply didn't get any money. Surely those rebates should come back in an orderly fashion over the next some years, so that some equity is gained for those owners of condominiums.

Mr. Philip: P. T. Barnum approach to government.

Mr. Warner: Heaven knows, they've got enough problems with the condominiums themselves. When the roof leaks and it takes $15,000 to repair it—that ends up in a maintenance budget to be split by the owners of the condominiums, not by the building. And the list goes on and on and on.

In summary, I really do think that the Throne Speech could have been useful had it done two things: Had it addressed the problem of unemployment in this province, so that the 323,000 people could get back to work; and had it provided some good sound economic direction—a little more than simply opting into the AIB and all those wondrous effects that the government thinks it will have.

I don't know when the next election will come and, in some sense, I really don't care. Whenever it comes, I'm ready to fight those very non-policies about employment and economic priorities that his government has set for 34 years. It's time for a change.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the Throne Speech debate. At this time last year, I afforded the members of the Legislature a little background on the constituency of Wentworth North. Tonight, I'd like to share with you my concerns about a number of subjects. I offer these comments in the hope that in a small way, they help to build a better Ontario.

I was gratified to see in the Speech from the Throne that the province will not unnecessarily involve itself in freezing land at the expense of the farmer. Many of us—especially in southwestern Ontario—are concerned about the evaporation of good farmland. There is not likely a constituency in that part of the province, where good farm land—soil classes one to four—have not been ploughed under for industrial or residential purposes. What is worse is the large number of acres held by speculators that lie idle year after year. There are also a tremendous number of small farms that are hardly productive. The farmer can barely make an existence, yet cannot effectively or profitably dispose of his land.

I believe the small farm today is a basic element of our private enterprise system and very vital to our social and economic fabric in this province. It must be protected. As essential as it is to recognize the importance of protecting the land and the farm, we must also give serious consideration to the preservation of the farmer. While the liberally improved Farm Income Stabilization Act may help protect some farmers, we have a long way to go in compensating farmers appropriately, ensuring the farm family a decent standard of living and a fair return on its investment.

A major problem that we face in preserving agricultural land is the problem of land-use planning itself. Since the implementation or should I say imposition, of regional government in my area, we have been awaiting the establishment of a regional plan. The authorities of the Hamilton-Wentworth region have just recently tabled their plans. In the interval, many farmers have gone by the board while some of our best farm land has been developed. Small and non-viable areas should be developed. Areas of prime soil classes one to four should be preserved —but, again, not necessarily at the expense of the individual owner of the farm. The province would do well to consider the development of a compensation plan to provide adequate compensation to farmers wishing to dispose of their lands.

The best method of protecting our farms would be to ensure that agriculture is once again a profitable means of earning a living. Improved methods of supply management, farm income stabilization, greater consumer awareness. and better foreign trade agreements will assist us all as farmers and consumers.

Ontario is not alone in facing the serious problem of unemployment. For many decades, Ontario was insulated from the effects of recession that caused severe hardship in other parts of this country. For the first time in many years, our unemployment level has reached what has to be the danger level. Clearly, it is a reflection on our economy in this province. At the same time, the current high level of unemployment in Ontario has a very severe effect on our economy.

From my perspective, the current situation reflects our preoccupation as a province with resource-oriented industries intent only on the export of our non-renewable resources. Clearly, over the past 20 years, we have been negligent in building up a diverse, productive manufacturing sector. Our preoccupation with priority industry has unnecessarily tied our economy to those of other nations.

The question naturally arises: "What do we do when our resources are totally exploited?" The hollow rhetoric of commitments to equality of economic opportunity for all Ontarians will not wash with our unemployed, especially our young people; nor will it be accepted in northern and eastern Ontario where the economic disparity is most severe.

While the increase in unemployment can be directly related to the economic recession in Ontario, much of it must be related to a costly educational system that leaves so many of our young people ill equipped and poorly trained for the future. Many of our trades programmes are a disgrace.

Instead of exporting manufactured goods, Ontario has involved itself unnecessarily in the export of our young people. We train doctors, nurses, teachers, engineers for other countries.

Mr. Bain: Isn't that what Prime Minister Trudeau suggested?

Mr. Cunningham: While our nurses and teachers leave for other countries or work in restaurants or drive taxi-cabs, we continue to graduate more teachers and nurses.

Mr. Bain: Especially cab drivers.

Mr. Cunningham: This is all done at the expense of the Ontario taxpayer while, at the same time, disrupting families and friendships.

Mr. Bain: How about lawyers?

Mr. Cunningham: With educational costs on the rise, it is now more important than ever that our entire educational system be more practical and oriented to employment after graduation or completion of studies.

Mention was made in the Speech from the Throne of the creation of a Ministry of Northern Affairs. Having travelled through many parts of the north, I can say that the creation of such a ministry will do little for the people of our north.

Mr. Bain: Let's vote against it.

Mr. Cunningham: If all the ministries we do have would do an effective job, no such ministry would be needed. Its creation further recognizes the unequal treatment that our northern citizens receive.

Reference was made by Her Honour to some changes in The Environmental Assessment Act. I look forward to seeing these changes and welcome any move designed to protect our citizens in northern Ontario while,

at the same time, developing appropriate, reasonable and co-operative development of resources there. While there is little argument that the record of the existing Conservative government in preserving and protecting the environment in southern Ontario is poor, it is dismal in northern Ontario.

It is little wonder, in these days of lead pollution, DDT, PCBs, mercury poison, human waste pollution, landfill sites, sulphur emissions and air pollution, that the average person in the province of Ontario is sceptical of our commitment to the environment. The inability of our statutes to effectively protect our citizens from abuse causes me to seriously question the sincerity of the government and the incumbent minister, who said: "The polluter will pay." To date, whatever fines have been levied in this province represent only a licence to continue to pollute.

The Speech from the Throne refers to the government's "continuing commitment to clean air and water and a healthy environment [which] will be advanced through amendments to The Environmental Protection Act, The Ontario Water Resources Act, and The Pesticides Act." Associated with these amendments, I would say, should be a commitment by the minister to improve the quality of the Environmental Assessment Board, the Environmental Appeal Board and the Pesticides Appeal Board, which all have recently become repositories for the current minister's political cronies.

One of the most serious problems facing us as a province and a nation is the development of an appropriate energy policy. Our entire way of life revolves around energy, most of which is non-renewable. If we expect to continue to enjoy a high standard of living in Ontario, we will have to dedicate ourselves to a sincere conservation programme.

During consideration of the energy estimates last year, I suggested that the sales tax be removed on insulation products. At the time, the incumbent minister didn't seem particularly impressed with that but, eventually, I realized the tax was removed.

Mr. Philip: He warmed up to the idea, Eric.

Mr. Cunningham: I would think some of his cabinet colleagues warmed up to the idea.

I would respectfully suggest that we consider further tax incentives to encourage real energy conservation. Any product related to housing insulation and energy savings should be made tax-exempt. Likewise, the costs of insulation improvements or double-glazing of windows should be made partially tax deductible at least. This would add further incentive to both business and individuals to properly insulate their businesses or homes and thereby save valuable fuel.

[10:15]

At the same time, serious consideration should be given immediately to restructuring the rate system of Ontario Hydro. Currently there is little incentive for the home owner to save hydro with the current system which continues to cost the consumer more and more every year. Clearly the less you use, the less you should pay. This would be of particular benefit to the penny-wise and especially to our senior citizens and those on fixed incomes whose hydro demands are less than the rest of us. Currently their rates are structured at the highest level. That is unfair.

No one contemplating environmentally aesthetic improvements should expect increases in their assessment. A guarantee to that effect should be made to all home and cottage owners. No one in Ontario need be penalized for saving energy. To that end, we would do well to consider making a real effort to develop the use of solar energy for residential construction. I would hope that many of our students will consider making summer jobs out of insultation activities. These are things that must be done.

Notwithstanding any commitment by our federal government, we must proceed with better forms of rapid transit. It is not my place to be provocative, but our record in this regard has been poor. The job must be done. It must be done as quickly as possible.

The day of the big V-8 cars should be just about over. Clearly we cannot afford to have cars that operate at 12 to 13 miles per gallon. The sooner our North American car manufacturers adjust to the realities of our energy limitations, the sooner they will protect themselves from extinction as a result of Japanese and European domination. Our licensing and tax structure should improve incentives for smaller energy-conserving cars.

All cars should be required to submit to a yearly or twice-yearly engine tune-up. This would reduce oil consumption and emissions, and save fuel. Ontario Hydro would do well to remember the mood of the select committee on rate increases. At the same time, serious consideration should be given to returning to water generated hydro. The growing cost of fossil fuels will seriously undermine our ability to use non-renewable fuel as a source of energy in the future.

It's obvious to me from the Minister of Energy's (Mr. Taylor) statement last week that this province has no energy policy what-

soever. Our party has over the years consistently warned the government of the necessity to come to grips with the reality of energy shortages and to develop a fair, pragmatic, comprehensive energy policy. Canada has a higher per capita use of energy than the United States, Holland, Great Britain, Japan, West Germany, Switzerland and France. Our survival depends on the development of an intelligent conservation-oriented energy policy.

The commitment in the Throne Speech to encourage our young people to study French as a second language is welcome on my part. At the same time I recognize and commend the government's recognition of our many ethnic heritages through the government's commitment to the heritage language programme.

A major consolation to those interested and dedicated to seeing a decent standard of living afforded to the less fortunate was the appointment of the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton) to the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Obviously it is an improvement over his predecessor, who could only be described as being slightly right of Attilla the Hun. Hopefully he may convince his colleagues of the need to raise family benefit assistance to reflect the increase in cost of living. To ignore these people who cannot help themselves is cruelty at its highest.

The indication that the province will provide assistance for small business should be welcomed by all parties of this Legislature. We, in the Liberal Party, have a basic commitment to competition and diversity as essential elements of a solid and prosperous economy. The small business sector employs between 50 and 60 per cent of all working Canadians. Clearly, the future prosperity of this province will relate directly to our ability to promote and encourage those involved in sall business.

Mr. Philip: Where do you stand on Bill C-42, Eric?

Mr. Cunningham: It is encouraging that the Treasurer has finally recognized the importance of the small business sector. This appears to be a departure from his recent submission to the royal commission on corporate concentration wherein he said:

"While I can accept the need for more government presence in certain aspects of government activity, at the same time I also accept the fact that in many sectors, businesses are going to be larger and more concentrated in the future. I do not think we should necessarily resist this trend with outdated notions of competition between a large number of small firms."

That, in essence, I would think would reflect the feelings of the current Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs—clearly a big fan of big business concentration of interests.

For some time I have suggested a meaningful review of the operations of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Most members of this House—yourself I'm sure included, Mr. Speaker—have experienced nothing but frustration in dealing with this board. We've all heard the stories of late cheques, no cheques at all, misplaced correspondence, senseless correspondence and misplaced or lost files. Nobody wins with this kind of misadministration.

The costs go up tremendously. These are passed along to business and labour. The net result is a high cost to small businesses, many of which are over-assessed already. In many instances this reduces the possibility of jobs. The cost associated with this confusion at the Workmen's Compensation Board undermines its ability to pay or compensate people at a humane or decent level. This is a real tragedy. A review of its operation is long overdue and should be welcomed by all members of this Legislature.

Notwithstanding the serious problem of unemployment, the most pressing problem facing us all as legislators is inflation itself. It, without doubt, is the cruellest tax of all. It is imposed without regard on every one of us. It fosters greed—self-interest in the pursuit of higher prices, higher profits, higher wages and higher salaries. It affects every citizen—those on fixed incomes, the young couple striving to buy a home, the average taxpayer who works every day to improve or at least provide a decent standard of living for his or her family. It is not an easy time for these people.

There are no easy, short-term solutions to inflation. We all know that a lower rate of inflation usually occurs at the expense of higher unemployment. Federal finance minister Donald Macdonald appears to recognize this. While there are no simplistic or easy answers to this problem, one thing governments can do is attempt to reduce their own expenditures.

To this end I was pleased to see in the Speech from the Throne at least a vague continued commitment to some form of restraint. The former federal auditor general, Max Henderson, in his report last year, made 184 recommendations, I believe, where sav-

ings to the taxpayers could be effected in this province. While the progress to date has not been particularly encouraging, I look forward to seeing meaningful efforts to cut out many areas of waste.

My concern in this regard emanates from our very serious deficit position. A key factor affecting our economy has been the impact of government on industrial society. The end of the last war saw the end of our laissez faire system of economics and the advent of Keynesian policy through continuing government spending as a factor in our gross national product. Initially, this government involvement was welcome and created stability where it might not have otherwise existed. It created jobs and reduced the extent of job dislocation.

Unfortunately, there are some serious ramifications associated with such government involvement in any economy. Currently, over 40 per cent of our gross national product relates directly to government spending. Our dollar has deteriorated in value to the detriment of everybody. That inflation must be directly associated with this, and has contributed in so many ways to selfish demands by manufacturers for their goods and labour for their services. The increased cost in the product or service, be it through the public sector or the private sector, has caused great hardship for our senior citizens and those on fixed incomes.

This province has played a significant force in accommodating itself to the period. The Hon. Leslie M. Frost, in 1944 in his budget address—he was Treasurer then, at the same time—said: "We are building not only for these times, we are planning for a greater population, for industrial explosion, for prosperous farms, for happy and healthy people. We are laying a sure foundation for a greater and stronger Ontario."

Those, Mr. Speaker, were the days. In that year, our net expenditures stood at $132 million. Twenty-six years later in 1971 the provincial net expenditure had reached $4.2 billion, more than 32 times that 1945 level.

Mr. Wildman: Thirty-two times in 26 years.

Mr. Cunningham: The budget last year provided for spending of $11.7 billion and revenue of $10.8 billion. Our current Treasurer refers to this shortfall as a "net cash requirement." As a realist, I prefer to call it debt.

For the past two years, projected net cash requirements have been underestimated by $200 million. We learned last week that our shortfall currently is $158 million.

Referring to the Treasurer's foresight, the late member for London North (Mr. Shore) was quoted as follows: "One can place less confidence in the Treasurer's forecast in view of the historical evidence which shows that the provincial government makes a practice of underestimating expenditures, and, I must submit, in many instances overestimating its revenues."

Our preoccupation in Ontario with government empire-building has stretched our financial limitations to real extremes. In 1976 we spent $766 million on debt retirement. That excludes the debt of Ontario Hydro. When compared to our annual rate of growth from 1972 to 1976 it represents 20.8 per cent, the highest rate in Canada. Our total debt in Ontario in 1976 was $3.59 billion. In 1975 it was $1.9 billion. There can be no question that we have gone wrong. The current government solution has been to fund these deficits and interest payments with taxpayers' pension funds and through capital markets abroad.

I was listening this afternoon to the Treasurer indicating his commitment to relocate different government offices across the province and I commend him on that decentralization effort. We have been suggesting it for a number of years. Recognizing that so much of our money is borrowed in Germany, I think he would probably be inclined to relocate the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs in Munich.

The current government solution I have to reject, as far as its borrowing practices are concerned. We cannot continue to borrow the extensive amount of money that we have from pension plans—$128 million from the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System, for instance; $750 million from the Canada Pension Plan; $228 million from the Teachers Superannuation Fund. To date, Ontario has borrowed $4.4 billion from the Canada Pension Plan and the annual interest on that is about $340 million. Eventually, in the not too distant future, we will wear out our welcome there.

In 1976-1977 we will borrow $813 million from the Canada Pension Plan, $330 million from the Teachers Superannuation Fund, another $180 million from the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System. Our total net cash requirements for 1976-1977 will be $1,388 million. This is again $158 million more than originally forecast by the Treasurer.

Big government means waste, whether it is at the federal, provincial, or municipal level. A waste in government stimulates inflation, which means paying more for less. When a citizen pays more and gets less, he cannot distinguish between jurisdictions. He feels powerless and confused. The incentive to work hard, to produce, to economize, is undermined seriously.

The effect of big government on private enterprise is just as serious. Taxes increase to accommodate a growing civil service. Red tape and government interference become further road-blocks to effective corporate managements. Profits decline, unemployment results. The time has come to clarify the judicial and legislative process so the people know where they stand when they wish to invest money or remedy a problem. How can this be done?

Last summer I had the pleasure of meeting in the United States with the congressional committee on small business. Not only do they look at methods of helping people in that particular sector, but they also make specific recommendations to government on ways of reducing its own growing bureaucracy. Agencies, boards, commissions, et cetera are studied, reviewed; their effectiveness and worth are re-assessed; as a result of this committee some are being disbanded. The same thing should be done in the province of Ontario. We would do well to consider such an activity. We have a multitude of boards and commissions which serve no purpose, save only maybe a haven for political appointments to defeated Tory candidates.

Many members have read the memo that appeared in the Globe and Mail in the not too distant future quoting a high official in the Ministry of Government Services—

An hon. member: It appeared in the future?

Mr. Foulds: Your verb tense is correct—"appeared".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could the hon. member find an appropriate place to terminate his remarks? We have reached the time for adjournment.

[10:30]

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I would conclude now by asking who let the hon. member for Sudbury East out of his cage, and I'll sit down right now.

I got the wrong guy, I'm sorry.

Mr. Cassidy: That was gratuitous.

Mr. Martel: Know what you're talking about before you start to howl.

Mr. Cunningham: I'll sit here and listen to you.

Mr. Mackenzie: You've got a long way to go.

Mr. Laughren: Don't bother.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please.

An hon. member: Get back in your cage, Eric; crawl under your rock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Cunningham, would you move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Cunningham moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In accordance with the provisions of standing order 27(g) and provisional rule 4, appropriate notice has been given by the members for Nickel Belt and Sudbury East and in accordance with standing order 28(a), I deem a motion to adjourn to have been made. I will recognize the hon. member for Nickel Belt for five minutes, and the minister will have five minutes if she chooses to reply.

Mr. Breithaupt: Betty will fix you.

CANCER AND ASBESTOS

Mr. Laughren: Thank you Mr. Speaker: We are here because the minister and the Workmen's Compensation Board have refused to recognize laryngeal cancer as a compensable disease. It is truly worthy of more than a 10-minute debate and I shall suggest a route which I hope will be more fruitful than I suspect this debate will be before I conclude my remarks.

I shall attempt also to deal with the issue without any kind of rhetoric or passion, although I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to do so once you've spent any time at all with people like Aime Bertrand, who is of the Sudbury area. He and other workers in this province, are truly leading, as someone said, "lives of quiet desperation," waiting for some kind of justice to be dispensed by the government.

The facts as I see them are that Aime Bertrand's work history includes 30 years as a maintenance mechanic in the Inco operations in the Sudbury area and include exposure, not only to one carcinogen but many,

including such compounds as nickel, copper, iron, zinc, lead, silenium, cadmium, cobalt, arsenic, asbestos, and sulphur dioxide.

There has been much medical evidence brought to the fore since the debate with the minister and the Workmen's Compensation Board ensued around Mr. Aime Bertrand, including—and I shall put some of those on the record—a letter from Dr. A. Cecilioni of Hamilton. He stated: "Enclosed are the results of the analysis of the sample of Aime's hair which I just received in the mail. The cadmium and nickel content do not appear above normal, but the silica content is quite high, 46 parts per million, and even higher is silicon dioxide, 98 parts per million. Since a major ingredient or component of asbestos is silica and silicates, I believe you have sufficient grounds to repeal the Workmen's Compensation Board's decision." That was Dr. Cecilioni's quote.

And then he says: "In conclusion, I would say that the Workmen's Compensation Board and the appeal board should review and reconsider their decision in rejecting the claim of Mr. Aime Bertrand, especially in the light of our present knowledge about the effect of prolonged exposure to not only one but many carcinogenic agents, both gaseous and particulate, that are present in the work place. Some of these have an additive or a synergistic effect when combined with cigarette smoking." That was Dr. Cecilioni.

Then Dr. Selikoff, a world renowned expert on the effects of exposure to abestos and various forms of cancer, prepared a report in which he followed 17,800 insulation workers, workers who had been exposed to asbestos between 1967 and 1975. Dr. Selikoff came up with the following statistics for different kinds of cancer.

Lung cancer; the expected death rate was 92.28, the observed was 427. Two different kinds of mesothelioma; the expected was zero because of the nature of mesothelioma, the actual was 52 and 92. Esophagus cancer; 5.77 expected, 16 observed. Stomach cancer; 12.71 expected, 22 observed. Colon-rectum; 33.89 expected, 53 observed. Larynx, 4.45 expected, nine observed.

Mr. Lewis: Every one of those should be compensable.

Mr. Laughren: Oral pharynx, 7.41 expected, 17 observed. Kidney, 7.08 expected 17 observed.

And the minister, of course, has decided that larynx cancer will not be one of the ones that is accepted. Yet those are the results of Dr. Selikoff's studies; and I might add that the minister has not refuted those in any acceptable manner whatsoever.

Back in December, 1976, this whole matter was raised during the estimates debate and Dr. McCracken at that time testified that there was no proven causal effect. At that time he did not mention the fact that the Workmen's Compensation Board had undertaken a study. Now he says in an interview with the Globe and Mail that he has indeed undertaken such a study. Why he did not mention it at that time is something that perhaps the minister could explain to us. So we are in a position now where, despite the work history of this man for almost 30 years, despite the epidemiological studies of Dr. Selikoff, despite Dr. Cecilioni's reports, despite Dr. Ritchie's warning about cancer of the larynx, the Workmen's Compensation Board goes out and seeks contrary evidence, despite the proclamations of the minister that the benefit of doubt goes to the worker, in order to refute the claim of Dr. Selikoff.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. My final statement would be that I would ask the minister, since she is apparently unwilling to change the position of the board, to appoint a medical referee to determine and dispense justice in the case of Mr. Aime Bertrand and any other worker who has been exposed to asbestos and ends up with cancer of the larynx.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has up to five minutes for her reply.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the basis of the establishment of a disease as an occupational disease and, therefore, one directly related to the hazards of the work place and therefore compensable, is in fact the consensus of informed opinion of a number of reputable scientific experts as determined from critical examination of all the relevant retrospective and clinical research available. As I have explained to the hon. members in the past, and as I will say again, just as one swallow doth not a summer make, one researcher doth not a scientific fact make.

Interjections.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It is well to remember that science is not infallible—

Mr. Deans: We in fact agree with that.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and that indeed it is necessary to have a number of studies done in order to develop the kind of informed opinion upon which a responsible decision can be made.

Interjections.

Mr. Philip: How many cadavers do you want for evidence?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Board differs in no way from any other responsible group of people attempting to make rational decisions for the benefit of the people they serve.

Interjections.

Hon. B. Stephenson: That is precisely what is being done in this case. The situation report upon which the hon. member has requested tonight's discussion is that indeed a report was prepared by Dr. Selikoff. I would reiterate again that although I believe that Dr. Selikoff is a dedicated researcher, it would be appreciated by all of his colleagues who are just as dedicated and just as expert throughout the world if he would at some time publish his findings, which he has never done, in order to permit them to be subjected to the critical scrutiny of his peer group which is the basis upon which valid scientific decisions can be made.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Oh that is slander, blasphemy.

Mr. Davidson: Why is he recognized as a world expert?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's have some order please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Dr. Selikoff is recognized as an expert in the world. There are several others who are recognized as just as expert in various places around the world.

Mr. Lewis: Like whom?

Mr. Laughren: McCracken? Name one.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am not going to name Dr. McCracken, of course. Dr. Mollie Newhouse of Great Britain is also an expert.

Mr. Lewis: And she agrees with Selikoff right down the line. She agrees with everything he has written.

Hon. B. Stephenson: In addition, as a matter of fact, we will present to this House a report from Dr. Newhouse, when it is received in full form—

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes, sure.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —which in fact does not agree with Dr. Selikoff.

Mr. Lewis: She came to the conference.

Hon. B. Stephenson: There was a document presented by Dr. Selikoff to Dr. McCracken at Dr. McCracken's request. It was indeed given to Dr. Miller, who was the epidemiologist who was asked by the board to examine all of the information provided in Dr. Ritchie's study about asbestos and cancer. Dr. Miller has examined Dr. Selikoff's report and I would like to read one paragraph of his letter. The entire letter I will submit to the hon. member for Wentworth who asked for it.

Dr. Miller states in the final paragraph of his letter: "I feel that we are no further ahead than we were before. The data we now have from Dr. Selikoff if anything makes us less certain of the relationship than we were with the earlier data; and since we have no fresh data at this time we must proceed with our own study in order to establish a valid situation."

Mr. Philip: Because they do nothing to start them.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Here is precisely what is happening: A study has been established. It is being carried out by reputable scientists in Canada. There is yet a further study in Great Britain which is being carried out. It is anticipated that we shall have some results within the next two or three months on this study—the European study—and there will be results, hopefully, within six months to 12 months from our own study. On the basis of this compendium of information, it should be possible to make a decision which is valid and which will stand up. In the meantime, I have promised—

Mr. Davidson: You are stalling again.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —that I would, indeed, reexamine the case of Mr. Bertrand, which I shall do—

Mr. Laughren: Can't you lead sometimes?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —in order to try to establish any kind of relationship with the other materials to which he has been exposed. But a causal relationship must be established if, indeed, compensation boards anywhere in the world are to function respon-

sibly on behalf of the people that they are designed to serve.

Interjection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I now recognize the hon. member for Sudbury East for five minutes.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I understand the minister to say she was going to send me something.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There is nothing out of order. The official opposition asked for five minutes to discuss this.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. Martel: This afternoon I raised the question with respect to the fact that there seemed to be a growing number of cases that were going unsatisfied and workers were having difficulty. The minister responded, no, this wasn't the case.

In my own riding office in the past 11 months we have handled 457 claims; that doesn't include the ones we've sent back to the union or unions in the Sudbury area, because the union official was working on it. It doesn't include those we just gave advice to. Those were actual involvements. For example, yesterday we had 15 in my office, a daily occurrence of four to five to six workers. And, tomorrow, Jim Hickey of the United Steel Workers will handle seven cases before the appeal tribunal in Sudbury or the appeal board; one on my behalf, seven for his own membership.

The minister also said today in her response that 91 per cent of the people were satisfied with the way they were handled. I'm going by her statistics. There were 433,000 claims last year. That means that nine per cent weren't satisfied and that represents 38,970 workers who are dissatisfied.

Mr. Warner: That's right.

Mr. Martel: And if we include their families, we are talking about 150,000 to 160,000 people who are affected by the delays that occur at the Workmen's Compensation Board. In my office I see people who are financially destitute. I see quarrels between the husband and wife. I have seen in the past month two marriage break-ups. I have seen functional overlays. I have seen despair.

Because of the inability to cope with the problems and the stupidity—and I say stupidity advisedly, because of the decisions which are coming from the board despite adequate medical information to get claims established. And the reasons given are the most stupid reasons—lost files, a lack of medical information. They don't tell the worker, "We need more medical information; we'll give you three weeks to get it." They cut his damn cheque off. Well, that's stupidity, in my opinion.

So the worker doesn't realize his cheque is cut off. He waits his two weeks for his next cheque. He figures it's in the mail. He waits another week or so. He finally shows up at our doorstep. He has been three, four, five weeks without a pay cheque and the board hasn't even advised him that he's been terminated. And this isn't one or two cases—this is many, many cases. And all of my colleagues can tell the minister the same thing, all of us. It is so depressing. Let me give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker.

Here's a man who was taken out of work by his doctor on January 23—by his doctor's instruction. An investigation was conducted and finally I got involved—about two and a half weeks ago. Last Thursday we got a decision—10 weeks.

[10:45]

Here's the type of letter you get from the Workmen's Compensation Board: "According to our present policy and regulations, we can only consider payment for cost of travel that is necessary. There is adequate treatment available in Noelville." Well, the one doctor there that day happened to be at the Olympics. I don't know where he was supposed to get treatment. The board decides it is not going to pay. So they paid $20 for 60 trips back and forth to Sudbury. That's the sort of treatment.

Mr. Seguin, a constituent of mine, writes, "I appeared before the board on Dec. 22. I am still awaiting a decision." The man has been out of work since December. What the hell do I do with him? The minister says to me, "Well, your language is bad." What do I do with a father of four children who cries in my office because he has no income and he won't go to the welfare in Sudbury because of one Mr. Paul Schack, who degrades people so badly they refuse to go on welfare. The minister's people know it in Sudbury. What do I do with a Mr. Willard Dupont when a Dr. Morrison Mitchell, whom the minister knows, writes the following letter:

"May I at least have an immediate reply acknowledging this letter? I find that you simply ignore my letters, my phone calls to your office in Sudbury, and ignore the fact

that the man has been examined on several occasions by you or your consultants." And that's turned down. Morrison Mitchell is the president of the Workmen's Compensation Board, he's the president of the PC organization in Sudbury, and also a doctor.

What do you have when you have a report from a neurosurgeon and the doctor says, "In my opinion there remains a period of approximately nine to 10 months when the patient received 50 per cent compensation benefits, when it is my contention that he should have received 100 per cent. My reason for stating this is that the patient is not and has not been able to return to work." That's a neurosurgeon's report, and it's turned down. It just goes on. Mrs. Yang, who's been tested for retraining, grade 13 equivalent—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Martel: Thank you; just one final statement, Mr. Speaker. A brilliant girl, could be retrained for anything, one year on compensation, and they haven't started the training programme. The minister wonders why we stand over here in despair and I want to tell her it's because of the stupidity. Until she decentralizes that bloody office those workers aren't going to get a fair shake.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the hon. member for Sudbury East in the only way that I can.

Mr. Davidson: Defensively.

Hon. B. Stephenson: If indeed the hon. members do have specific difficulties with certain sections of the Workmen's Compensation Board—

Mr. Warner: How many hundred do you want?

Mr. Davidson: When will you stop protecting that board?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —it would be extremely helpful to me if indeed they could document them for me, so that I may trace them through the system in order to try to find out where the problems lie.

An hon. member: Can you handle 1,000 cases?

Mr. Cassidy: Make the system work.

Mr. Warner: That's not the question.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I have specifically asked the administration of the board to examine very carefully the claims section because it seemed to me last year that that was an area in which problems were arising. As a result of my request a specific area in the claims section has been established in order to ensure that claims will be expedited as rapidly as possible. As a result of that activity, almost 50 per cent of initial claims are now being handled totally within three days. That I think is a very real achievement, when a very large number of claims is received every hour within the board.

Decentralization may in fact be an answer eventually. At the moment and for the past several months the board has been attempting to automate the claims system and the information system so that indeed the computer terminals at the various regional offices could be activated in order to provide instant information for those requesting information at the various regional offices.

Mr. Foulds: The local board office uses my constituency secretary.

Hon. B. Stephenson: At the end of February this year, that system was completed, and at this time instant information can be obtained by anyone inquiring of the regional office about any claim which they have concern about.

It is important, I think, to remember that indeed this is a very large organization dealing with a very large number of people in very unfortunate and unhappy circumstances.

Mr. Wildman: Decentralize.

Mr. Davidson: Then spread it out.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The Workmen's Compensation Board has decentralized quite dramatically in the last four years.

Mr. Laughren: Not true.

Hon. B. Stephenson: They have developed regional offices with much more competence than they previously had.

Mr. Davidson: You still have to get all the answers in Toronto. No decision-making.

Hon. B. Stephenson: And the impetus toward improved claims activity, improved appeal mechanisms and improved rehabilitation services is a matter that I have been specifically concerned about.

Mr. Davidson: Why do the problems still exist, then?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'm pleased to tell you that within the next several months there are going to be almost double the numbers of vocational rehabilitation officers, who thereby, as a result of a smaller case load, will be able to deal much more rapidly and I think much more effectively with the

vocational rehabilitation of those individuals who require that kind of service.

There are specific problems which do arise as a result of late medical reports. There is no doubt about that at all, and it is difficult to ensure—

Mr. Davidson: Cases 10 years old?

Mr. Warner: And to lose files?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —that indeed the medical reports do arrive on time. Cases which have been dealt with in the past are sometimes reported inadequately medically and must be re-examined. But I think it is extremely important—

Mr. Davidson: What do you do, make them up and look at them?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —that if indeed there are problems with the processing of claims, if indeed there are problems with the lateness of arrival of cheques, that it would be useful, particularly to me, if my colleagues honestly want me to try even harder, and I have been trying very hard to improve the service of the board, to let me know the areas specifically in which they are having difficulties so that I may personally examine—

Mr. Lewis: You have been doing that for 10 years.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No. Unfortunately—

Mr. Laughren: You never listen. Why don't you try some other line of work?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —I have yet to receive, outside of one or two specific claims from the Leader of the Opposition or any other member—

Mr. Lewis: Why should we go to you direct?

Mr. Davidson: We wouldn't send them to you because you wouldn't handle them properly.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —a specific name or number on individual claimants.

Mr. Laughren: That is a lie, an outright lie.

An hon. member: That's untrue.

Hon. B. Stephenson: When, indeed, I have received those—

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Do you want a response from the minister or not?

An hon. member: Yes; an honest response.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's why we're here.

Mr. McClellan: I've sent you three or four cases in the last month.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I can adjourn the House right now if that's your wish.

Mr. Laughren: You might as well.

Mr. Davidson: You might just as well.

Hon. B. Stephenson: When, indeed, I have received that specific information, I have made a valiant attempt to find out the reasons for the problems and to resolve the difficulties.

Mr. Lewis: But that is not the way we should proceed.

Hon. B. Stephenson: And that is precisely the course that I can follow, because if I know where the major—

Mr. Wildman: You are going to have to have an awful big office.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —problems or roadblocks seem to lie, then it is possible to attack them.

Mr. Deans: What about the people who don't go to members of the Legislature?

Hon. B. Stephenson: We have been attempting to resolve the problems which have been drawn to our attention in an equitable way.

Mr. Warner: You should try protecting the workers instead of the board.

Hon. B. Stephenson: And it is indeed, I think, my responsibility and the responsibility of the board, to ensure that the action which is defined by The Workmen's Compensation Act is carried out responsibly by that board.

Mr. Davidson: Change the Act.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The Act is the responsibility of the Legislature—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. minister's time has expired.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and the board functions specifically under that Act and can only function that way.

Mr. Davidson: Change the Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I deem the motion to adjourn to have been carried.

The House adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 5, 1977

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Reed, Mr. Williams, Mr. Warner, Mr. Cunningham 187

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cunningham, agreed to 212

Debate re answer to oral question on cancer and asbestos, Mr. Laughren, B. Stephenson .. 212

Debate re answer to oral question on Workmen's Compensation, Mr. Martel, B. Stephenson 215

Adjournment 217

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davison, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Wiseman, D. J. (Lanark PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)



No. 7

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question which I raised yesterday, the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) made the following statement—I'm quoting from the Instant Hansard:

"Thank you very much. I shall remind myself, Mr. Speaker, to not read the last lines of any of those letters since they are somewhat disconcerting in their content. It would seem [to me] that the use of the English language is something that might be exercised by some of the correspondents."

I'm afraid that statement could create and has created a false impression. Let me quote to you, Mr. Speaker, the last paragraph of the four letters I wrote to Michael Starr on the issue which I had raised with the appropriate minister and I'll let you judge the language.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If it's a point of personal privilege, as the hon. member announced, he may state his point of privilege but not debate it and not build up the information.

Mr. MacDonald: He is not debating.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest—

Mr. Speaker: He may state the point of privilege; and if he's been misquoted and so on—

Mr. Martel: I'm not suggesting—

Mr. Speaker: —it could be construed as a point of personal privilege, but otherwise we don't debate it, except that he can raise the matter at the time as a point of order. But as a point of personal privilege—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: —if none of the privileges of the hon. member has been breached—

Mr. Martel: My privileges have been breached.

Mr. Speaker: Well now, a misinterpretation of what one says, or a difference of opinion as to what one says or reads, is not a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I've spoken—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. So he may state his point of privilege, not debate it.

Mr. Martel: I am not attempting to debate it, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect. I simply stated what the minister in her statement indicated, that some of the language was intemperate or whatever. I'm just going to quote, very briefly, the last paragraph of each of the four letters involved in this issue. There are only four sentences, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: I'd certainly like to hear what he said.

Mr. Philip: I would too.

Mr. Martel: The first letter, on July 18, says, and I'm quoting the last sentence: "I think your position is intolerable. I would appreciate your comments." The one on January 24, 1977: "Can you indicate to me whether or not there is really any intention on the part of the Workmen's Compensation Board, through Dr. McCracken or yourself, to meet with the above-named people to discuss the problem of industrial deafness. Thank you."

Mr. Nixon: "Thank you"?

Mr. Martel: On February 17, I wrote the following—and these are addressed to Michael Starr: "Maybe you aren't concerned about deafness in the Sudbury area, but I damn well am, and I want to know when this meeting will take place without further BS." And the BS means Bette Stephenson.

Mr. Lewis: Now there's an abuse of the language.

Mr. Martel: The last letter, Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1977; the final paragraph: "It is for those reasons that I do not need a

meeting to be briefed, but rather I need a meeting that will clearly propose action on this matter."

Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister's statement left the impression with the press that my language is intemperate, because the headlines say: "MPP's Language Called Filthy." I want to know where the filth is.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The last part is about the only point that could be construed as a point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: Yet another Stephenson discrepancy.

Mr. Speaker: We do not build up a case in this case; I repeat again we simply state the point of privilege.

Mr. Nixon: I think we should hear from the minister on that.

Mr. Speaker: There's nothing I can do about any misinterpretation.

Hon. B. Stephenson: On a point of personal privilege, I did not write the headline in the newspaper.

Mr. Deans: No, you made the statement.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such matters can be brought up, I'm sure, at—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: —order, please—at an appropriate time, some other time; but none of the privileges of the member has been breached.

Statements by the ministry.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON PENSIONS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the establishment of a royal commission to examine the state of pensions in the province of Ontario.

I also take pleasure in appointing Miss Donna J. Haley, QC, as chairman of this commission. Miss Haley has had a great deal of experience in the field of pensions. Since February, 1974, she has chaired the Pension Commission of Ontario and this February she was reappointed for another three-year term. As well, Miss Haley was a member of the task force on employee benefits under part X of The Employment Standards Act, and has been involved with other task forces and commissions, both as a member and a participant in preparing briefs. In addition to these and many other duties, Miss Haley has been practising law with the firm of Haley and Martin in Toronto since 1970, and she was appointed a Queen's Counsel in 1967.

Along with Miss Haley, Mr. Donald Coxe of Guelph, Mr. Walter Upshall of Toronto and Mr. Alfred Cordell of London will be commissioners in this public inquiry. Brief biographies of each are attached to this statement, together with the terms of reference. A representative of organized labour will be appointed shortly.

There are compelling reasons for initiating a royal commission on pensions. During the past year, the private sector has encountered criticism for its apparent inability to provide adequate retirement pensions; and further, it has become obvious that private sector pension plans find it financially difficult, under the existing institutional and legislative arrangements, to maintain the real value of pensions during periods of inflation. This fact, alongside fully-indexed Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security benefits, and conspicuous fully-indexed benefits of federal and provincial public employee pensions plans, has caused some public dissatisfaction with private sector pensions.

As a consequence, there has been widespread pressure to significantly expand the Canada Pension Plan at the cost of displacing private sector pension plans. Such an expansion of the CPP under its present financial structure would result in a private-to-public shift of capital, increase intervention by government in an individual's consumption/savings decisions and a much larger transfer of income between the present generation and the next.

We are approaching a crossroads with respect to the financing of the Canada Pension Plan. The government of this province welcomes views and suggestions as to the appropriate method for financing the CPP, and what investment policies should be followed with respect to any surplus funds that are created. Similarly, the commission will solicit opinions on the future structure and investment role of public sector employee pension plans.

Before Ontario embarks on any changes to its own pension legislation, or agrees to changes in the Canada Pension Plan, it is absolutely essential to know the economic impact of these changes. Pensions involve social, political and economic issues which are as complex as they are significant. The

importance and the complexities of the issues involved require the establishment of a commission. The in-depth investigation of the commission and its final recommendations will provide the government of this province with much-needed information and will determine the direction in which pension policies should be pursued.

The royal commission will seek and welcome submissions from all interested parties during its investigations. We have heard much from those who are avowed spokesmen for the public but we have heard little from the public themselves. I wish to emphasize that submissions from the public are specifically welcomed. Their participation is necessary if the commission is to evaluate the effectiveness of current pension policies and formulate appropriate changes.

SHIPBUILDING

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have a very brief announcement to share with the House. We have been expressing some interest in employment. The member from the riding involved is there at the moment, and I am pleased to say I have received a report, through my wife who has just christened the motor vessel, Algolake at Collingwood, a maximum sized vessel which can be built for the Seaway and which will be hauling Ontario coal. I understand the christening went well; that the champagne, or whatever it was—the Canadian champagne, I'm sure—broke on the first effort.

Mr. Roy: It was good they sent her and not you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was also brought to my attention that there will be a press conference in Collingwood this afternoon where an announcement will be made that a similar ship, to be known as Hull 215—

Mr. Nixon: That's a romantic name.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —will be commenced in June and built for Algoma Central Railway; built by Canadian Shipbuilding and Engineering in that community.

Hopefully, it will provide much employment in the area. It is estimated that at the peak of production of this new vessel, there will be 850 people employed at the shipyards in Collingwood, without us having to take an equity position in that great organization.

Mr. Lewis: We didn't say that.

Mr. Moffatt: The Leader of the Opposition wins again.

Mr. Lewis: I thank you for acting so quickly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition shouldn't thank me, he should thank my wife.

Mr. MacDonald: That would be much more pleasurable.

BASEBALL TICKETS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I hope you won't rule me out of order; this is a statement, and as such perhaps it should come before orders of the day, but I do have a small problem which will become evident in a few moments.

I understand that the Leader of the Opposition, while contemplating the government's Throne Speech, and offering co-operation and legislative dependability, has also been cited by the press as being upset at not having received baseball tickets.

Mr. Lewis: Upset isn't the word, it is "concerned."

Hon. Mr. Davis: The saddest hallmark of old, tired, bankrupt and intellectually stilted socialism—that of the variety espoused so eloquently by the Leader of the Opposition—is that it institutionalizes envy, preaches total lack of faith in personal private commitments and initiative.

Mr. Lewis: Did you have to have this written for you?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wanted you to understand—

Mr. Lewis: Have you no spontaneity left?

Mr. Breithaupt: He may strike out as well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wanted you to understand, because I don't have many more and I have to be very careful of what I say. I made the private commitment to take the initiative of offering to the Leader of the Opposition two tickets to the ball game, which I am pleased now to transmit. The seats, sir, are slightly to the left of the plate. I could not get those far out in left field which would be more appropriate, but I want to assure him that they are in the blues.

[2:15]

Mr. Speaker: I might allow a brief response to that out-of-order statement.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may, as a matter of simple graciousness and without a text, thank the Premier immensely for his generosity and say that I would sit anywhere in that stadium tomorrow other than the Premier's box, because I would not wish to be the recipient of booing but to boo myself.

Mr. Speaker: I think we should hear briefly from the member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of view, I suppose it is, I would like to say that to be sure that I could participate in the booing, we have already purchased four tickets which we will be using.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker has been forgotten in all this.

Mr. Lewis: That's free enterprise for you.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a point of order?

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I hate to keep this going and belabour this matter, but I am rising again on the Minister of Labour's attempt to respond, and I ask Mr. Speaker to turn, when he has an opportunity, to page 1435-2 of the Instant Hansard for yesterday:

"Hon. B. Stephenson: I do worry about your language, Elie. It's pretty filthy."

And that's quoted in Instant Hansard.

Mr. Lewis: It is time you told the truth.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I stated before that—order, please—on rising on a matter of privilege, one must state the privilege. If it's a matter of debate, a matter of interpretation, that is not a point of privilege. There's no privilege. I say again, if there is a difference of opinion on the interpretation or meaning of someone's words—order, please—it is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Your point of order.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, if a member, either in government or opposition, has specifically denied the use of language and words which are explicitly contained in Hansard, surely it is a breach of the privilege of the House not to have that corrected or drawn to the attention of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As I understand there was no misquoting; and that's what a member may rise on.

Mr. Lewis: She denied the words.

Mr. Speaker: No. As I understand it, it was a matter—order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: She denied it this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: I heard it very well, I think, and it was a matter of interpretation.

Some hon. members: No, no.

Mr. MacDonald: Read the Instant Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: I haven't heard of any words having been misquoted. I will check the record and just see for myself. As far as I am concerned, as I understand it, there was not a misquoting. That's what a person may rise on.

Mr. Deans: It was a denial.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Treasurer.

AUDIT LEGISLATION

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time this afternoon I will be introducing The Audit Act, 1977. This new Act represents, I believe, a significant structural reform to help all of us improve the productivity and accountability of our government institutions.

Since the first auditor for the province was appointed in 1869, it has been seen that this office performs an essential role in making responsible government work. Major revisions in our audit legislation have moved to confirm and clarify its task.

In 1954, The Financial Administration Act was introduced to deal separately with certain functions which were not directly related to the audit process. The last amendment to the current legislation, made in 1971, provided the means to phase out the pre-audit function of the Provincial Auditor. Thus relieved of the task of examining each requisition for funds within approved appropriations before a cheque could be issued, the auditor gained a larger degree of independence and more time to evaluate the internal controls of each ministry.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have the privilege to introduce today aims to strength-

en the role and responsibility of the Provincial Auditor and to delete those sections of the current legislation which still pertain to the pre-audit function or are otherwise redundant.

This proposed Act will: First, require the Provincial Auditor to report on the economy and efficiency of expenditures, as well as on the procedures undertaken by the ministries to measure the effectiveness of their programmes; second, broaden the powers and responsibilities of the Provincial Auditor by providing for inspection audits or of requiring a full accounting from recipients of transfer payments, which now make up more than 70 per cent of provincial expenditures; third, expand the powers and responsibilities of the Provincial Auditor regarding the audits of Crown agencies and Crown-controlled corporations; fourth, improve the independence of the Provincial Auditor by having his staffing and financial requirements approved by the Board of Internal Economy and by having his report tabled directly in the Legislature by the Speaker.

In preparing this legislation the government is indebted to the fine work of the independent review committee on the office of the Auditor General of Canada, which was under the chairmanship of the late J. R. M. Wilson, FCA, and to the experience of the Exchequer and Audit Department of the United Kingdom. Also, I would like to thank the members of the standing committee on public accounts for their advice and recommendations.

We propose by this legislation to provide the auditor with a more visible and dynamic mandate. He will now be able to bring to the attention of the Legislature cases where he has observed that value for money, comprising the concepts of economy and efficiency, has not been obtained. We look forward to his reporting on the assessment of our procedures to measure effectiveness, and whether our activities are achieving positive results in relation to our legislative goals and objectives. This could only spur us on to be concrete about what we want to do and careful about how we go about it.

I recognize that certain jurisdictions are hesitant to take this course for fear of undermining the primacy of our representative system, but I feel that this concern is ill-conceived. The immediate danger of modern government is that its size and complexity may diminish our capacity to check bureaucracy and to debate better ways of doing things. A stronger auditor cannot diminish the responsibilities of this Legislature, but this office can help us perform our tasks more competently, and thereby enhance the good name of this system of government which we cherish.

ALUMINUM WIRING

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce today a one-man inquiry which is being instituted under The Public Inquiries Act to examine the reliability and safety of aluminum wiring for residential use.

Mr. Moffatt: Boy, you're dynamite.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The government recognizes that there are questions in the public mind and a lack of consensus among the standard-setting bodies, manufacturing industries, installers, electrical inspection agencies and consumer organizations as to the reliablity and safety of this type of wired electrical circuits.

In order to resolve the conflict of views and to ensure that the public interest is best served, we have appointed Dr. J. Tuzo Wilson to undertake this task.

The terms of reference for this inquiry are quite simple and straightforward:

1. To investigate all matters relating to the safety and reliability of aluminum-wired electrical circuits for residential use, relative to the safety and reliability of copper-wired circuits for residential use.

2. To hold public hearings to enable groups and organizations, individual citizens and representatives of industry to present evidence and other pertinent information on the subject.

3. To make appropriate recommendations, if warranted, on any measures that should be taken by the government of Ontario, by other levels of government, by the general public and by the industry.

I am pleased that as eminent a scientist and scholar as Dr. Wilson has been able to take on this task. As members of the House are probably aware, Dr. Wilson is a former professor of geophysics at the University of Toronto, principal of Erindale College, and since 1974 has been director-general of the Ontario Science Centre. He is a noted author and a fellow of several learned societies, including the Royal Society of Canada and the Royal Society of London, and an associate of the National Academy of Science in the United States.

Dr. Wilson will, of course, be accorded the full assistance and co-operation of all government ministries, boards, agencies and

commissions, and will have the authority to engage counsel, expert technical advisers, investigators and other staff as necessary.

I would emphasize that this inquiry is being undertaken in the public interest. I'm sure that the members of the House, many of whom have spoken on the issue, will look forward to Dr. Wilson's report.

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION COMMISSION

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the appointment of the members of the Farm Income Stabilization Commission of Ontario. The members representing the three major agricultural organizations are:

Mr. Conway: Gordon Hill?

Hon. W. Newman: Cash crop and beef farmer Hilbert Van Ankum of Wroxeter, representing the Christian Farmers' Federation; dairy farmer Ellard Powers of Beachburg, representing the National Farmers' Union; and tobacco and corn farmer Albin Kormas of Vanessa, representing the Ontario Federation of Agriculture.

Other commissioners are cash crop farmers: Jules Debrabandere of St. Marys, dairy farmer; dairy farmer George McLaughlin of Beaverton, a former chairman of the Ontario Milk Marketing Board; and dairy and beef farmer Arden Baker of Brockville.

Chairman of the commission is Henry Ediger, who is also chairman of the Crop Insurance Commission.

Mr. Nixon: That is in the riding of Brant.

Mr. Breithaupt: Didn't Gordon Hill make it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He sure led you guys up the garden path.

Mr. Breithaupt: No, not us at all.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are right on. Gordon Hill didn't make it; and he won't.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with these appointments. I believe the experience these people have in various sectors of agriculture will help ensure the success of Ontario's income stabilization programme.

The commissioners will administer The Farm Income Stabilization Act, which was proclaimed April 4. Under the Act, agricultural producers will be able to establish a stabilization plan for individual commodities. Each plan will be financed one-third by participating producers, two-thirds by the government of Ontario. Plans will be established only at the request of producers, and membership is voluntary.

Now that the commission has been appointed, the stabilization programmes can be applied to the 1977 production year.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The Leader of the Opposition.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), perhaps I could put a question to the Premier.

Given the clear undesirability of putting another 159 young people onto the unemployment rolls as a result of a decision of the Toronto Board of Education to release or dismiss those teachers, might the Premier speak to the Minister of Education about the particular funding for English as a second language and special education classes for kids with learning disabilities, which it appeared from the board's discussion underlay the need to fire the teachers? It wasn't so much that they weren't needed in the school system as that the programmes which were required didn't have the appropriate funding.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the issue is really quite that simple. The Minister of Education will be here and I am sure would be quite prepared to reply and give his point of view to the Leader of the Opposition. I expect he will be here shortly.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if when that happens I could redirect I would appreciate it—I'll consider that a question, of course—if you would allow me at that point.

Mr. Speaker: We could class it as supplementary if we are still in the question period.

PUBLIC HEALTH NURSES

Mr. Lewis: Thank you. I'll ask a question, then, of the Minister of Labour, if I may:

Can the Minister of Labour indicate to us what her plans are, beyond the industrial disputes commissioner appointed into the three collective bargaining disputes with the public health nurses, to deal with the other,

I guess more than 20 areas still outstanding, still unresolved, in what is one of the longest ongoing labour disputes in this province for many years?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am awaiting the report of the industrial inquiry commissioner who has been appointed. I anticipate we shall have that report, probably by the end of this month, and hopefully there will be some directions which will be delineated by the report which we will be able to apply to the other areas.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I may; if that report turns out to be as futile as every other initiative has been in the case of the remaining units, might the minister, for the purpose of reaching a resolution of the bargaining process, take into trusteeship, purely for the purpose of collective bargaining, those boards of health which are intractable? Let them do all their other normal functions but resolve it once and for all so that we don't have to retreat to arbitrary legislation?

Mr. S. Smith: Anything but arbitration.

Mr. Lewis: If possible, yes.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting idea, one which has been proposed previously as a matter of fact, and one which I would consider to be an almost last-resort activity. But I shall certainly take it under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: Surely before the minister has to go to the extent of taking boards of health into trusteeship, surely she could consider, could she not, giving these nurses the right to arbitration, which is all they ask and all they require?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, as I think I said, I would consider the hon. Leader of the Opposition's suggestion a last resort. I think there are many other steps which one would consider before that one.

Mr. Lewis: None of them is working.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West with his questions then, please.

BEER SALES AT SPORTS EVENTS

Mr. S. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

In the light of the decision last night by Metro council in favour of the sale of beer at Blue Jay baseball games, at least on a six-months' trial basis, might the minister now be prepared to support the resolution that I have tabled today which gives people credit for sufficient maturity to conduct themselves responsibly at the ball game, and permit beer to be sold at professional baseball stadiums in Ontario?

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I've seen neither the resolution from Metro council nor the resolution that the hon. member mentions.

Mr. Nixon: You are like Lord Nelson.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Once I've seen them I'll be discussing them with my cabinet colleagues and it will be a cabinet decision.

Mr. Peterson: What do you say, Sidney?

Mr. Nixon: You have got two blind eyes.

Mr. S. Smith: Does the minister, or for that matter does the Premier, agree with their former candidate, Barbara Greene, who said on the radio this morning that they are "out of touch with young people if you think that they're going to get their first drink at the ball game"; and that in any case, "better they should get it there than in the back alleys of Metropolitan Toronto"? Are you aware of that comment by your former candidate; and how do you feel about that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is that to me? Are you asking me?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'm not aware of the comment; and I wouldn't agree with it if I was aware of it.

Mr. Lewis: Is that a matter of confidence?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes; and I have news for you, be very careful.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough-Ellesmere with a supplementary.

Mr. Warner: To the minister: Could he share with us the explanation that he will be giving to Metro council with respect to a definition of local autonomy and how that affects this decision?

Mr. Deans: Would you fight an election over beer?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'd be glad to share with the hon. member and any other members of the House whatever explanation is

given to Metro council upon receipt of whatever resolution has been made by that council. I haven't seen it, I can't comment on it; and I don't know how I can share the reasons until that time comes.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, you are hiding.

Mr. Nixon: Bill knows best, he knows what local autonomy is.

Mr. Samis: Could the minister tell us if, once the election is over, once the baseball season is over, he would reconsider his intractable, immutable decision for the following season?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Beer in the Cornwall arena?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'm very grateful to the hon. member for his confidence that after the election I'll still be in a position to make that decision; and I assure him that I will do so.

Mr. Warner: As your party's critic perhaps.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The most revealing question of the week.

Mr. S. Smith: The new defeated party—the NDP.

CANADIAN HISTORY

Mr. S. Smith: What is the Premier's response to the charges levelled last night during the TVOntario programme entitled Issues, and supported by, among others, Dr. Ian Macdonald, that the inadequate instruction in Canadian history in our schools is a primary cause of the tensions that we are now experiencing in Confederation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I must confess that I didn't have a free evening last night—

Mr. Nixon: You need a rest, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —to watch TVOntario; which is a great organization; I'm delighted to know the leader of the third party is watching it. I was working in the public interest.

Mr. Reid: It is nice to keep busy.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. S. Smith: Does the Premier not get it in Fort Lauderdale?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was hoping the hon. member was going to ask me about beer. I guess when you're at 13 per cent you seize on any issue, don't you?

Mr. Roy: You weren't that popular about a year ago.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; only the hon. Premier has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Okay, who is on his side? Put your hands up.

Mr. Reid: I am.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, have you heard any kind of an answer?

Mr. Speaker: No, because of the interjections. The hon. Premier can continue with the answer to the question please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If there were fewer interjections I could get to my answer. I have to confess I did not see the programme so it's very difficult for me to comment on something I didn't see. However, I go back to a period of time when we had debates in this Legislature and discussions on the whole question of Canadian history. I can recall some dialogue between myself and the former leader of the third party on this issue.

It was very constructive. I can recall some constructive criticism emanating from that party as it related to a programme that I rather personally had initiated with respect to the teaching of Canadian history in the school system of this province. I recall very vividly a report being prepared related to this very subject. I acknowledge the great interest of a late member of this House, and one who took a very active interest in this himself, Alex MacLeod, who was partially involved in the development of this concern, this critique, and we discovered some very interesting things. I am just trying to give some background to the leader of the third party.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We discovered there was a certain reluctance—

Mr. S. Smith: It is a serious matter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a serious matter and I took it very seriously; I am pointing this out to him so that he will learn something from the history of the situation.

Mr. S. Smith: Then give an intelligent answer. Don't lecture me.

Mr. Lewis: This is intolerable.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am having a little bit of fun.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Would the hon. Premier continue with the answer to the first question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, now the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about his other two points.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The first question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, what we discovered in that discussion with the people in the profession, the history teachers, was their own reluctance in terms of, shall we say Canadian history being colourful, being the kind of thing they wished to emphasize.

As a result of this study, the Ministry of Education then, as it does now, has given great encouragement to the teaching of Canadian history. But I would point out to the leader of the third party that the teaching of Canadian history cannot be confined to the teaching of history in one single province. I want to once again acknowledge the involvement of an organization headed by a gentleman who is very close to the members opposite, Mr. Walter Gordon, in a programme which has been supported by this government in terms of finance, in terms of moral support, in terms of persuasion of the other provincial governments in this country as it relates to the teaching of Canadian history. I think it is important. It is something that has received a priority as far as government is concerned, and while I didn't hear what Dr. Macdonald, or President Macdonald, has said, I have to tell the leader of the third party if he had been here—and I am not being critical of this—some years ago, we had these discussions, and this government is very clearly on the record in terms of the importance of teaching Canadian history. But I say with respect it cannot be confined just to the province of Ontario.

I said something else, now that I am on the subject, some years ago—

Mr. Cassidy: We haven't heard this style of answer for a long time.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Cassidy: This goes back four or five years.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the hon. Premier continue with the answer?

Mr. Peterson: The style is the man himself.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I made some other observations—I forget to which organization—that while we can't get uniformity in terms of the teaching of history, that is something that I don't think one can expect; we have made progress in terms of mathematics and science, but it is very difficult to get uniformity in Canadian history among all the provinces of Canada.

I don't know whether this is what Mr. Macdonald was saying in whatever he said last night; I have no idea. He is only 100 yards away and I can go and ask him. But I would say to the leader of the third party that there are many reasons for the present difficulties we face, and I do not minimize the importance of history. It is taught in schools right across this country, as being a very important priority. But I just can't tell him that we have any capacity here to determine the history courses, the texts and so on in all the various provinces of this country.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Premier just answer two specific points; and they are: Can he assure us that he will take issue with the Minister of Education and guarantee that the new core curriculum, which includes Canadian studies, be implemented for those students presently in high school rather than simply for those who may be entering this fall, so at least they will know Canadian history; and can he guarantee us that some steps will be taken so that every public school child, every elementary school child in Ontario, shall have some reasonable understanding of the basic history of this country, especially at this time of crisis?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is in public schools, it is already in public schools; it is already there.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Talk to your former leader.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Where were you educated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I assume this is the point the leader of the third party made to that massive audience in Oakville last night on matters of education. I would say to him—and I don't often get provoked—the students in our school system are learning Canadian history. I happen to have five in the system. I don't know how many the member has.

Mr. S. Smith: Two, and they haven't learned a thing about Canadian history.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, my five are learning something about Canadian history and they

are damned proud of it. What I can't say to the leader of the third party is that every student in Canada is going to learn the same history. We don't have that capacity. It may be one of the problems, but to suggest to the public of this province that young people in our elementary and secondary school system aren't learning Canadian history and have no appreciation of it, is just pure, utter nonsense and he should know better.

Mr. Lewis: One of my children knows a great deal about Upper Canada.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been answered. I'll allow the member for Kitchener-Wilmot a final supplementary on this question.

Mr. Sweeney: Is the Premier not aware of the fact that it was on his own initiative in 1968, as the then Minister of Education, that it was no longer required that history be a compulsory subject in the secondary schools of this province?

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Sweeney: And has not been since that time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know a little more about the educational system in this province than some of his colleagues.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He knows full well Canadian history is compulsory. It is compulsory in the elementary grades and has been since day one.

This is where the young people get an appreciation and understanding. If he didn't teach it in his system then it was his negligence, but it was being taught in every other system in this province.

Mr. Conway: That is not the question.

Mr. Sweeney: The question has not been answered.

Mr. S. Smith: You are on weak ground.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I announced that was a final supplementary. I might point out that we have been close to 15 minutes on the—

Mr. Breithaupt: Who are you pointing it out to?

Mr. Speaker: Just to the House.

Mr. Breithaupt: I don't think we can have both leaders' questions answered at such length.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There has been a request that the question period change its format a certain amount to give more people a chance to ask questions and get answers. If that is going to be abused, if you spoil it; it's your question period and I can't help that.

Now then we will go back, as we promised. The Leader of the Opposition asked permission, and was granted it, to complete his first question—I guess we could call it that. The Minister of Education being here, he may now do that.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Mr. Lewis: Since it becomes clear from the previous exchange that teachers are badly needed in this system, may I ask the Minister of Education is there any way that he can move urgently in the area of grants for English as a second language, and special education classes for the learning disabled, in order to allow the maintenance on staff of 159 teachers in the Toronto board, whose dismissal seems not so much to be a matter of overhiring as a matter of inadequate funds to provide the programmes so urgently needed?

Mr. S. Smith: I think you are trying to get Cressy off the hook.

Mr. Lewis: Cressy? He is no longer there.

Mr. S. Smith: Yes, but he did the overhiring.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that there is a problem, budget-wise, insofar as the Toronto board is concerned. Declining enrolment is also part of the problem, as is the Metro staffing formula, a negotiated formula.

All of these together mean that the Toronto board, as I understand it, is not able to keep a group of teachers they hired and whom they didn't need last year. I think no one disputes that fact. It was an error, and errors are made, I guess we have to realize that.

Certain accommodations were made for those teachers over the year. But now the issue of permanent jobs for them is the question and it isn't possible for the Toronto board, under those various formulas I just stated, to offer permanent employment.

It bothers me—and I did some checking this morning—that some of the reductions the Toronto board has made in its number

of teachers because of declining enrolment involves cutting teachers in the special education and English as a second-language areas. I can't tell you exactly why they have chosen to do that, Mr. Speaker, at first glance it doesn't please me that they have done that.

That seems a rather strange area to cut. As the hon. member knows, we have suggested there will be some new initiatives in the English as a second-language area coming forward very shortly.

All I can tell the member at the present time is that I intend to investigate this matter just a little further to find out a little more about the special education and English as second-language areas that are represented here; but I think we also have to realize it is a case of a Metro staffing formula and a surplus of teachers who were hired because of an error a year ago.

[2:45]

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary then, quickly: Since the minister, as others, finds it unhappy that we always seem to have to cut back in the most vulnerable areas of the school system, around kids who are most vulnerable, and since he intends to introduce measures, financial included, to provide greater support in precisely those areas, can he ask the Toronto board to declare a moratorium on the dismissal of those teachers so that they can be absorbed, contingent on the minister's programmes?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't give the member that assurance until I find out exactly how this relates to the 159. I understand that 44 special education positions are being somehow phased out. I'd like to find out why, and how that relates to this particular problem. Certainly it doesn't sound at first hearing as if it's a very reasonable way to do it, but I've got to investigate it a little more before I can find out exactly why this is the situation.

I think my friend has to remember that the decision to do this has been made by a group of people who are elected the same as we are, and represent the citizens of Toronto. If we believe all we say about local municipal bodies, they are closer to those people whom they represent than even we are.

Mr. Lewis: Like Essex county.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Warner: To the Minister of Education: Am I to understand from the minister's statement about English as a second language that he will take the responsibility of direct funding for English as a second-language programme through his new legislation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh no, Mr. Speaker. I think if my friend remembers the Speech from the Throne, it said there would be some new initiatives in the area of English as a second language linked with our multicultural programme and our heritage language programme.

Mr. Warner: And will not include—

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, this is the English.

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: What's the Treasurer muttering about? Let the Minister of Educaion answer the question.

Mr. Conway: Darcy, you are not boss yet.

Mr. Ruston: He's trying hard, though.

Mr. Grande: Could the minister give us some ideas in terms of what these new directions are that he is talking about, as a result of the Throne Speech, in terms of ESL and in terms of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I'm sure the hon. member heard the hon. minister state these new initiatives will be announced shortly, and we will await that time.

HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, a question for the—Point of order, Mr. Speaker: Is he still to be referred to as the Minister of Housing?

Mr. Speaker: I don't understand the question. Would the hon. member please ask the question, if he has one, of the ministry?

Mr. Breaugh: To the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, I think the Minister of Housing: Would he be a little more specific in providing the House with the inventory or a list of properties that he intends to make available, with actual prices that he will charge to builders or developers, in this new dismantling of the HOME programme? And when he does that, does he intend to address himself to that small problem in the assisted-home-ownership programme of no income ceiling, so that the programme itself that he has opted into might be abused, if you like, by those who may not need the

financial assistance? Does the minister intend in any way to address himself to that problem?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. member has not taken the time to read the programme or he would know that there is, in fact, an income ceiling and that the grant structure that has been set up in the combination of the two programmes provides for a declining grant, to the point where there is no grant when the income ceilings are there—which has been a position espoused by the member's predecessor, a very commendable predecessor; the weakness of the opposition is noticeable now. It's there; read it.

Mr. Cassidy: That's a gratuitous comment.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But true.

Mr. Breaugh: Supplementary: I certainly appreciate the quality of the response. I wonder whether he does intend to present to the House the list of the properties that will be made available and the actual prices that would be charged. Does he intend to give us any inkling as to what he intends to do with things like North Pickering and Cayuga sites?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, certainly the prices of those lands will be public knowledge; we have said so, that they will be made available on the public market. I've indicated I can't give the member a specific price until such times as appraisals of the lands have been completed. We have said in the statements, and I repeat here, that it was intended they would be sold and will be sold at the low end of the market, the lowest of three appraisals.

I cannot comment on the Cayuga lands because it is not my area of responsibility. As far as North Pickering is concerned, we are carrying on with the final acquisition of that land. As the member knows, there is now some controversy over that, and at the same time we are proceeding with the planning for the area in conjunction with the regional municipality of Durham, to whom we have a commitment of not proceeding until we can find an accommodation with the region.

Mr. Breaugh: Could I have another supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We've had two questions. The one had to do with income ceilings and the other had to do with the price of lots; one's not supplementary to the other. I allowed them because they're in the same general field, but is this a supplementary to that question? It is? Then I'll allow a final supplementary.

Mr. Breaugh: Could the minister provide us with the rationale for proceeding with North Pickering and other sites under the Ministry of Housing, when he intends to buy it with public funds and then turn it back to private enterprise? Why is he continuing to do that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The hon. member should be well aware that the lands I'm referring to under the AHOP-HOME programme are lands that were purchased and were being held by the Ontario Housing Corporation.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The lands at the North Pickering site are lands that were not purchased by the Ontario Housing Corporation but are now in the hands of the North Pickering Development Corporation—

Mr. Lewis: They are both public lands.

Mr. Cassidy: They are public lands.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and they are proceeding in their planning as a developer would and are dealing with the regional municipality. It is not in my area of responsibility.

Mr. Breaugh: An excellent record of performance.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The hon. member will have to read the material and understand what is happening in those areas.

ABORTIONS

Mr. Sweeney: A question to the Minister of Health: What will be the response of his government to the initiative by the federal Minister of Health that he intends to press the provincial governments to set up regional abortion clinics to replace the present practice in provincial hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have had no such indication from my federal counterpart, Mr. Lalonde. I understand the federal Minister of Justice, Mr. Basford, has indicated he intends to tour the provinces to meet with officials. There has been no prior indication of what he specifically intends to say to us. When the report, known as the Badgley report, was received by my office, I established a review committee made up of representatives of the OMA and the OHA under

Dr. Caudwell of my ministry and I should have their report within a few months.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary: What would be the criteria of this ministry to determine whether or not regional abortion clinics might be set up?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We are not considering setting up regional abortion clinics. I don't know where it comes from. Maybe that's an idea being espoused by the hon. member, but it is not being espoused by me. The committee to which I referred, under Dr. Caudwell, is examining the report as it pertains to the application of the aspects of the federal Criminal Code that relate to therapeutic abortions—how they're applied in this province and how fairly they're applied.

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary: I'm wondering if the Minister of Health has considered adding a woman to his review committee?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: There are two women members of the committee.

Mr. Nixon: Another one will make three.

Mr. Ruston: Take one off; they only want one.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

DRIVERS' MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would like to reply to two questions asked on Monday, April 4, by the hon. member for Etobicoke.

Officials of my ministry did meet with members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters on March 17 and March 31, 1977. The question of confidentiality of medical records was raised at those meetings. The first concern raised was the right of the drivers to refuse to supply an employer with a copy of the medical report. It was, of course, possible to state emphatically that the employer had no entitlement to such reports.

On the more general question of confidentiality of medical records in our files, they were advised that complete confidentiality is maintained as a matter of firm ministry policy. This is not a new policy. The ministry's medical advisory committee has functioned for some 30 years and confidentiality of medical records has been maintained during that period and continues under the new licensing programme.

Section 143 of The Highway Traffic Act makes the original report of a medical practitioner, required under this section, privileged for the information of the registrar only and not open to public inspection. While this section does not ensure confidentiality of the types of reports filed by drivers for licensing purposes, the same policy is supplied to them without exception.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would also like to reply to a question asked Monday by the hon. member for Durham East also in connection with the classified drivers' licence system.

On the matter of the diabetics being excluded from operation of heavy trucks or passenger transport, this follows the recommendation of the Canadian Medical Association and is dealt with on pages 27 and 28 of their publication, A Guide for Physicians in Determining Fitness to Drive a Motor Vehicle:

"A problem of diabetics is the risk created by the element of instability that is always present and which is subject to so many variables. Insulin reaction can be caused by irregular or skipped meals, degrees of exertion, other illnesses such as flu, nausea, et cetera, which would, at times, prevent the diabetic from adhering to the usual diabetic diet, as well as errors of the patient in insulin dosage. An insulin reaction is not always accompanied by a warning and so mental confusion, automatic behaviour without memory or ability to function normally, or complete loss of consciousness may occur. Should any of these occur while driving larger commercial vehicles, or passenger-carrying vehicles, the results are potentially that much more hazardous."

Mr. Philip: I wonder why the minister cannot simply accept a statement by a qualified physician that the particular driver lives up to the criteria set by the ministry, rather than require the filing of all this detailed documentation that can fall into the wrong hands.

An hon. member: Like insurance companies.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You people are experts, yes.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —this information is at all likely to fall into the wrong hands.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Like you leave it on the desk and say it is there.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As I mentioned—and if the Premier wouldn't interrupt me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As I stated, Mr. Speaker, it is a strict ministry policy that all these medical records are kept confidential.

Mr. Mancini: It is the moustache.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Although The Highway Traffic Act of which I quoted a section requires the strict confidentiality of these records provided under section 143, the same section does not apply to the licensing records but, as I stated, as a ministry policy we follow the same degree of confidentiality. When reviewing future amendments, if it is the feeling of the House that it should be included, I'm going to discuss with my staff when we are bringing forward amendments to the Act that we include that degree of confidentiality right in the Act. I'm prepared to say right now that I will do that.

I'm not prepared to accept a simple statement from a doctor that a person meets our standards because, of course, we have a medical review committee; we have an appeal procedure, if it's necessary for the medical review committee to have the form forwarded to it. This is the policy in any other similar circumstance where a medical is required, that the report of the doctor is forwarded to the receiving authority so that if there is any doubt it can be reviewed by a medical review committee and not by one individual. I think this supplies a considerable degree of protection for the driver whose privileges you are concerned about protecting.

[3:00]

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I appreciate the minister's comments in regard to this question which was asked the other day, but what I would like to ask him now is, is there no recognition—and I have read the regulations—for the degrees of insulin requirements by various individuals, given that a great many people now qualify as commercial vehicle drivers holding licences? Those people will be precluded from holding such licence after February 1, 1978, and I think we are going to get into great difficulty there. Would the minister investigate that as well?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I will send the hon. member a copy of this Canadian Medical Association booklet which may help him.

In my previous answer I mentioned the medical review committee; that's why we have that committee. I think, not being one that knowledgeable about medicine, or not having had any direct personal experience with people who have to take insulin, there are obviously different degrees of capability or seriousness of the situation. I think anyone whose driving privilege is affected by these new requirements would certainly be able to ask for a review of his or her particular situation by the medical review committee and forward the necessary doctors' reports to support his particular degree of need so that it could be properly assessed. That's why we have the medical review committee, so that these can be assessed on an individual basis independently, and not just take the word of one doctor's yes or no.

Mr. Moffatt: Check with Bobby Clarke.

Mr. Cassidy: In view of the discrimination against people handicapped in this case, why is it that the diabetics are deemed not to be a risk if they drive cars; but to be a risk if they drive trucks?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't believe I ever said that they are considered not to be a risk if they are driving cars either. There is a degree of risk there.

I think I said in my first answer that with a person who could be subject to becoming incapable of driving because of this handicap, the degree of danger is much more serious if he or she is driving a bus down the highway with 50 or 60 passengers in it or driving a large semi-trailer than it is if he is driving his automobile. Of course, there is no doubt that if his degree of illness, shall we say, is serious enough, the medical review committee would not allow him to drive a car either.

BILINGUAL COURT SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: A question to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: In view of the several announcements he has made about bilingual court facilities in Ottawa, can he now give a date when bilingual court facilities will begin in the Ottawa area?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My best estimate at the present time is at the end of June.

WIRETAPPING CHARGE

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General as well: Is the Attorney General aware of a charge under section 178 of The Criminal Code, the wiretapping section, against the Niagara Falls telephone repairman who apparently found a listening device in the course of changing telephones and that this individual was in fact charged and, as I understand, acquitted?

Would the Attorney General express to the House or maybe give a directive to his officers about the propriety of an individual in the course of his work like this being charged under section 178 of The Criminal Code?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular case but I will be happy to learn what I can and report back to the House.

Mr. Roy: I wonder if the Attorney General as well might look at the fact that apparently section 178 of the Code covers the case where one in the course of his work—as is stated in the Code and I read just very briefly—"in the course of operation of a telephone or telegraph, discloses that there is a listening device." That is why, in fact, the individual in Niagara Falls, was charged.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As I indicated I will look into all the circumstances of this particular case and report back to the hon. member and to the House.

TOWNSEND TOWNSITE

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On Friday last the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. G. I. Miller) asked a question of the Premier as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Townsend site is in my riding and in view of the fact that agriculture requires many years of planning in advance, I wonder if the initial plans for the Townsend town site have been finalized, and when they may be made available?"

The planning work connected with the preparation of the Townsend community plan has, for all intents and purposes, been concluded. The planners are now preparing the final report for printing, and I understand it will be available in approximately six weeks. The results, of course, will be presented to the council of the regional municipality of Haldimand-Norfolk. In conjunction with this, however, the planning proposals will be subjected to review and evaluation by the responsible municipal and other public agencies, the citizens in the region and all other interested parties. At the conclusion of that review the province will meet with the region to determine the acceptability of the plan or the need for revising it.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: I wonder if the minister can indicate whether his ministry has made a decision to go ahead with the servicing of at least a part of the Townsend city site and the building of homes within the next 15 months? Secondly, is the commitment made to bring a water service either fully into the Townsend site or at least as far as Jarvis?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No. We have not made a firm decision to bring that servicing all the way up. As the hon. member is well aware, I'm sure, there has been some debate going on in the regional council about that. We had indicated to the council at a meeting held here in Toronto that we would like to see development take place and would like to see approximately 240 to 250 houses on the site by 1980. That decision, though, has not been finalized. That, of course, would require bringing the services, as he suggested, initially up to the site.

We have not made any commitment as far as the servicing of the area into Jarvis or Hagersville is concerned. There is still some negotiation going on between Stelco and the region and the Ministry of the Environment concerning the water supply for the Stelco steel works there—so, it's all to be tied together. No final decisions have been made yet.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: I wonder if the minister could tell us what the estimated cost would be to service the proposed 250 lots in the proposed city of Townsend? We've heard $40 million.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think the figure of $40 million is, probably, reasonably accurate—I would refer to my absent colleague for more exact figures—if you went in and put the total servicing in at one time. We have been looking at the possibility of starting off and phasing the servicing, so that you would not start off with an initial cost of $40 million, but substantially less than that. This would supply the water to those two communities that really need that water supply—Jarvis and Hagersville—as well as getting it to the Townsend site, and possibly using a lagoon system in the early part of the stage for sewer servicing.

LAND SPECULATION TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. Makarchuk: Question to the Minister of Revenue: In view of the fact that the Provincial Auditor has concluded that, on the basis of her ministry's decision alone, Ronto Development Company owes the province of Ontario something like $493,158 —that's without interest—does the minister intend to collect this money from the company now?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I have not been so informed by the auditor.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary: Will the minister, first, try to find out from the auditor that the computation has been made and, second, report back to the House as to what she intends to do about the matter?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I will take the matter under advisement.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Can the minister at the same time undertake the review to see what the amount would be if in fact the full profit of Ronto were subject to the land speculation tax? It appears to the members of the standing committee that it could be as much as $2 million that has been forgone as a result of the order in council exempting Ronto.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: My ministry has already been represented and has expressed its opinion before the public accounts commiteee.

COURT FACILITIES

Mr. Stong: Does the Attorney General propose the establishing of county court facilities in Willowdale and the building of a provincial court complex at Woodbine and Steeles? If so, does he intend to continue with the court complex at Newmarket? Again, if so, when does he intend to commence the project at Newmarket?

Mr. Hodgson: That was announced last week.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I know of no proposed county court facilities in Willowdale. When the courthouse is built in the north end of the county, it would be hoped there would be county court and indeed Supreme Court facilities there. I believe the Minister of Government Services (Mr. J. R. Smith) made an announcement last week with respect to the commencement date. I'm afraid I can't tell the member off the top of my head what it is at the moment.

LINCOLN PLACE NURSING HOME

Mr. Grande: My question is to the Minister of Health. Is he concerned that senior citizens are getting ripped off in nursing homes, in particular at the Lincoln Place Nursing Home? Is he aware that these senior citizens are being charged for services which they do not receive? Is he also aware that the ripoff has been going on since January 1975 and that Mr. Graham, chief of the nursing home inspection service, has known about it since May 1976 and to this date has done nothing about it?

Will the minister order an investigation or a review of the nursing home regarding pricing of services, whether the prices charged are legal and whether those residents who have been charged for services not rendered will be reimbursed?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, may I correct my answer to the member for Carleton East earlier? I said two of the members of the review committee were members of the female sex. I was incorrect. It's three out of the four nominated by the OHA and the OMA.

Mr. Lewis: What was that? Members of the female sex?

Mr. Speaker: Now the answer to this question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I believe the name of the nursing home in question is Lincoln Place. I haven't had any correspondence from the member. Fortunately, I do read the newspapers and members of my staff have talked with Mr. Corder, who is the head of our inspection branch. That matter is being investigated. As soon as I have a report on the matter, I will get back to the member.

TUBE TURNS STRIKE

Mr. Spence: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Could the minister inform me if any progress has been made in settling the strike at Tube Turns of Canada Limited in Ridgetown? As has been brought to my attention, there is big concern.

Hon. B. Stephenson: To my knowledge, that strike is not as yet settled but the members of the mediation conciliation branch are in touch with both parties. If there is anything

of event to report to members, I shall certainly report to the House.

BENEFITS RATES

Ms. Sandeman: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. In view of the fact that the Ministry of Community and Social Services has underspent its budget by some $31 million this year, could the minister explain why he is finding it so hard to give an immediate increase to recipients of family benefits and general welfare payments?

Mr. Conway: And don't shout; just settle right down. Your one pair of shoes won't last.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I have no intention of shouting. I am very calm.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. minister answer this particular question and just ignore the interjections, please?

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am sure the hon. member realizes, for one thing, that increases in the level of support for family benefits and the other income-support programmes are not a one-shot affair. While it's under consideration, the matter has to take into consideration resources on a longer-term basis than just at this particular moment in time. I would point out, just to put it in perspective, that under the family benefits alone we pay out almost $30 million per month in support under that one programme, not taking into consideration general welfare assistance and the other income-support programmes.

So although the $30 million that the member referred to—and I can't at this point confirm whether that's an accurate figure or not, but assuming that it is—seems like a very substantial amount of money, taken in the total picture of what the cost is in terms of income support programmes it is not such a large amount. It would be substantially less than one month's commitment, and if one looks at the long term, then I think one has to look at it more carefully before jumping to the conclusion that it's a good way to get rid of some excess money you have in the budget at the moment.

Ms. Sandeman: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that for family benefits recipients it is often the short term that is the most important to them, and that in the short term of last year the underspending could have meant an average increase of 9.7 per cent to family benefits and general welfare recipients had it been put to those budgets?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I can't, again, confirm the member's figures or her calculations. I'd be glad to take a look at them.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, for God's sake.

Hon. Mr. Norton: But I might add that certainly I'm aware of the importance of the short term and the long term and I think it would be totally irresponsible of us to jump to the conclusion that an immediate and perhaps very popular short-term infusion of funds might be very popular at the moment and create a great public response. I want to find a more reasonable and longer-term proposal that is going to be of more substance to the people in the province of Ontario who are receiving income supplements.

Mr. Cassidy: You are just a trendy version of James Taylor.

Mr. Warner: Did James Taylor leave you all his old speeches?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the minister consider phasing out any family benefits received by a recipient in case of the death of one of the members included in the family benefits team, rather than reducing it automatically on the death of the individual—phasing it out over a period of time?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would certainly be prepared to take a look at that. If the member could give me details of a particular case, I'd be quite prepared to look into it at the present time.

Mr. Warner: At the same time.

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you do something?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: There is a phasing-out programme under other circumstances. I'm not aware of the details in the case of death, but I'd be quite prepared to have a look at it.

FUEL RATES FOR FARMERS

Mr. Mancini: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister going to take action so that the farmers of Essex county and Ontario will no longer have to pay more for gasoline while they're

buying in bulk than they would when they buy at the retail level?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will check back through Hansard, I did cover that aspect of it. As far as the—

Mr. Conway: Have you done anything?

Mr. Nixon: It is still more expensive in bulk.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister ignore the interjections and answer the first question.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the hon. member should talk to his federal counterpart who put the five-cent tax on diesel fuel for farmers, for number one.

Mr. Nixon: What about your tax?

Mr. Breithaupt: What about your sales tax?

Hon. W. Newman: As far as tax is concerned in the province of Ontario, we don't tax the agricultural community for gasoline or diesel fuel.

Mr. Sargent: What about your 19-cent tax?

An hon. member: They're exempt.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Mancini: Supplementary: In view of the fact the farmers are now paying an average of three cents more per gallon while buying in bulk, does the Minister of Agriculture and Food have any plans for writing or getting information as to why these companies are allowed to do this? And does he also plan to take any steps, such as possibly writing himself to these companies to see if he can persuade them to lower their prices, in view of the fact that the farmers are already under severe hardships?

Mr. MacDonald: He is in favour of higher prices. Be frank, you are in favour of higher prices.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have already had correspondence with the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) and had quite a lengthy reply back from him on the matter; it's a matter of delivery by tank truck load and other matters. I think the member should ask the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) for details on it, but certainly I will be glad to give the member the facts that I have if he wants them.

Mr. Warner: I heard he can't read, Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has the answer to a question asked previously.

TORONTO DOWNTOWN PLAN

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, April 4, the hon. leader of the Liberal Party asked a question concerning the current Ontario Municipal Board hearings on the Toronto central core bylaw. At that time I agreed to provide further information with respect to senior citizens' projects. It is my information that there are four senior citizens' projects involved, which are being dealt with separately and apart from the core bylaw.

First, restricted area amendment bylaw 590-76 and 591-76 involves a senior citizens' apartment building on the north side of Queen Street between Beverley and John Streets. No objections were filed to this project and it was approved on March 18 and the board's order was issued on that date.

Second, restricted area amendment bylaw 616-76 and 616-77 involves a senior citizens' apartment building on the southeast corner of Sherbourne Street and Dundas Street east. On March 18 the OMB was advised by the city legal department that formal application for approval is not now being made.

Third, restricted area amendment bylaw 620-76 and 622-76 involves a senior citizens' building at numbers 12 to 14 Spadina Road. Objections have been received and a hearing is scheduled for May 19.

Fourth, restricted area amendment bylaw 566-76 and 567-76 involves a senior citizens' apartment building on the south side of College Street, west of Spadina, east of Augusta Avenue. Objections have been received and the date for a hearing has been set for July 25.

The reasons that the senior citizens' restricted-area amendment bylaws were capable of being separated from the core bylaw hearing is that these amending bylaws have, in fact, been passed by the city council. The matters that cannot be severed from the main core bylaw hearing are those applications to the council for amendments to restricted-area bylaws where the council has refused to pass the amendments.

As I understand the process, the hearing of the core bylaw involves a three-stage process: first of all, the consideration of the official plan as a whole; secondly, the consideration then of the particular height bylaw, and then

the third stage of the process is the amendments to the bylaw, or I should say the exemptions that are requested to the bylaw. Because it has to be carried on in this three-stage process it is not possible, I understand, to separate out any of the other projects.

I would like to underline the concern of myself and my colleagues for the rate of unemployment in the province, and particularly the concerns of the construction industry. Following my meeting last week with the chairman, I wrote him a letter as follows:

"There has been much recent concern over the rising rate of unemployment and in particular the increase in unemployment in the construction industry. Representatives of the construction industry have indicated that part of the problem stems from a delay in applications for new construction projects which must be approved by the OMB.

"I believe we should do everything possible to ensure the construction projects are not being delayed by our inability to process the OMB applications within a reasonable time. It is my view that we should give priority to OMB applications which involve new construction projects. I would appreciate your comments on my suggestion along with any difficulties you anticipate would be encountered in scheduling such applications in priority to the other work of the OMB."

In conclusion, I therefore invite any members of the construction industry, those involved in the industry, to advise us of any particular specific projects where they believe it would be in the public interest to expedite hearings before the OMB, and we would certainly lend our good offices to the expedition of these hearings. I understand further that the Treasurer of the province has had a similar conversation recently with the chairman to the same effect.

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest to the hon. Attorney General that an answer that length really should have been given in statements by the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Snow: But it was an important question.

WCB REHABILITATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister really aware that the length of vocational retraining allowed by the Workmen's Compensation Board, and therefore the type of course or programme that could be approved for an injured workman, is tied directly, and therefore limited, to his degree of residual disability or pension rating, irrespective of what course has been determined by Manpower, for example, through testing, as being the most appropriate course for that person, taking into account his interest, ability, intelligence and permanent productive prospects for the future?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I shall answer this extremely carefully because although I have been aware for a very long time of the relative weakness of the male sector of our species I really didn't know—

Mr. Peterson: Compared to who?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —until yesterday just how hypersensitive and how tremendously fragile were the psyches of the official opposition. Therefore, I shall be very sure in future that no words of mine will ever disturb their psyches unduly.

Mr. Breithaupt: Again.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes, I am aware of the kinds of limitations which are placed upon the rehabilitation programme. I am aware that these limitations are under review at the moment and that indeed there is to be a move to the direction of expansion of what has been a limitation in the past.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The oral question period has expired.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Breaugh: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Minister of Housing inferred that the Assisted Home Ownership Programme has an income ceiling. May I just simply quote from page 8 of the CMHC information booklet on AHOP, one line? "There is no income limit."

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think if anything, it was a point of order which was raised as soon as he could. If there is a brief reply I'll allow it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has suggested that my answer to his original question was not correct.

Mr. Lewis: It wasn't.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The hon. member is referring to the CMHC-AHOP programme

which quite properly does not have income limitations. If the hon. member will look at the new programme of the combining of AHOP and HOME he will find that there are built-in limitations of income, and he knows that is correct.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

AUDIT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 24, The Audit Act, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

MEDICAL DATA BANK ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 25, The Medical Data Bank Act, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish a medical data bank in which would be stored in computerized form the medical histories of persons in Ontario who wish to participate in such a bank. The proposed bank would be operated and maintained by the provincial Ministry of Health and every public hospital would have an outlet for the medical histories of persons using that hospital.

Written consent of a person concerned would be required before the record is stored in the bank and the medical history could not be removed without the written consent of his or her legally qualified medical practitioner. Social insurance numbers would be used for identification when using the medical data bank. Participation in the medical data bank would be on a volunteer basis only.

[3:30]

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, when I concluded last night I possibly made an inappropriate remark with regard to one of my colleagues, and to that end I would like to say that I am sorry.

Mr. Lewis: Your language was positively filthy.

Mr. Cunningham: I don't want to engage in a debate with the hon. Leader of the Opposition because he's been here a lot longer than I have, and he may stay a lot longer than I will.

Mr. Lewis: I doubt it.

Mr. Roy: I wouldn't count on that.

Mr. Cunningham: I would only say to him at this time that my language was not filthy. There are some in this House whose language is filthy, he is not one of them, of course.

Many hon. members have read of the memo—I don't think any of us has seen the memo from the Ministry of Government Services. I see the minister is in his seat at this time; if he'd like to send us the memo advising the ministry to bill firms now and to bill at a higher rate, I'd like to see the contents of it myself. I certainly would appreciate it. I know the Hamilton District Chamber of Commerce would like to receive it as well; they were interested in the contents of it.

I must say I was somewhat disappointed to read, in the account published in the Toronto Globe and Mail, that it was requested by a senior official in the Ministry of Government Services that his associates contact their suppliers with a view to getting their bills in and getting them in at the highest possible rate before the end of the fiscal year in order that the ministry could maintain or increase its budget in the coming year.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Only for work in that fiscal year.

Mr. Cunningham: It's hardly a standard business practice in the private sector, but I think it is typical of the stupidity that occurs in that particularly ministry. I can only say that it indicates quite clearly to me the need for the practices of zero-base budgeting. I think they should be considered very seriously as soon as possible. Ministries unable to meet their programme demands, and that fall below budget levels, should be hard-pressed, in my view, to justify budget increases in subsequent years. On the other hand ministries that over-spend their budgets should require serious analysis.

I was pleased to see today that we're going to be giving consideration to The Audit Act. I think we should give some serious

consideration to increasing the staff of our Provincial Auditor, Mr. Scott. I believe he and his staff have served the Legislature and the taxpayers very well, and especially indicating recently the abuse in the land speculation tax system and the problems in OHIP and a tremendous waste of millions at Minaki Lodge.

The government currently employs more than 14,000 contract employees. While I would say that some contracting can be justified, the process is often open to gross abuse in the form of patronage. The Civil Service Commission must be directed, I believe, to recommend guidelines which have economy and staff reductions as their first principles.

Serious consideration should be given to reorganizing and streamlining the cabinet. I was told not long ago that the cabinet in the British House has, I think, 25 persons operating 25 ministries. It's inconceivable to me that in a province with eight million people, with various other levels of government sharing responsibilities, we should have the number of people we do have in the cabinet at the current time.

I would suggest that we could possibly give consideration to combining the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the Ministry of Education because the two are so closely related. The tiny policy of the Ministry of Energy, I believe, should be combined with the Ministry of the Environment; they are directly related and, as things become more difficult in future as far as conservation of energy and the importance of our environment are concerned, I think a combination of them would serve us all very well. Correctional Services, at the same time, might well be combined with the Solicitor General's office, and Revenue could well be moved into the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

I believe, as I said earlier in my speech, that if all the ministries of this government served the people of northern Ontario effectively, there would be no need for a Ministry of Northern Affairs. In my view, there is no need for ministers without portfolio who, I respectfully submit, cost the taxpayers of Ontario at least $160,000 a year in current operating figures, and probably a considerable amount more thereafter, in the form of pensions, et cetera. In these times of restraint, the fact that we have such high-priced help, which I don't particularly think is required, really is a very serious condemnation of our sense of revenues and priorities—especially when we are contemplating closing hospitals or maintaining low or inadequate levels of workmen's compensation payments or family benefits assistance.

The cost of the Premier's office itself is indicative of spending trends in the province of Ontario. The total cost of this, I believe, now approaches something in the area of almost $2 million per year. We have people in the building tripping all over themselves in that office—some in this building who could be replaced with signs.

From my perspective, many wage settlements bear no relationship to productivity. While I don't want to malign any particular union or group, I would say that some unions, both in the public and private sector, have abused their position. In Canadian society, we have rather inadequate methods of settling labour disputes. I would have hoped through the course of the Speech from the Throne that we would have seen some indication that some tremendous improvements would occur in the provincial sector. It is not surprising that we see the kind of unfortunate adversary types of systems that have developed.

It's obvious to me now that we would do well to consider new methods of settling disputes, and they should be implemented immediately. I refer now to the need for updating our labour laws, the possibility of labour courts, recognition of final-offer selection as a method of collective bargaining, and productivity incentives—especially incentives for profit-sharing which our tax system should recognize and encourage.

I'd like, very briefly, to make a few comments on private enterprise. Initially, I should admit my bias in this regard. I'm a product of that system and it's a way of life I prefer to see continued. The late Robert Winters, the former federal cabinet minister, a Liberal, and prominent Canadian industrialist, once stated: "The more good decisions made in board rooms, the fewer will have to be made in cabinet chambers." And, while that was said a number of years ago, I don't think that is wrong.

Not long ago the chairman of the board of Labatts, also the owner of our new Blue Jays, stated: "Government ownership is no substitute for and guarantee of good management." I think he was very correct in that regard.

Mr. Philip: We're not going to nationalize the Blue Jays.

Mr. Cunningham: No, I don't think the Blue Jays will have to be nationalized. They could use some hitters, I think, though.

I would have liked to have spent some time talking about the Anti-Inflation Board

and some other subjects, but time does not permit.

Before I would conclude, I would like to make a few brief remarks on our regional system of government in Hamilton-Wentworth. When it was imposed on my constituents, they were assured there would be no loss of autonomy, there would be improved services, better strategy for growth, and a break on municipal taxes. I would respectfully submit that the opposite has occurred. Services have declined, the taxes continue to go up, there is currently no strategy for growth, local communities are losing their identities, duplication and confusion prevails. I seriously feel that our fiscal situation in that area will continue to deteriorate if a complete administrative overhaul is not considered immediately.

I'm pleased to see that the provincial Treasurer is in his seat at this particular point in time, and, possibly, I might through this speech ask him to give serious consideration to such a review. I've done it on a number of occasions and I'd like to see it undertaken as soon as possible, because I seriously do not believe we are going to be able to continue that structure of government as it currently exists. I see some study was given recently to the Ottawa-Carleton area, and I would hope the same consideration would be given to our region. I appreciate the efforts of the many people who work in the region, or for the region, and particularly the chairman, who is a fine person. But until administrative reform occurs, the cost to the taxpayer, I believe, will continue to rise.

Some people refer to the Hamilton-Wentworth region as a family. To that end, given the increase in taxes and the decrease in services, I think some of the communities in my riding should sue for non-support.

These are exciting times in the province of Ontario. The challenges are many and I believe these are times that require effective and immediate solutions to the problems. I also believe all members of this House have the moral commitment to work together on these contentious issues and our main challenge, I believe, is to see it through.

Mr. Davison: It is with great pleasure that I rise to participate in the Throne Speech debate and to reply to the Speech from the Throne. I promise to keep my remarks rather short.

Since I was elected to this asembly, there has been one agency of government that has continually caused severe hardships to large numbers of my constituents. That agency is the Workmen's Compensation Board. My staff and I have spent countless hours working with injured workmen trying to rectify some of the problems and some of the wrongs being done by this board in Hamilton. I can think of no agency that has caused more social damage in the community I represent.

There is something terribly wrong with the Workmen's Compensation Board and I'm thoroughly convinced that only the most drastic kind of action at this time can even begin to resolve the problems with the board. This is a most serious matter and I will not do it the injustice of attempting to deal with it in the limited time available in this debate. However, I would like to put the government on notice that I will take every opportunity in the coming months to raise this matter in an exhaustive fashion and to detail case after case where injustices have been perpetrated upon my constituents by the Workmen's Compensation Board. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I won't be the only member of the official opposition who will be doing so.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring before the House in some detail a matter that is becoming more and more urgent as the end of the month approaches. For some time now, I have been quite concerned about certain individuals and certain businesses that are purchasing income tax refunds at rather considerable discounts in this province. April 30 is the tax deadline, so the need for speedy action is quite obvious.

In early February, these companies came to my attention as the result of constituents coming into my office and complaining about them. These businesses take an individual's income tax information and provide an estimate of the tax refund. The client may then sell the full return for a portion of the refund which is then received in immediate cash. Power of attorney is turned over to the companies and the individual never sees the actual amount that he is reimbursed by the government. Any error, unintentionally or otherwise, on the part of the company or the individual can result in a substantial windfall profit for these companies without the knowledge of the client.

There is no standard percentage taken by these firms. What they do, is they make a determination, based on risk and based on the amount of money one is to get in his return, and refund him usually 60 per cent or less of the amount of money shown on your return. If one chooses to look at the fees they charge as interest rates, as some people do choose to look at them, com-

pounded annually they can equal 2,000 per cent in some cases. It's totally outrageous.

It was immediately apparent to me that the public was being ripped off by these companies. These companies have been, and still are, gouging those constituents of ours who can least afford it, the constituents of every member of this assembly, because the people most vulnerable to these services are those in such dire financial straits that immediate cash is necessary. I'm sure this House is the one forum in which I don't have to make the case against this kind of activity. I'm sure that all members understand the kind of social damage that can result when so much money is taken out of people's pockets.

Earlier this week, no less a radical rag than the Toronto Star criticized these activities in an editorial. It said: "There is something wrong when operators can prey on people, many of them unsophisticated and often desperate for money, by charging exorbitant rates." Even that champion of consumer rights, that Ralph Nader of Ontario, our own Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), has lashed out at these firms. He said, and I quote: "We consider it almost to be a criminal offence," or, and I quote again: "In our view, they ought to be prohibited and not merely regulated." When constitutents brought this matter to my attention, I made some initial inquiries.

[3:45]

Mr. Philip: But only by the federal government.

Mr. Davison: Yes, stand in line. I made some initial inquiries when my constituents brought this matter to my attention and I was quite surprised to find out that these operators aren't breaking any laws. They are not breaking any municipal laws, they are not breaking any federal laws. There is no legislation in place.

It seemed to me at the time that the obvious next step was to write our dear old Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations about the matter, and I did so on February 15, 1977. I explained the situation and asked the minister to investigate the matter. I suggested that he propose changes to current laws that would get these services under control.

On February 22, the minister put pen to paper and signed what seemed at the time to be a more or less reasonable reply to my request. After some bizarre and on my part unsolicited comments, the gist of which seemed to have been an attack on the province of Quebec, the minister finally got down to the problem at hand. He parroted my concerns and explained that his ministry's legal advisers had told him there was no way in which the province of Ontario could claim jurisdiction in this matter.

He also told me he had absolutely no authority under The Business Practices Act to move against these corporations, and he was further able to inform me that the chances of a conviction under The Unconscionable Transactions Act were quite slight. The minister concluded his letter by saying, and I quote: "I must confess that I am as frustrated as you are in attempting to deal with these kinds of operations."

Mr. Speaker, if I might be able to suggest to you en passant, if the minister is as frustrated or even half as frustrated as I am, I think it's about time he stopped engaging in the practice of self frustration. At the time I wasn't prepared to drop the matter, so I looked into it further. I looked for solutions on the municipal level, the provincial level and the federal level, and I will deal with the municipal and federal aspects very briefly later on.

The minister clearly indicated to me in that letter that other provinces were not challenging the federal government by introducing their own legislation. I was absolutely shocked when I discovered some time later that several provinces were not only considering bringing in legislation but actually already had legislation in place. Manitoba and Saskatchewan both have excellent legislation which limits the discounters to five cents on the dollar. They are required to pay 95 cents on the dollar. Even British Columbia, which isn't exactly a bastion of progressive government these days, has legislation on the books which requires the discounters to pay 85 per cent.

Frankly, I didn't know what to think. I was absolutely sure that neither the minister nor his staff was deliberately trying to mislead me. The only other conclusion that I could draw from the minister's letter of February 15—I am sorry, February 22—was that his staff was so entirely ignorant of what was happening in the other provinces in this country that it suggested an unbelievable lack of competence on its part.

I wrote to the minister in rather strong terms suggesting he should make himself aware of the fact. I also asked him to introduce legislation when this House came back into session. I also told him I couldn't

imagine how he could possibly do anything less than that. Well, how poorly sometimes those of us in the opposition understand the reality of Tory government in Ontario. As my leader was saying the other day, for the Tories in Ontario, politics is very much the art of the minimum.

On March 31, at question period, I took the opportunity to ask the minister when he would introduce legislation. He took that opportunity to pass the buck along to Ottawa. Later on the same day, Ottawa passed the buck back to the province. The minister then had the unmitigated gall to attack those provinces in this country that were doing something to protect their citizens while he was sitting about doing absolutely nothing.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's normal for them.

Mr. Davison: I'm afraid it is.

Mr. Philip: Who was that, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations?

Mr. Davison: Yes, "commercial protection" I think is the new name for the ministry. He said that the legislation in the other provinces was completely unconstitutional, that they had no right to be passing it. Under questioning from the Leader of the Opposition the minister admitted that in fact no jurisdiction had had their legislation successfully challenged in the court.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the members of this House that I take a very dim view of any minister of the Crown who thinks that he's a member of the judiciary branch of government rather than the executive or the legislative branch of government.

Mr. Makarchuk: Some of them think they are God.

Mr. Davison: Under questioning by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), the minister admitted that he hadn't even bothered to talk with the Minister of Revenue, his cabinet colleague, about the possibility of a provincial solution. Now, I ask, how do you deal with such a character?

On April 4 I was forced to introduce a private member's bill in an attempt to get some solution to this problem. I am sure it will be as effective as private members' bills in the past have been, because I'm due in the lottery for Christmas, and the deadline for this is April 30.

On April 5 the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations penned another of his very weird replies to me, in which he said he was deeply disturbed. I was inclined to agree with him. He also had managed to come up with an entirely new excuse for not acting—one that rather surprised me. Let me quote from that letter:

"We are all aware that there is now far too much legislative and administrative overlap between the two senior levels of government. Federal and provincial roles must be re-examined and rationalized. The case of the discounters is as clearcut a starting point as we will find."

My goodness, for the sake of rationalizing overlap—what greater cause?—this minister is prepared to allow the people of our province to be gouged. What a sad and sorry thing government in Ontario has become.

One of the arguments that the minister uses frequently to avoid having to regulate these businesses is this desire of his to completely prohibit these sophisticated loan-sharking operation. It's something new for him. That's not an opinion he held earlier on this issue, because in an appearance by him before a recent parliamentary committee he proposed the suggestion which he himself admitted would not eliminate the practice but rather make it less profitable. In other words, Mr. Speaker, regulating the practice. There are so many examples of this minister fudging on this issue that I can't possibly take the time to list them all.

I mentioned earlier that I would make some brief comments on the federal aspects of the situation and the municipal aspects of the situation, and I'd like to do so at this time. Clearly, the federal government is capable of acting in the matter. The reality, however, is that they have not yet passed legislation. That is not an excuse for this government to duck the issue; rather, it's cause for this government to take action of one sort or another. I might add that if we wait for the federal Liberals to act, we could all be waiting for a very, very long time.

On March 4 of this year I wrote to the Hon. John Munro, who is the federal Liberal member in the area that I represent in this House, and asked him for his assistance in speeding up federal legislation for the protection of our mutual constituents. To this date, a month later, he has yet to even acknowledge receipt of my letter, so I don't suggest we sit around waiting for the federal Liberal government to take action to protect the people of our province.

Last month I appeared before the city of Hamilton's legislation, fire and licence committee to ask the committee to enact a bylaw attempting to solve this problem.

The committee was quite concerned about the issue and they agreed with me. As members know, The Municipal Act does not specifically give the municipalities power to act in this area. Attack under the general sections of The Municipal Act, such as section 242, was rejected for rather obvious reasons by the city council. I am certain—I am absolutely certain—that if this province took the initiative to make some very minor changes in The Municipal Act—three or four words is all it would take—that several cities, several municipalities in our province would move to put these operators under control. I wonder, are all the members of this government, are all the members of this cabinet so unwilling to protect the consumers as the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations is? Why hasn't one of his colleagues moved to do something about it?

I've given this matter a great deal of thought and I've spent a fair amount of time on it, and I've come to the conclusion that it is clearly a question of consumer protection in Ontario for Ontario residents. The failure of this ministry to protect the consumers of our province, even though the need is totally documented and admitted by the minister—and let me say there are several ways in which it could be done—that unwillingness, that failure is totally unacceptable by any standard imaginable.

On April 4 in this House, the Leader of the Opposition remarked on this minister, and I think he expressed the real problem we're faced with in a way that few members of this House could have expressed it. I would like to associate myself with the remarks he made at that time. I would remind the members of just two sentences in those remarks, and I quote the Leader of the Opposition: "If I may submit to you humbly, Mr. Speaker, he is the wrong minister for anything to do with consumer protection—anything at all, whether it's rents or whether it's television repairs. His refusal to consider a simple intrusion on the private marketplace to protect consumers from illegitimate private behaviour makes this often unworkable; and it leads to the minister's own lovable eccentricities, which then govern, piously, the programmes we implement."

But perhaps even better than the Leader of the Opposition, the problem of the current minister is best understood by the current minister. I have a copy of his testimony before a parliamentary committee in which the minister stated, regarding this very matter of consumer protection that I have raised: "Leave alone those activities in the marketplace, which for the most part are self-regulatory. Again, we speak from the point of view of a philosophy. Our belief is that the less intrusion in this kind of thing, the better." Oh, that's a philosophy for you, boy.

In conclusion, I don't mean to condemn the current Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I don't mean to condemn him at all. I'm sure that he's well qualified to sit as a minister of the Crown in this province. The problem is, he's simply been given the wrong ministry. I am totally convinced, for example, that he would do a splendid job as the Minister without Portfolio.

I sincerely hope that this minister will step down from his position in the cabinet before April 30, so that something can be done about this problem and so something can be done about all the other problems faced in the field of consumer protection in this province.

[4:00]

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss only one matter with you, sir, and the other members of the House who are gathered in such numbers this afternoon. It has to do with the government's decision to exempt Ronto Development Company from the payment of land speculation tax. The reason I bring this to your attention, sir, is that you are no doubt aware that in Votes and Proceedings, paper No. 1, there is a resolution passed by the standing committee on public accounts calling on the government to establish a select committee to look into this matter. I am afraid that it is not going to be raised by the government in any significant way, even though the instruction is there from the all-party committee, and is quite clear. I would hope, because of the information that has been put before the standing committee by the Provincial Auditor, that the government can be persuaded to take some positive action to remove the uncertainty, the lack of information and the cloud which lies over the judgement of the government in exempting Ronto Development from paying the land speculation tax.

I think you're aware, Mr. Speaker, that the matter was referred by special resolution of the House to the standing committee which was also granted the rather special power to sit when the Legislature itself was not in session. At the meeting on February 3, 1977, the Auditor, who attends all of the public accounts meetings and is the main source of professional advice in this connection, was instructed to gather information and documents pertaining to the decision of the

government to exempt Ronto Development Company from the payment of the land speculation tax.

The delay, until the Auditor brought the material before the committee on March 29, was caused by the fact that he had to undertake many visits to a number of offices to look over the extensive files in these offices of the papers and materials associated with the Ronto Development matter and then make judicious extraction from those documents; those which he felt would be of importance and significance to the standing committee on public accounts. So it wasn't until March 29 that the Auditor put the materials before the members of the committee for our perusal.

We had an opportunity to look at these documents and they were voluminous indeed. They formed a stack about six inches high, although they were all carefully indexed and tabulated so that we could consider them more readily than would have otherwise been the case. We came to the conclusion as a committee because of the importance of the matter and for other reasons that I'll bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, during the course of my remarks, that it was essential that this House move to establish a select committee so that a more careful investigation into this important matter could be undertaken.

I simply bring to your attention, sir, that the decision by order in council of the government meant that the Treasury of the province was by this decision in a position to forgo as much as $2 million in legitimate taxation. Basically, Ronto Investments purchased the property, which was in Brant county and is now by annexation in the city of Brantford, for just under $1.5 million. Less than two years later the property was sold for $12 million. It was not developed as required by The Land Speculation Tax Act for forgiveness of the tax or exemption. It was by order in council that Ronto was exempted.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, first something about the land in question. It is a well known farm in the area of Brant county. I suppose if you were to pick out the best farming land in the whole of the county—you would find that farm among the 10 most productive, most fertile farms. Because of its location right close to the city of Brantford and now within the city of Brantford, I suppose it was inevitable that it be developed under the present procedures for land-use planning. I would think a decade from now it would be impossible, whatever government is in office in the province or in Canada, or whatever the thoughts of any local council, to put that land to ordinary development purposes.

I feel it is essential—and I don't want to get off the track of my remarks—that this House takes action as soon as we possibly can to see that there is a procedure whereby such excellent land is not going to be developed in a way which means that forever it will be lost for the production of food material. I've heard so many members of this House talk about the need to protect class 1 land, but I wish that I could take the interested members to see that farm which is one of the best in the province.

A good friend of mine, James W. Pate, inherited it from his father. I can remember him being in high school when the sad news of Jim Pate's father dying came to our attention. Jim, who was 18 or even younger at that time, left school to take up farming full time. He has made an excellent success of it with the help of his charming wife, and I believe four or five sons, all of them very able young men, well known in the community.

The fact that the farm was on the edge of the very rapid development coming out toward the northeast from Brantford meant that under our present laws and planning regulations it was inevitable that it would be developed and Mr. Pate, I think very wisely, decided to take some initiative in that connection, and I understand sought out the possibilities of making a sale, so that he could use the proceeds to relocate himself and his family so that they could continue farming with the skill that they have and enjoying the lifestyle which certainly is an enviable one.

I wanted just to indicate, however, sir, the materials that came before the standing committee which prompted us to consider and finally pass a resolution calling for the establishment of a select committee to look into this. Because the first instance that concerned us was that the government, in giving its indication of the reasons for the exemption from the land speculation tax, decided that the transfer of the land from Mr. Pate to Ronto took place on September 18, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize in advance for having to refer to some specific dates, but they are essential, because this Legislature in its wisdom passed the land speculation tax on April 9, 1974. As a matter of fact that is not the date it was passed, but it was introduced into the Legislature following the Treasurer's budget of that time, and it was many weeks later before it became law.

But one of the sections indicated that its application began April 9, 1974.

Now the document that the Auditor provided for us was referred to by the solicitor for Ronto when he appeared before our committee, Mr. E. A. Goodman. He indicated that the document itself was essentially the sale document. It was then possible for the officials in the Ministry of Revenue to establish the sale date at that time.

Upon examination of that document it became clear that it was very little more than an offer to purchase, very little more than an option—a nine-month to a 12-month option—giving Ronto the opportunity to buy the property if certain conditions were fulfilled. For a period of nine months Mr. Pate, the original owner, was not permitted to sell the property to anyone else. I suppose it was on that basis that the solicitor for Ronto wanted to have the earlier date established as the date of the sale of the land or the acquisition of the land.

Now in fact the deed was transferred much later than that. It was transferred on June 25, 1974. Since this was substantially after The Land Speculation Tax Act went into force, the timing of the sale for taxation purposes is of great importance indeed.

One of the first questions that was asked the Provincial Auditor was as to his opinion on the decision made by the Ministry of Revenue on whether or not the sale took place the previous fall, that is before the land speculation tax became law, or in fact after it. The Provincial Auditor said—and I don't blame him for this—"I am not a lawyer, but in my opinion the sale took place after The Land Speculation Tax Act came into force."

I will try to explain in a few moments how important this is. It has no bearing on any possible payment by Mr. Pate of this tax, because you can easily find that the transaction between Ronto and Mr. Pate was at a level where no land speculation tax would be paid, and of course Mr. Pate had been the owner and the bona fide farmer of the property for his whole lifetime, and his father and his grandfather before him. So we are not talking about that particular matter.

As a matter of fact, although it has no significance in this House, Mr. Pate will be subject to the federal tax, capital gains tax, because the valuation, of course, would have gone up from the evaluation day pertaining to the federal capital gains legislation. There is a strange anomaly in that case where the one government is attempting to set a value which would mean that the value of the Pate land to Mr. Pate had accrued to the largest amount so that he would be liable for the largest amount of capital gains tax, whereas another government seems to be attempting to establish a value in a slightly different direction for special purposes of the land speculation tax computations.

But I wanted to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Auditor himself expressed an opinion to the committee that he felt for tax purposes the sale of the land should properly be construed as of June 25, 1974. There is no verbatim record of the statements made before the committee on public accounts and I trust that I am in no way misleading the House in putting to you, sir, in the words that I have used, what I consider to be the views expressed by the Auditor.

But I would also like to quote from one of the papers that the Auditor put before us. It is a letter signed by Mr. I. Stephenson, one of the directors of the Ministry of Revenue, and I quote from the fourth paragraph of his letter dated February 18, 1976. "On the basis of the information provided, it would appear that the designated lands were acquired by the transferor after April 9, 1974."

So in the first instance when this matter was brought to the attention of the Ministry of Revenue it was clear to them that the transference date from Mr. Pate to Ronto was after the establishment of The Land Speculation Tax Act. The reason that this is important is that because of certain events which I don't intend to be talking about here in any detail, Ronto felt that they did not want to carry on the development of the land themselves to the point where they were fully serviced and the lots ready for building. They entered almost immediately into negotiations with a company called George Wimpey Canada Limited for the sale of the whole tract of land, about 340 acres.

It is interesting to see the documents indicating that the exchanges of views between these two large development firms, and without going into any detail, it is clear that the transference was intended to be made, for example, without a real estate agent having been involved. It is interesting to note that the transference from Mr. Pate to Ronto Development makes no indication of any agent having been present or having been used in the transference or the sale of the property. But when Ronto finally did decide that it was going to complete a sale to

Wimpey, then the amount of $12 million, which was the purchase price, an extremely high price indeed, a very profitable price indeed, would give some real concern as to the payment of the land speculation tax.

Whereas the solicitor for Ronto, Mr. Goodman, had indicated in his letter to the Ministry of Revenue that a good deal of development had already taken place, still there is not a clear indication that the land was serviced to the extent, as Mr. Goodman said in his letter to the Ministry of Revenue, and I believe I can quote it: "The pipes are practically in the ground." It was really far from that. And while this may have just been more or less a loose use of words, still there is no indication that the land itself was developed and was therefore under the provisions of The Land Speculation Tax Act that it could be exempted.

It was not developed. In fact, it was sold by Ronto to Wimpey and was developed after that sale took place; that is, the servicing was established well after that sale took place.

I can quote, Mr. Speaker, from a communication addressed to Mr. I. Stephenson, director, succession duty branch, Ministry of Revenue, from the solicitor for Ronto. The letter is dated February 13 and he says in the second page, the third paragraph: "You will notice that it is also a term of the condition that a subdivision agreement be assigned prior to the closing. In short, our client has done everything except put the pipes into the ground."

[4:15]

Obviously the solicitor for Ronto had to use all of his undoubted abilities to persuade the Ministry of Rvenue that an exemption could be recommended to the government of Ontario on a bona fide basis. I'm not for a moment saying this letter is misleading, other than to say that there is no evidence that was put before the committee that the services were in. As a matter of fact, the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk), who at that particular time had just left his services as a councillor for the city of Brantford, was able to bring to us the dates for the calling of contracts for the servicing of this land and those dates were very much later than the dates of the matters that I am putting before you, Mr. Speaker, today.

I have also been considerably concerned as well that an evaluation of the property known now as Brantwood Estates—it used to be the Brantwood Farm—in our area, was carried out by a firm from Waterloo, W. H. Reimer. The evaluation was carried out on behalf of Ronto, who were very much concerned that the huge profit, if it were to be taxable based on the price they had given Mr. Pate, would have subjected them to a land speculation tax in excess of $2 million. So they hired Mr. Reimer to make an evaluation of the property at valuation day for land speculation tax which was April 9.

By coincidence, the same firm, W. H. Reimer, had been inserted into the Pate-Ronto deal as an agent and had been paid $36,250 on June 4, 1974, in its capacity as an agent. The same firm, according to the material given to us by the Auditor, was used to evaluate the same property for the purposes of the sale by Ronto to George Wimpey Canada Limited, and in order to establish a value for the land. Mr. Reimer, as certainly was appropriate, examined the sales of a number of properties in the area at about that time, and in this connection there is a further communication from the solicitor for Ronto indicating as follows—this is a letter from the solicitor for Ronto, once again to Mr. I. Stephenson of the Ministry of Revenue, dated March 10, 1976. Now I quote from the main paragraph of the letter:

"The designated lands were purchased under an agreement of purchase and sale dated September 18, 1973." In parenthesis, I simply bring to the attention of the House that this follows the one from Mr. Stephenson indicating that the sale was after April 7, 1974. So they're trying to establish this date for evaluation purposes. "The transaction was closed on June 26, 1974. The valuation we have used as of April 9, 1974, can be substantiated by sales of adjacent properties owned by one Webster which sold at a price of $20,000 an acre. Prior to April 9, 1974, our client's lands were annexed to the city of Brantford which substantially increased its value."

Now written in the margin of the letter that is provided to us by the Provincial Auditor is a notation, "October 1, 1974." In other words, in spite of the letter signed by the solicitor for Ronto, Mr. E. A. Goodman, the annexation did not take place prior to April 9, but in fact took place some months later, October 1, 1974. The letter also refers to the fact that the property owned by one Webster was used as the basis for evaluation. Now one Webster happens to be Max Webster, who is a well-known entrepreneur, a farmer—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) keep his voice down? I under-

stand he's the next speaker on my list. The hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Breaugh: He's warming up.

Mr. Nixon The gentleman who is referred to in Mr Goodman's letter is the vice-chairman of the Ontario Racing Commission, obviously a good friend of Mr. Ron Todgham, now deceased. The valuation of the Ronto land—president, Mr. Todgham—has been established basically by comparing it with the value of the lands owned by Mr. Max Webster in a nearby and adjoining area. Upon reading, as carefully as we can, the documents that the Auditor has provided for us, it's clear that Mr. Webster and the representatives of Ronto—whether it was Mr. Todgham at that time or not—co-operated in working with the city of Brantford on the establishment of this area and its developmental plan.

I would emphasize to you, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of what I'm talking about now, I can't see anything wrong in the procedures. I would be critical of the solicitor for Ronto for perhaps overstating the position of the lands under discussion because they had not been annexed, as his letter claimed, and there is some indication that the servicing of the land had not gone nearly as far as the letter had indicated.

When we come to the sale of the properties from Ronto to Wimpey, which had been negotiated all during this year, the Auditor has provided the members of the committee with a number of draft agreements. On a number of these agreements, we find it is clearly indicated that no agent would be used in the sale. As a matter of fact, it states clearly in some of the drafts: "No agent used."

After a while, particularly when it becomes quite clear that the sale from Ronto to Wimpey is not going to go forward—because, at the price at which the land is going to be transferred, the $2 million or nearly $2 million in land speculation tax tends, let's say, to dilute the advantages of the sale to some extent—there's a tendency for the negotiations to sag a bit. Then another draft comes forward and there is an agent referred to.

Let me make it clear that the seller, Ronto, and the buyer, Wimpey, were clearly in negotiation for some months before the agent, Ernest Goodman—and I want to make it clear that this is not the E. A. Goodman who was the solicitor for Ronto—was brought on the scene.

Mr. Ferrier: Is he related?

Mr. Nixon: It is very interesting to see the documents as they were put before us by the Auditor, because the first communication directed to Mr. Ernest Goodman was delivered by hand to the Primrose Club. There's some indication that they didn't even know where to find his business address, although that, of course, seems to be incredible. But the copies of the letter put before the members of the committee indicated that the communication was put before the agent at the Primrose Club.

It's very difficult to see what function the real estate agent, Ernest Goodman, was able to perform, since the buyer and the seller were already in quite deep negotiation—over the numbers of lots that would be transferred and the whole thing—and the copies of these negotiating forms have been put before us. Then this agent comes along. I'm sure he's a bona fide agent, a very able person indeed, but it seems to me that he did little or nothing for the fee of $400,000 that was paid to him.

Mr. Worton: That is a commission.

Mr. Nixon: All of these matters have given rise to a concern by the members of the committee. To begin with, we were not persuaded to accept the decision of the Ministry of Revenue that the transference from Mr. Pate to Ronto was, in fact, on September 18, 1973. We can undestand why Ronto would like that, and we have no objection at all to their solicitor writing to the government to persuade them that the government's first reaction—that is, that the sale was later—was wrong. That's surely why you hire a lawyer. That's probably why you hire a good lawyer. It's probably why you hire the very best lawyer you can under those circumstances. And that's certainly what Ronto did.

But we are very concerned that the officials in the Ministry of Revenue, and the minister, saw fit to recommend to the cabinet that the purchase date was June 25 and that the amount of tax that would otherwise have been collectable would have been something like $400,000, rather than $2 million. We are concerned that the government should excuse Ronto completely from paying speculation tax on property for which they paid $1.5 million and sold less than two years later for $12 million.

The committee has examined it. It's difficult to keep the date straight and to put all the correspondence in some kind of order. The only person that we on the committee are criticizing is the Minister of Revenue and the government who took his recommendation that there should be an exemption established by order in council. We feel the reasons given by the former Minister of Revenue were inadequate.

Mr. Drea: You weren't even there.

Mr. Nixon: He indicated that after the unfortunate—

Mr. Drea: You weren't even there when he gave them.

Mr. Nixon: I certainly was.

Mr. Drea: You were not here when he gave them.

Mr. Nixon: I believe the member is right. I was not at the committee when he gave those reasons.

Mr. Drea: You are right: You are absolutely right.

Mr. Nixon: They were fully reported and there was nothing secret about the position put before the committee by the government. If the hon. member who may speak next—and probably he will be speaking all the time now that he's in here—is indicating that there is some information that I put forward that is not factual, then he will have every opportunity to put that forward before the House.

Mr. Makarchuk: You were not there either, Frank. You were not there either.

Mr. Drea: I'm not saying that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nixon: All right. The former Minister of Revenue had come to the committee, and it was fully reported. Of course, I was very interested in it, since it involved land well known to me and formerly in Brant county. I was particularly interested that the minister said: "Upon the unfortunate and unexpected death of Mr. Todgham, who was well known in the community and had served on a number of boards and was extremely active in many business areas, evidently there were some problems with the estate and that liquidity was essential." Therefore, the government had to permit the sale to Wimpey, which had given an undertaking to carry on with the development of the land and build the houses because it wanted the government to make an exemption of the tax for that purpose.

There has been no evidence given to our committee of the problems that the Todgham estate had with liquidity. There is no evidence of the problem that Ronto had with liquidity. As a matter of fact, it was pointed out by the member for Brantford and is evident to anyone who listens to Channel 11 television, Ronto has bought some of those serviced lots back; they're building houses on them and they're advertising in the Hamilton area for people to come up to Brantford and enjoy the obvious advantages of living in that part of the world. That's very, very sensible for business people to do that.

So the reasons for the exemption are completely inadequate. The problems that the government has had with this may have come to a head when we see that the Minister of Revenue does no longer hold that portfolio.

Mr. Drea: Shame. What a cheap shot.

Mr. Nixon: Shame? He was removed from the portfolio and he's now Minister of Correctional Services.

Mr. Drea: What a cheap shot.

Mr. Nixon: And I will tell you—if that isn't a demotion, what is? I don't think the man warranted that, since the decision to exempt Ronto was not made by the Minister of Revenue but made by the whole cabinet. That is the objection that we have.

Mr. Drea: On the same basis you should be the Liberal leader today. What a cheap shot.

Mr. Nixon: I have tried to put before you and the members of this House not the whole compendium of information that was put before us by the Auditor. He gave us three books—bigger than this—of the extracts from the correspondence and the accounts of all the companies concerned. The Auditor himself indicated to us that the dates of the transfers from Pate to Ronto were different from the one that the government has accepted. The letter from the officials of the Ministry of Revenue indicated that the date was the date after the establishment of the land speculation tax.

We're very concerned about these matters. We're particularly concerned that in these times, by decision of the government's order in council, Ronto has been exempted from

paying the amount of tax that has been previously referred to.

[4:30]

As a matter of fact, I just wanted to make one reference to the amount of that tax because the Auditor was asked by the public accounts committee to determine how much tax had been foregone. His conclusions were that approximately $400,000 had been forgiven. At the time the application from Ronto for this matter before the Ministry of Revenue, they asked the solicitor for Ronto to make an application indicating the figures that would normally be used to compile the tax. While Mr. Goodman or the person from the solicitor's office for Ronto did not fill in the bottom line, the 20 per cent tax on the taxable amount would, according to Mr. Goodman's office, mean that we have foregone $660,000.

Let me put it to you this way, Mr. Speaker: If the purchase of that land was not the date put forward by Ronto but in fact the date when they got the deed, which is the date of acquisition for all of the other business of government, then the value of that land when it was purchased was $1,484,900 and they sold it for $12 million. With certain deductions that are allowed under the statute, it means that the tax payable would have been close to $2 million.

There are many things associated with this. The very fact that that land for development, which was sold in good faith by one of the best citizens in the community for a good and fair price—and there's no complaint about that—escalated in a few months to $12 million and all of that unconscionable profit is now built into the cost of those lots, really means that because of the inadequate application of the laws of this province the taxpayers really are taking a beating in more ways than one.

Mr. Ruston: It's the buyer who pays.

Mr. Nixon: As my colleague says, it's the buyer who pays and certainly the developers are not out of pocket in this connection. There's a good deal of controversy in our own area now that that land is being developed, and that's too late. We are not going to save it. I wish you could see it, Mr. Speaker, a fine bush, flat level corn land, a fine old farm house and building. That's going to be gone. But when you see what's going in its place, you almost cringe to think what kind of a community is going to be there 20 years from now. If we are not building a slum for two decades from now or maybe less time, I will be surprised.

In an effort to put these houses on the market at a competitive price, and that's what we want, the price of that land has meant that the value of the house itself is far lower than what it should be. Many people have phoned me and said, "Isn't there some way you can stop the building of those kinds of houses?" I don't want to be critical. People are going to live there and I am sure they are very proud of what they have got, but I will tell you it could have been a lot better, Mr. Speaker.

I believe the reasons for the exemption were completely inadequate. Because of these reasons and others put forward by other members of the committee, we discussed and debated a motion calling for a select committee of the House. The whip of the government party was there and he pointed out very properly we are not supposed to have select committees except in matters of grave importance. We can say we believe this is a matter of grave importance and we feel the best way to look into this is by means of a select committee.

The public accounts committee was just organized today and named its chairman. This was briefly discussed but not at any great length. But they have the full public accounts, a new volume that has never even been cracked. It is up to them to review and examine. That's their job now.

Mr. Drea: I notice you're not on it.

Mr. Nixon: If they are going to stick with Ronto in that committee, they could undertake the examination for many months indeed. There is no lawyer in that committee who is seconded to it, although there are lawyers on the committee. But their legal opinion may perhaps be something less than completely objective on all sides. So obviously we have got to have an examination of this matter in as independent a style as we possibly can. It is obvious as well that there has to be competent legal opinion advising the members of the committee that do the examination.

I can see that the government might not want to turn this over to a select committee of the House with the establishment as it presently is.

Mr. Drea: How about a judicial inquiry?

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member, interjecting as he does so well, says how about a judicial inquiry? I feel that a reference to a judicial inquiry is more appropriate when there is some indication of malfeasance.

Mr. Drea: You are grasping now.

Mr. Nixon: In this instance, we are critical of the government's bad judgement and interested in learning the reasons for the government's decision in foregoing this tax. This is a matter for the House, not for a judge, but if the government does not want to have a select committee, as is recommended by the resolution that has been sitting before this House, then it should do something else with it. If you want a judicial inquiry I would think that's fine, but that is an indication that they feel that there has been some malfeasance, in my opinion.

I believe that it should be investigated by a select committee of this House, and that is why I put forward the resolution which was carried by the committee, and the resolution is found on page 14 of Votes and Proceedings No. 1. It says:

"The committee is of the opinion that the government's exemption of Ronto Development Corporation from land speculation tax by regulation made April 14, 1976, and all circumstances related thereto, require the fullest investigation; which can best be conducted by a select committee of the Legislature with power to sit while the House is in session, power to retain counsel and staff, and power to send for persons and papers.

"The committee further recommends that the Legislature constitute such committee as soon as possible in the new session"—that's now—"and that the committee report back to the House no longer than six weeks after its inception." This last was an amendment put forward by the member for Brantford.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter of grave importance to the House, and I hope that the government is not going to ignore it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre now has the floor. I hope other members will afford him a better opportunity to be heard than he provided to the previous speaker.

Mr. Drea: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As somebody who first congratulated you some years ago, and I am going to do it again today, I believe you are the finest introduction to an institution of any Parliament in Canada that has been.

Mr. Nixon: Better leave it there.

Mr. Drea: But by the same token, Mr. Speaker, I really think that you have to leave some discretion when people are inordinately moved. Having been with you, Mr. Speaker, on several committees, you expressed that opinion to me—

Mr. J. R. Smith: Three cheers for the Irish.

Mr. Breithaupt: Up the Irish.

Mr. Drea: —and I am certain that in your chair, and it has now been confirmed and really set as a precedent, that I really think that the authority goes with the discretion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you just for a moment because it's customary in these debates. When I said that you were the finest introduction into any Parliament in Canada, it was not gratuity. It was not asking that you refrain from using your harsh voice against me when I am wrong. It was meant as a very sincere compliment. I happen to think that the parliamentary system needs just a slight bit of reform. I think one of the reforms has to be that when we are fortunate enough in the chamber, and it is within the chamber that we elect a Speaker, that we find somebody who is so extraordinary in the particular complex and sophisticated times in which we live—

Mr. Conway: Don't blush.

Mr. Drea: —that I really think it becomes an onus upon the members of the chamber, regardless of the political affiliation, that we have to really look at the institution.

One of the things that the institution of Parliament in this country needs, and I am neither radical nor new in this because certainly in the federal House they explored it in the 1960s, and a great many provincial Houses have explored it—I think now is the time in this province, as the bellwether province of Canada, that the parties get together and I think that now is the time that we begin to elect a permanent Speaker.

I say that for two reasons: One, it is needed. There is no question that we're into precedents, we're into parliamentary procedure. The thing that bothers me in the precedents is that while the Speaker ordinarily is a member of the government party—and I am quite sure all my friends in the House today are prepared to explain why that has to be—it is very difficult to tell the people outside how a person who is a member of the government party can be depended upon to preserve democratic rights, no matter what the occasion, no matter what the cause. That is a very difficult thing to explain, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that in your riding particularly, remote, away from the centre of communications as it is, that that was—I'm going to use

the past tense, was—a very difficult thing to explain. I assure you, sir, in these days you can use the present tense and I am quite sure your constituents would applaud.

The second reason is, I think we need continuity in parliamentary government. Certainly in the sixties and certainly the particular occasion that was looked upon was in a riding to the east of all of us, it was in Cornwall. And not because of the good faith of the particular participant, who was the Speaker in the federal House at that time, but because of disagreements among those of us who were underneath him. It was a political disagreement. I think that we as members sometimes have to recognize that we have political disagreements.

Mr. Conway: Just sometimes.

Mr. Drea: A pioneering effort in the government of Canada for the Parliament of Canada that really was to determine a permanent Speaker was to have been achieved. It broke down because we—those of us underneath the Speaker—from political partisanship or political whatever, couldn't agree. I think that was a very great loss to this country. I think, particularly today in terms of the very real struggle we have to keep not only a face of nationhood but a real nationhood, some time in the future that may have been one of the landmarks that we didn't achieve.

Mr. Conway: How about electing a Supreme Court?

Mr. Drea: I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that now in this Parliament, because we are the bellwether of Canada, we are the example of Canada, I think the time has come—

Mr. Conway: Are you an example, Frank?

Mr. Drea: —and I say this to you with all due respect, sir, because I know your modesty, I think now the time has come that we really look in this Parliament, even though it is a provincial Parliament, at setting up an effective, an efficient method of electing a permanent Speaker. And, sir, with you in the chair, I say to you, as an example that may defeat all of the objections, you as an example, sir, I really think we can move forward, and I recommend that, not only to this government but to all the people in the House. I think we are very fortunate to have a man of your calibre in the chair today. I think we are very fortunate.

Mr. Ruston: However!

Mr. Conway: It's an Irish conspiracy, Frank.

Mr. Drea: With the present Speaker there are no "howevers." I say that to you, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity. I say that to you, recognizing your own modesty, and I say that in a bit of humbleness. I have thought about that for some time and I have certainly recommended it to this government, and I certainly hope it permeates right through the House. I think we can set an example in these very troubled times in this country—

Mr. Conway: Have you discussed it with the member for Northumberland (Mr. Rowe)?

Mr. Drea: —for the people who can adjudge fairly and honestly regardless of their political affiliation, and, sir, you have always done that. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my friend, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), having been here for a little while, I learned one thing from the member for Lakeshore a long time ago: The first thing you do is placate the Speaker.

[4:45]

An hon. member: You've done a good job today.

Mr. Drea: Sir, I haven't placated you; I've elevated you. But there are other attendants in the House who I think should have some recognition, at least upon one occasion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As long as you address your remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Drea: Yes, sir.

Mr. Conway: Leave the Irishmen alone.

Mr. Drea: With all due respect to your position, Mr. Speaker, there are times when you can leave. There is one person who is attendant upon this chamber who really can't leave, and that it the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Nixon: Great fellow.

Mr. Davidson: That's the end of your career.

Mr. Conway: This makes the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams) sound good.

Mr. Drea: The Sergeant at Arms really has the most onerous duty of any person either elected or appointed in this province: He has to listen to these sonorous debates.

Mr. Nixon: I think it is time he performed that duty.

Mr. Ruston: He's got his earplug unplugged.

An hon. member: Not now he hasn't.

Mr. Drea: He has to attend upon all of us with attention and decorum. He has to be prepared for the call. I know you have been here longer than I have, Mr. Speaker, but after six years I can tell you that any man who is prepared to listen to our sonorous dissertations, who is ready to spring into action at a moment's notice, is really somebody who is prepared to give his all to public service.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Drea: In my address, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your particular attention to Mr. Thomas Stelling, who is our Sergeant at Arms. I don't think there is recognition any other time. I wish there were. But certainly this is an event where I think all of us can show our appreciation to our Sergeant at Arms.

[Applause.]

Mr. Conway: Now to beer in the ball park.

Mr. Cunningham: Let's get to beer in the ball park, Frank.

Mr. Drea: Not me, I don't—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will deal with them as firmly and as directly as you have dealt with me in the past.

Mr. Moffatt: Teasing the bears.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You have my assurance that I will monitor it constantly.

Mr. Drea: Good.

Turning formally to the Speech from the Throne, the one thing that impresses me is that one of the measures of a government is how it deals with a problem before it becomes a crisis. I really think that is the measure of government today. It's all very well to say we're into a crisis, but one of the difficulties with telling the public we're into a crisis is that there is an emotional upheaval that gets up to here and then it drops down because there is another emotional upheaval.

The strength and the stability of this government—and that is the Davis government—

Mr. Conway: Fifty-one seats.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Fifty-two.

Mr. Conway: The member for London North (Mr. Shore) doesn't count.

Mr. Moffatt: Fifty-one and a half.

Mr. Drea: —is underscored by the outstanding statesmanship and leadership of the Premier of this province, Bill Davis.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: More important than Jack Horner.

Mr. Conway: Only just.

Mr. Drea: That leadership and that statesmanship are underscored in these very troubled times because we're into emotional times. I realize there are some giggles from the Liberal bench. If I didn't have anything else to do, I would giggle too.

Mr. Conway: You are pretty laughable, Frank.

Mr. Drea: I understand that there can be giggles. I suppose when you are a political party that has been found bankrupt nationally, and when there is the threat of separatism and the threat of the fabric of the Canadian dream being ripped apart, which is basically the fault of the Liberal Party, I can understand why there are only five in there and they giggle. They can't give an answer.

Mr. Samis: Don't worry. They are going to get Horner.

Mr. Conway: What's the dream?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew North doesn't have to respond to every phrase by the speaker.

Mr. Warner: He doesn't have much to do.

Mr. Drea: Because of the events of the last six or seven months, we live today in Canada in a dreadfully emotional time. We can pick up things in the media whether we want to read them or whether we want to tune in to them at night. We can hear about this event or that event taking place to the east of us. We can read about the threat of separatism where people stand up very proudly in this country and say they are going to tear this country apart. We either read or see or hear that every day.

It takes a leader of uncommon statesmanship and leadership ability to remain calm to present a very positive and a very concrete programme from a province, not from the federal sphere. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I think that you and I as private members, divorced from this occasion to-

day, have some suggestions. But I suggest to you that the leader of a province and of the province that will determine whether there is going to be a Canadian dream or not in these times has to remain calm and stable and above all to present a concrete and a practical series of solutions to the dilemma we find ourselves in.

I realize there are some yahoos in the House. They would like to go back to Fort Sumter in 1861. They have never smelt powder so they would like to shoot a cannonball. That is not the way in these times that a fabric of unity is preserved. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it is by leadership, it is by statesmanship and above all it has to come from a province. No matter what the rhetoric, no matter what the language, no matter what the issue, the basic issue is the right of a province to say: "We will control our own destiny and we will do it, and if you don't agree we will pull out."

There isn't a very great deal of difference between the province of Quebec in 1977 and the state of South Carolina in 1860. Take away the language, take away a little bit of the changes and there is really nothing different. In the way that the United States handled the issue—and this is in retrospect, this is many years ago—I don't really think, looking upon history, they had any other choice. I do not think, with all due respect, that is the way in 1977 that Canadians in 10 provinces—and we do have 10 provinces—want the particular issue settled.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to you in the Throne Speech that the strength and stability of this government—and I am proud to be a member of this government—is underscored by the outstanding statesmanship and leadership of the Premier in these emotional times.

Mr. Cunningham: Where is he right now?

Mr. Drea: I will read from the first five pages of the Speech from the Throne. I am going to condense some of it and I am going to give my interpretation.

Mr. Samis: Amen to that.

Mr. Drea: The Premier of this province has remained calm despite the antics of some of those who want to lead an expeditionary force into Quebec.

Mr. McClellan: You should follow his exemple.

Mr. Samis: Especially with Marc Lalonde.

Mr. Drea: The Premier of this province has taken a firm and a practical stand so that, for the first time — and I emphasize — by a province—

Mr. Sargent: You'll still be in the back row, Frank.

Mr. Drea: —the equality and the distribution of income and the opportunities of this country are going to be determined on a national scale and not by an accident of geography. Now, Mr. Speaker, I remind you, the federal government has been saying that for some time. I know of no other province that has put it on the line that that equality of opportunity, the equality of income, the equality to participate has to be an integral part of this country or we don't have a country.

In all due fairness, Mr. Speaker, if we cannot achieve that then I really suggest to you, sir, that really we have to start looking at what is a country really for. I know that I certainly can't look at the people in Quebec when there is economic disparity, there is disparity between opportunity, there is not the right under Confederation, under the flag of this country, to achieve your own destiny because the odds are against you from the first place then, Mr. Speaker, I will say to you, heretical as it may sound, I will say to people, okay, you do have the right.

I may be naive, but I do believe with some simple and fundamental changes, and mind you, the mechanics of them may be very complex and may be very sophisticated. They are not the things that we can do in this chamber in the afternoon, nor can our colleagues do in Ottawa in one afternoon, or in the other nine provincial assemblies. They may not be the kinds of things we can do in one afternoon. They may not be the kinds of things we can do in one week. They may take years.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Throne Speech from this Premier of this province has put it right down on the line that we may be the wealthiest and we may have it made and we may be the great "have," but read those first five pages of that Throne Speech and we are going to sacrifice and we are going to endeavour and we are going to put the things forward, so we won't need to go into this kind of thing about "We are going to win the hearts and the minds," and all of this. We can't win the heart and mind of a person who can't even achieve his or her own destiny, who's got to be in a second-class existence. That's stuff is nonsense.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the first five pages of this Throne Speech are the stuff of what we, as Canadians, are known for. It may be difficult. It may be long. It is not going to happen in an afternoon. We are not going to take a vote. I suppose it may in the end be a consensus but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you this is the only way we are going to keep the Canadian dream.

Somebody has asked me: "What's the Canadian dream?" I'll tell you what the Canadian dream is to me. There are 10 provinces in this country and I like to think that all children born have the opportunity to fulfil their opportunities as much as they are able, according to their own talents, according to their own desires, but they have that opportunity. They are not denied because of this, this, this or this and including the worst of all, an accident of geography.

I suggest to you in the first five pages of the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, we have really achieved something in this country. I suggest to you this is the first time that a province has said this. Let's be honest about it.

[5:00]

Mr. Conway: For a change.

Mr. Drea: Ontario is the wealthiest province in this country. If we are going to do this, then you and I are going to have to make sacrifices, Mr. Speaker. Not only you and I, but our constitutents are going to have to make sacrifices. You are going to have to answer that they don't have three stereos in every room.

Mr. Conway: And a chicken in every pot.

Mr. Drea: You are going to have to answer. I happen to feel that the members of this assembly are the people who can go out and say, without fear or favour, that maybe the standard of living—or the artificial standard of living, or whatever, that we have in this country—is maybe not the best in terms of family life or a lot of other things.

Mr. Conway: McMurtry says so.

Mr. Drea: Perhaps it is time— Sorry, you said McMurtry?

Mr. Conway: Go ahead; you are going to elect the Supreme Court.

Mr. Drea: Certainly, they could trim their expense accounts, my friend. The member can tell them that. I think the time has come in this country when either we want a country and a society that has a fundamental identity—and that identity to be Canadian. I know in the member's time, and in his particular area—and I'm drawing particular reference to him—that nobody in his particular area ever asked for the accent on the English as long as the person could do the job. I think maybe that is the kind of thing we have to get back to, and not all this nonsense about provincial rights and federal rights and what it's going to do to the constitution.

For heaven's sake, we couldn't even repatriate a constitution; that was before Rene Levesque was elected. We couldn't even repatriate it then. Now we're going to repatriate the constitution on the grounds that Rene Levesque has been elected. The thing that bothers me is—what happens when the provinces and the federal government get into the room? Finally, after all these years, and knowing deep down it would never come, we have the constitution in a room.

Mr. Sargent: Joe Clark will fix it. Get Joe Clark—he will do it.

Mr. Drea: I suggest to the House that the first five pages of the Speech from the Throne are really a new declaration of principle in this country. If I was in a "have-not" province—and I won't mention them, but there are those—that kind of thing would be the kind of thing that we do every year. If I was in a province where the "have" and the "have-not" were pretty equalized and we were playing little games with the federal government as to whether we get more on this end or a little bit on that end, I wouldn't be concerned. But I suggest to the House that this is the most "have" province of Canada, we are the "haves". We have been the "haves" since even prior to 1867.

Mr. Davidson: A lot of people have been had, that is for sure.

Mr. Sargent: Fourteen-billion-dollar debenture debt.

Mr. Warner: We have the biggest debt, the largest unemployment. We have a lot of things.

Mr. Drea: I suggest to the House that it is really a matter of statesmanship and leadership for a province that has nothing to lose in terms of the economics of the standard of living—

Ms. Brydent: Highest unemployment.

Mr. Drea: —to say that Confederation is basically, in the 20th century, a matter of economic equality. I suggest that that is

leadership and that is statesmanship, because we all know there are a number of provinces who are below the equality level. Those are the "have-nots". We have some that are "have"; we have some that are in-between. It depends upon the petroleum revenue. We have to have a dominion-provincial conference to determine whether the accounting ability really reflects.

In the first few pages of this document there are no excuses, there are no exemptions. It is that there is going to be an end to economic disparity and the accidents of geography and the impingements upon economic opportunity, period, right across this country.

Sir, I suggest to you for about the fourth time, this is leadership and this is statesmanship from the province that, with all due respect, sir, has nothing to lose and only everything to gain from the disturbances going across this country. I want to underline that that is not the feeling of you, Mr. Speaker, or me or my colleagues or of the House, but I think we have to look at economic realities.

We have nothing to lose in terms of economics. We have launched a very new and a very real plateau in this country. We have put a plateau that is as important in the 20th century as John A. Macdonald building his railroad in the 19th century, and I think that it has to be drawn to the attention of a public that is desperate and thirsty and wanting for a solution to a problem it neither understands nor can attempt to grasp on a day-to-day basis.

I think it is magnificent that all the radio stations want to find out from people what is the matter with Canada. It's too bad it wasn't done a decade ago. Maybe we wouldn't be in the trouble. I think it is magnificent that the television networks, the communication networks of this country, want to find out what is the matter: Why don't you want to be part of Canada?

Again, a decade ago, we mightn't have been in this position. I think it is remarkable that newspapers are all of a sudden hiring people from the province of Quebec and giving them a full page of print. I think that's really remarkable. A year ago, you had a little local scandal municipally and you got a paragraph; something big—three paragraphs. Now you get a whole page. Ten years ago, it might have meant something.

I think now is the time that we, as the foremost political institution of this province, underscore and underline and applaud the leadership and the statesmanship of the Premier of this province and his approach to the problem, because alone in Canada he is the realistic, he is the practical, and he has the concrete answer.

I want to turn to other parts of the Speech from the Throne, particularly one of those that concerns me a very great deal and it reflects upon the remarks that I have made in the past few minutes, and that is the fundamental underscoring of the fact that whatever the problem is in Canada today, it has an economic basis. I realize there are those in the House who can say from their textbooks that Karl Marx—

An hon. member: Is alive and well.

Mr. Drea: —said everything was economic. I don't believe that and neither do they.

One of the difficulties is that when we talk about a new and a different concept of economic equality for all Canadians, regardless of the accident of birth or where they live and whether they have raw materials or they don't, I really think the first thing that people are going to say is "How about an example?" I think in this province, because of its very diverse nature, its very immense mileage, its particular difficulty from time to time in achieving an economic system of fair play for regions that have been at one time endowed with natural resources and now, for one reason or another, are not, quite frankly, we have to set the example. In the vernacular, Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way: If you're going to tell me what to do, put your money where your mouth is.

In this province, we have pretty generally been blessed by an equality of opportunity. Sir, I say to you that some years ago we achieved equality of educational opportunity. You were in this chamber then. We put up the county school boards, the composite schools, so that the ability to achieve an education was not by accident of birth; one had the opportunity. We have gone further. We have tried to achieve, with regional governments and a number of other introductions, an equality of opportunities, so that because you were born in Winisk didn't necessarily mean that you were going to be a second-class citizen only because the facilities weren't around, that the whole world didn't revolve around Toronto, Hamilton, Kitchener and a couple of other places. With all due respect, I think and I hope it is appreciated that while we haven't achieved that, at least we are on the road toward achieving it in our lifetime, which I think is a remarkable accomplishment.

Today, when we look at the economic disparities of this country, I don't think we can look at them just in terms of provinces. I think we have to look at them in terms of municipalities. The very same things that have bred the cancer of separatism, that have bred the tremendous distrust of the rest of this country in the province of Quebec, are lying fallow in our own municipalities. We're at the position where the municipalities, and by municipalities I take in the school boards, are three things. One, they are the last remnant in the 20th century of the master and servant relationship, and we, in this House, are the masters and they are the servants. Two, they cannot even attempt to achieve control of their own economic destiny.

It may very well be that in the province, through an Edmonton commitment, through the PMLC, through the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, papers are sent out. We're very good at this. We can do it for six months or four years, but the people in municipalities are not in control of their own destiny. They are in the position of the only person who has not survived the 19th century and that is the servant. They are still there with a hand out. With all due respect to the provincial Treasurer, when he says, "I have honoured the Edmonton commitment but there is a limit this year," and he puts a number on it, I will suggest to you, sir, that I feel for the municipality, because I don't know if the particular number that he has put on it is the accurate one. I don't dispute that, in good intent, he is carrying on with that, but I wonder about the economics of it.

Mr. Warner: Scarborough got less money last year.

Mr. Drea: Not because of me, my friend; you got elected.

Mr. Warner: Scarborough got less money from the province.

[5:15]

Mr. Drea: I am not in a position to question the very abstract formulas, and many of them are several pages long, about how grants are done. I would say, in principle, that I like the fact that there is a formula by which grants are done because it takes away the political clout and makes it a matter of right. I like that in principle. When it comes down to the particular municipality, I have some concern, and I say that in terms of the principle and what have you, I agree the province should set down some formulas. We don't want political clout. We don't want somebody coming in and saying, "He got a little bit more this year. He didn't do it this way; he got a little bit less." We don't want this.

Ms. Bryden: The Treasurer picks a number.

Mr. Drea: But I can't understand. I know of almost no one—and I am sure there are some who have spent considerable time trying to figure out these formulas—who really realizes what they mean.

Mr. McClellan: The Treasurer—

Mr. Drea: I think the time has come, and bearing in mind my past remarks, that we have to look at the particular disruption of the Canadian dream in terms of economics because we are in the latter part of the 20th century, and economics are what is going to determine. I think in the midst of adversity —and the adversity is that the Canadian fabric is being disrupted or threatened to be disrupted—we have a marvellous opportunity for the first time to really get down to some of the economic basics of this country.

I respect The British North America Act and the people who wrote it. It has lasted for virtually 100 years. When we in this Legislature are talking about legislation that will deal for 10 or 15 years without monumental changes and we consider that an achievement, and we do, we must realize that the people who drafted that legislation that has lasted 100 years — the people who wrote it and the people who thought about it — really knew a century ago what they were doing.

We have this marvellous opportunity now. The province of Quebec wants constitutional changes at least as a minimum. Well then by all means.

Sir, I recognize you in the chair and I know you are concerned about the repatriation of the Canadian constitution and the BNA Act. Let's get it repatriated back into this country. Let us sit down as 10 provinces and a federal government and let's really look at it in the light of 1967.

One of the things that we have to do is give a new deal to the municipalities.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is 10 years—

Mr. Drea: The day of the property tax being the only real basis where a municipality or a school board — and when I talk about a municipality, I am talking about a school — this is the only real way in which they can—

Mr. Conway: How do you repatriate what you never had in the first place?

Mr. Drea: —not only raise money but have control of their own destiny. It is the most regressive tax that man ever devised. Sales tax is minor in comparison to property tax.

Ms. Bryden: Why don't you tell your boss?

Mr. Warner: Are you looking for a seat over here?

Mr. Drea: We're not talking about my boss; we're talking about a constitution in this country—

Mr. Makarchuk: I thought you were talking about taxes.

Mr. Drea: Where? The municipality is a creature of the province. It is precluded from this, from that and the other thing. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that since we are going to have to look at that entire constitution in this country as a method of saving the Canadian dream, that we now get down to basics so that when we look at it, we start looking at municipalities and we start working out a new deal. Because I suggest to you if we don't—

Mr. McClellan: Start that right now.

Mr. Drea: —the separatism of Quebec is going to be a minor matter compared to the separatism of the municipalities in the future.

Mr. Conway: How do you repatriate what you never had in the first place? How do you repatriate what you didn't patriate?

Mr. Drea: I am not going to be provoked. He's yours. You elected him, you sit with him. He's yours, he's not mine.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I would appreciate that you would understand my objectivity at the present moment. He's not mine, nor do I wish him.

An hon. member: Who'd want him?

Mr. Conway: It is an Irish conspiracy.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Surely, we don't want the Speaker.

Mr. Drea: I think we are at a time in this country, and I think all of us agree, when somebody can wave a flag or somebody can say this or somebody can say that, but really if we want a Canada it is going to be a Canada of equal opportunity. It is going to be or there's not going to be one. I suggest to you in this province, since we are leading the charge, that Ontario has to be a place where, regardless of accident—

Mr. Makarchuk: Give everybody a tax exemption, not only Ronto.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I am always concerned about the Marxist progressive leftist view. I have just heard it.

Mr. Samis: There's this and there's that.

Mr. Conway: Irish madness.

Mr. Drea: I notice the member doesn't deny his affinities.

Mr. Warner: Here comes the innuendo. You're good at it.

Mr. Conway: February 2, Frank.

Mr. Drea: February what?

Mr. Conway: February 2, your big day.

Mr. Drea: One of the concerns that I have in the municipal field is that I really think we're two or three annual or semi-annual tax raises away from the day of decision for a great many senior citizens. I don't think it really matters where they live. I think the same thing is applicable to the smaller community as it is to the very large one. If we suppose hypothetically, and I have to take the word of the provincial Treasurer—

Mr. McClellan: No you don't, Frank.

Mr. Drea: —that a uniform method of assessment will be in by next year—and I know the man. I know Mr. Blair. I know the man who looked at it, I know him very well. I know Mr. Blair and he is a man of method and of fairness—I don't think, Mr. Speaker, we are more than 1980 or 1981 away from the day of decision for a great many people in this province.

Mr. Breithaupt: Or 1984 I would think.

Mr. Drea: We are in an aging society in this province. Because of immigration we are not probably pressed as much as other jurisdictions are. What I call the day of decision, sir, is the day when older people—and we have to recognize there is an older life span, it is going to go on, and they are upon fixed incomes. No matter what government does, because in the end your pension is controlled by government, whether it's your private pension or whether you get it through the Canada Pension or you play with us and you get GAINS or what have you, it is the government of the day that determines the

amount of that fixed income, notwithstanding the government of the day also controls the monetary supply.

The government of the day, for better or for worse, can determine whether there will be inflation, whether there will be this. I don't think we're much more than four or five years away from that day of decision by senior citizens. I, frankly, don't think they can continue on.

I say this in all honesty. I used to say and I used to parrot the government line—I'm as good as anybody else—I used to say we have this rebate thing, we have this thing, we have that thing. In the last six or seven months I have lain awake many a night. I'm sorry. I just don't believe in it any more.

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you tell—

Mr. Warner: Are you going to resign?

Mr. Drea: I say that notwithstanding the best intentions of government. I just don't think that we can provide a formula of rebates based upon income or based upon means that will take into account the economic situation, not only in this country but in the world, and inflation in particular. For heaven's sake, the most sophisticated investors in this country are the people in the stock market. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, they were all told last Wednesday, as a day of duty, to get into the market to show it will go up. The market was awful. The market was even awful today. As you know, sir, by law I am precluded from giving anything other than an objective review of the market. If the sophisticated investor, the educated person, spends eight, nine or 10 hours a day in trying to figure out where his money is going—

Mr. Warner: What happened to the senior citizens?

Mr. Drea: —then how can we expect an ever-growing part of our population who don't have that opportunity to try to play games? And even if they did, even if they were successful, what is a two per cent gain on an income on $200 a month? It doesn't matter at all.

Mr. Conway: To be sure.

Mr. Drea: I suggest that since we are looking realistically—and hopefully we are realistic—at the economic future of this country, that we don't stop with the provinces and that we start looking inward. As an example, in this province—and we deserved it—this Throne Speech issued the call for an economic look at the constitution. By example, let's take a look inwardly: let's look at the municipalities; let's look at the property tax.

I suggest that the time has come when the property tax is redundant for both municipal and school board purposes. It may very well be, if we divorce one from the other, that the property tax may provide the basis for the other.

Mr. Warner: That's heresy. The Treasurer will never talk to you again.

Mr. Drea: I say to my friend from Scarborough-Ellesmere that the Treasurer will call me Frank in the morning and he will call me Frank tomorrow—

Mr. Warner: He may also tell you goodbye!

Mr. Drea: He will talk to me. And so will some of the NDP's lefty economists, because I'm now talking about some of the things that they reject as being too right-wing. They'll all talk to me.

We have to come down to basics. I reiterate that the property tax is the most regressive, the most unfair, the most inflexible—

Mr. Makarchuk: That's what you said five minutes ago.

Mr. Warner: The Treasurer doesn't say that.

Mr. Haggerty: They want to tax the schools.

Mr. Breithaupt: And the churches and golf courses.

Mr. Drea: No applause from the Liberal benches? They all believe that, too; come on, it's motherhood. Come on, you believe it; it's motherhood, too.

Mr. Haggerty: They want to tax all the schools.

Mr. Drea: No, that's not true. We are talking about a regressive, unfair and, above all, I don't care if taxes are regressive or unfair; I want to know how much yield they make. I'm a nosy enforcer. The yield is going down year by year. We all know this. Everybody in here knows this.

Mr. Breithaupt: If you get more out of it, it would be all right.

Mr. Drea: With all due respect, sir, we cannot change that because of The British North America Act.

Mr. Breithaupt: We can so; we sure can.

Mr. Warner: You can tell the Treasurer.

Mr. Drea: The municipality is a creature of the province—

Mr. Makarchuk: Why don't you give them a couple of points of the income tax?

Mr. Drea: That's exactly what I'm coming up to, but I think we have to do it in the constitution. I think we have to sit down, not only as 10 provinces but as municipalities. As a matter of fact, I am going to suggest that when we sit down to really look at equality of economic opportunity in this country, we can't stop at 10 provinces. Even if we could achieve that to the point where somebody in a small town in northern New Brunswick has the same economic opportunity as someone in Toronto, Calagry or Vancouver, we would be achieving miracles, but I don't think it would save this country. What we have to do province by province is to sit down and give the municipality—and that includes the school board—a new opportunity to finance the revolution of rising expectations.

[5:30]

Mr. Martel: Tell that to the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Drea: I'll wipe the smirk off your face.

Mr. Makarchuk: Watch your language.

Mr. Drea: The fact is that a great number of municipal employees now have the right to belong to a union, have the right not to be fired and have the right to seniority and a great number of other things. These are rising costs, and I think we have to face that. I'm sure as a Brantford alderman, the member for Brantford has faced that.

Mr. Conway: But he never faced you before.

Mr. Drea: Those are the economic facts They are grim but they are there and they are our realities of life. I suggest the time has come when we are talking about economic fair play for this country, which is the only way we will destroy the romantics of separatism, and the example has to start at home.

An hon. member: The way we have taught French is not a fair deal.

Mr. Drea: The Premier of this province in the Throne Speech has issued the call. We started it. It is above and beyond everything else. The onus is upon us.

Mr. Warner: Have another drink of water.

Mr. Drea: When we go down, talk to the people in Quebec and do the Robarts thing,—he was 10 years ahead of his time—we're going to go down and win the hearts and souls. I can just see me, with all due respect, walking into Rouyn, Quebec. I know Rouyn. I'm sure the member for Sudbury East is going to know what I'm going to talk about.

Mr. Conway: Walking in.

Mr. Drea: I can walk into Rouyn, Quebec, and I can tell them their mines are gone, that this is gone, that that's gone, and that they're going to have to export their children. I can tell them that I'm a Canadian. "I want to win your mind and your soul." I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be lucky to get out of that town alive.

Mr. Conway: You would know about it.

Mr. Warner: We would be lucky if you didn't.

Mr. Drea: It's great for all the fat cats down in Toronto to say, "Let's go down and tell them they're all Canadians." Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that there are two very famous people. One was a saint and one was the head of the Salvation Army. One was Saint Francis of Assisi and one was General William Booth who started the Salvation Army. They both agreed on one thing: It's pretty useless to try to save somebody's soul until you feed him. If they're starving to death they're not very, very receptive to all kinds of ideas.

Mr. Warner: Let's try feeding you first.

Mr. Drea: Feed them. After you have them fed, then let's get into the philosophical discourse. That is what this Throne Speech does. I am asking that it goes further.

Mr. Breithaupt: Tell that to the unemployed.

Mr. Samis: Tell us about unemployment.

Mr. Conway: A chicken in every pot.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Everybody will have a chance to make his contribution.

Mr. Drea: I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will be as firm with the literate over there as the Acting Speaker was with me. I emphasize the literate.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Intellect.

Mr. Drea: The literate. That was aimed at you.

Mr. Martel: I was saying there is Mr. Intellect, the whiz kid. I shouldn't have distracted you.

Mr. Warner: Irish madness.

Mr. Breithaupt: He is moving right along.

Mr. Drea: I have talked about—

Mr. Conway: This and that.

Mr. Drea: —basically two things today. I have talked about the need for an economic realization of fairness, the ability of an economic opportunity with fair play for everybody across Canada. I think we all agree with that—at least I hope we do. By the same token, I have turned inwardly, which the Throne Speech did not do, upon the province of Ontario. I don't think one can go to people and say, "Here is a new idea. Here's how we can save," unless one is prepared to answer the question and the operative part is within one's control. I think the operative part is. We have to turn inwardly in this province. We really have to achieve economic fairness and economic opportunity. And within this province, Mr. Speaker, it is no longer a matter of geography. It is a matter of municipality.

I suggest to you, sir, that the time has come, if Ontario really wants to do something about preserving the Canadian dream that we now set the example, we look inwardly upon ourselves. As much as it is possible within our own control we promote what we can do for the municipalities and the school boards. If it is beyond our control, instead of passing the buck we turn it over to Ottawa with the call that if you want a Canada, this is the start of the price that we are all going to have to pay.

I know it means belt tightening. I am a little bit tired of the fat cats telling everybody: "Tighten your belts."

Mr. Conway: Tighten up, Frank.

Mr. Drea: Every time I look at one of the fat cats saying we have to sacrifice on behalf of this or on behalf of that, the guy has got a vest out this high and he has got a glass in his hand.

Mr. Conway: We are all tight enough, Frank.

Mr. Drea: I will tell you I know how much the vest cost and I know how much the glass in the hand cost. I will tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, the working man and the working woman, when they look at that, they just turn their backs. If we are going to do something then it means we are all going to have to tighten our belts, whether it is collectively or individually. The start of it is in this province; that we tighten the belt provincially and we give the municipalities a new deal, because when somebody from another province asks us: "How is this equality of economic opportunity going to work?" we don't say: "We have a report," we say: "We have done it and here is what has happened in one year."

Mr. Breithaupt: We will see what the budget says.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I believe the member for Beaches-Woodbine is next on the list.

Ms. Bryden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know whether I was going to have any time left before the supper hour, but there is a little.

The Throne Speech delivered by Her Honour last week might be described as motherhood times 60, because there are 60 areas touched on, but in most cases the proposals for action are simply vague statements of good intentions and perhaps death-bed repentances. It is a speech which is long on rhetoric but short on reality. As a plan of action to meet Ontario's most pressing problems of unemployment, economic slowdown and ongoing fiscal mismanagement, it is like a drunk promising to espouse sobriety for the fourth time around.

One of the areas where some action is promised is that of youth unemployment. Apparently the government has just discovered this problem in our midst. What was it doing in 1976 when the unemployment rate for young persons was almost 2.6 times as great as for the work force over 25? What was it doing in 1975 when the same rate prevailed?

In February 1977, the latest date for which we have figures, there were 143,000 persons under 25 unemployed in Ontario. They constituted almost one half of the total of 316,000 unemployed. Their unemployment rate was about 14.8 per cent compared to eight per cent for the rest of the work force, or for the work force as a whole I should say.

But this does not give us the full picture. There are the hidden unemployed. Many are not counted because they have given up looking for jobs as a result of discouragement. Others are not counted because they live in remote areas, or are treaty Indians or sea-

sonal workers in the off-season, in areas where there are no alternatives. Others are under-employed, with only part-time jobs or in jobs where their capabilities are not being used. Further, the figures do not include the handicapped and the disadvantaged who need special programmes to get them into the labour market. What's obvious from the statistics we do have. Mr. Speaker, is that young people in Ontario are carrying an excessive burden in the unemployment picture.

But statistics are cold and lifeless comparisons. I don't see statistics in my constituency office, I see the real thing; the young and desperate men and women who want any sort of job that will give them a reasonable income, a chance at some promotion and a feeling of contributing to society. The 143,000 young persons out of work in February are 143,000 personal tragedies; and the failure of this government to manage the economy and to give leadership in economic development and in job creation is largely responsible for these tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, one of the favourite targets of after-dinner speakers and editorial writers today is waste in government spending. They have plenty of examples from the Conservative government of this province, like the $9 million computer system for the community colleges which was scrapped; or the $30 million to $50 million spent on land for abandoned new town projects.

There is another form of waste that should make the headlines but doesn't. It is the waste of human beings. Too many young people, deprived of access to a career, are becoming disillusioned and disaffected members of society. If their only employment is part-time or dead-end jobs between periods of idleness, they will not develop good work habits, they will not feel they are part of society. If they have no opportunity to learn useful skills on the job, their potential will not be realized.

What's more, Mr. Speaker, this waste is costing all of us a great deal of money. Ed Broadbent, the NDP federal leader, estimated that the current unemployment of close to a million person in Canada is costing us $6 billion to $7 billion in lost production of goods and services. It also means we are paying some $2 billion a year in unemployment insurance and welfare payments, and at all levels of government we are losing hundreds of millions in tax revenue which would otherwise be paid by Canadians if they had jobs. The result is that the rest of us have to pay more taxes or do without necessary government services.

But beyond the economic costs are the uncountable social costs represented by this under-used human resource. There are the stunted careers, the ill-health, the mental deterioration, the delay in family formation, the search for escapes from discouragement and rejection.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Council on Social Development sponsored a seminar on the issue of youth and employment. Shortly after, the council's board of governors issued a statement which highlights the seriousness of the problem. It said: "The Canadian Council on Social Development is greatly concerned about the deteriorating position of young people in relation to employment opportunities. It deplores the haphazard manner in which federal, provincial and local levels of government intervene with the problem and the prevailing public attitude, which ranges from one of indifference and apathy to blaming youth themselves.

"The council recognizes that the youth employment issue is part of a larger problem of unemployment and under-employment, and cannot be treated in complete isolation. Nevertheless, its severity and chronic nature, as well as long-term ill effects if left unattended, make it economically, politically and socially explosive."

[5:45]

I ask, why hasn't the government been addressing itself to this very serious problem? Has it bought the myth that the young people don't want to work? Recent surveys show that the vast majority do want jobs. I quote from a study by the Department of Manpower and Immigration called Canadian Work Values, published in 1975. It said:

"A further survey question revealed that approximately 90 per cent of all males above 20 years of age would prefer full-time to part-time employment or to being out of the labour force. Part-time employment had a somewhat greater appeal to female respondents, particularly during the child-bearing years"; they also preferred jobs to being out of work.

But these young people want career jobs, not dead-end jobs. Certainly the ones who come into my constituency office for advice—

Mr. Martel: A LIP project.

Mr. Conway: Tell me, has Wardell been in lately?

Ms. Bryden: He is unemployed at the moment, I believe.

Mr. Conway: We will have to keep him that way.

Ms. Bryden: Certainly the ones who come into my constituency office want to work; and most of them are prepared to start at anything. But the number of jobs available is abysmally short.

For example, in February of this year there were only 37,300 jobs available for the close to one million unemployed, less than four per cent. The latest figure for Ontario covers the fourth quarter of 1976. At that time there were only 12,300 job vacancies. Today there are 143,000 young people looking for jobs.

Mr. Martel: Darcy says it is an honest budget, though, federally.

Ms. Bryden: Of those 12,300 jobs, very few are tailored to the inexperienced young people coming out of schools and colleges.

Perhaps the government thinks that youth unemployment is a temporary phenomenon which will go away, a demographic quirk from war-baby booms. But forecasts of young people in the labour force show that while the 14-to-19 age group is declining, the 20-to-24 age group will continue growing in the 1980s.

Perhaps the government thinks that the unemployed young people are mainly students who can't find part-time or summer jobs, and that that is the only problem. But a study by the Economic Council of Canada in 1976 showed that very few of the pool of unemployed young people were students looking for jobs. In fact, if you excluded the students from the unemployment rate, the rate would go up by two points in some months.

What has the government done about this very serious problem? Well, it did produce a summer employment programme for students in recent years, producing from 7,500 to 10,000 jobs. But over 100,000 applications were received in the last two years.

It has an industrial training branch which supervises apprenticeship and industrial training programmes. But the number of places available is far below the number of applicants. For example, the joint apprenticeship council in the electrical industry told me last fall that they were still absorbing the 1974-75 applicants who had qualified and had not started to place the 1976 applicants.

The government has a strange programme called the Ontario Career Action programme, otherwise known as OCAP, which is supposed to give young people a chance to acquire clerical experience so that they can presumably have a better chance at applying for clerical jobs. But to me it looks rather like a method of obtaining cheap labour for the Ontario government. It places young people in clerical jobs in the Ontario government at about $100 a week for a maximum of 52 weeks. They have no opportunity to get a foot on the civil service ladder, or even to enjoy any of the rights and benefits of a civil servant.

Mr. Speaker, if there is work to be done in the Ontario government, it should be done by persons who are paid a living wage and are given a chance to enjoy the same benefits and the same right to move up the career ladder in the same way as those beside whom they work. Second-class citizens in the public service are not the mark of a fair employer.

This government looks after people at the top, like Mr. Fleck, but it sweats those at the bottom along with the contract employees whom it is using to fill job needs these days, instead of adding to the civil service complement, in order to keep up its smokescreen and delude the public into believing that it has a freeze on civil service growth.

The contract employees are among the most exploited; they receive almost no benefits and work side by side with civil servants who are receiving pensions and other benefits. They are often paid less than the people who are doing the same work beside them.

Mr. Conway: Sounds like the members of the Legislature.

Ms. Bryden: I counted the number of jobs in the Experience '77 booklet put out by the Youth Secretariat on summer employment, and I found that at least half of them started at the bare minimum wage.

An hon. member: Shame.

Ms. Bryden: But today there is a rising call for a lower minimum wage for young people from some quarters, and the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) seems to be listening to it.

Interjections.

Ms. Bryden: The critics point to high unemployment rates existing among young men and women in provinces where the minimum wage is $3 an hour compared to our $2.65 an hour. But the idea of a cheap minimum wage for the young would just encourage employers to replace older workers with younger workers. It was George Meany of

the AFL-CIO who said that this would mean laying off the father to hire the son. It would be a subsidy to employers and there's no proof it would create any new jobs. It would only mean an across-the-board wage cut for thousands.

Mr. Speaker, this government's past record in the development of jobs for young persons is abysmal. Can we expect anything more in 1977 or are the words in the Throne Speech simply empty rhetoric?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: More.

Mr. Martel: More empty rhetoric.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, more jobs.

Mr. Martel: I'm glad you said that, George.

Interjections.

Mr. Makarchuk: Where's the legislation?

Ms. Bryden: What should the government be doing about this serious problem of youth unemployment? Well, first, in my opinion, it should make a commitment to effect a progressive reduction in the youth unemployment rate over the next few years. We all know, of course, that an expanding economy is the first prerequisite for opening up job opportunities to the unemployed of all ages. But planning for full employment and for the development of new industries, both secondary and tertiary, is not one of the bases touched by this government in the Throne Speech. That's because they don't believe in planning and they don't have a commitment to full employment. They prefer chaos to coordination. They prefer laissez-faire to leadership. It's a doctrinaire approach that hasn't worked in the past.

Professor Lester Thurow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology said in a recent article in Newsweek, I quote: "Real per capita growth since the advent of government intervention has been more than twice as high as it was in the days when government did not intervene or have social welfare programmes."

What else must the government do? I think it must fact the fact that young people do need an assist to get on to the career ladder. Companies and governments must open their doors to them and give them a chance. Incentives may be necessary to persuade employers to hire inexperienced people and to provide training on the job.

In addition, opportunities for training and upgrading must be increased and student aid must be expanded to allow young people to obtain this training. It's a myth that our young people are over-educated. Of the 143,000 young persons unemployed in February, 1977, only 20,000 had any post-secondary education. Unless we want to just sell off our resources to the world, we have to increase our productivity, we have to specialize, we have to do research to meet world competition. That's going to need educated people.

We're going to need more than handouts to industry. We're going to need planning. We're going to need joint public-private action. We're going to have to bring education and work experience together in shared-time programmes which are more than cheap labour schemes. Apprenticeship and on-the-job training in additional fields might ensure that we have qualified TV repairman at least and a more skilled and productive labour force.

Perhaps we should involve the young people in planning these changes. No unemployed young persons in the work force were at the recent Partnership for Prosperity conference which was called by the government to plan for the future development of this province's economy. Besides that, the conference spent its time looking at 1980 rather than at the current 143,000 young people out of work.

In addition, of course, we should consider special programmes for handicapped and disadvantaged youth. The rehabilitation branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services does good work but only scratches the surface. Programmes to make the handicapped and disadvantaged self-supporting will pay for themselves in the long run.

Young people don't want sympathy or exhortations. They simply want jobs and, right now, they aren't interested in long-term solutions. They want action today. They want to see new jobs going up on the boards in the Manpower offices.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps if the hon. member is going to go into a new area this might be an appropriate time to adjourn the debate.

Ms. Bryden: I have about three minutes more, but if you like I'll adjourn.

Mr. Conway: I grant it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed?

Mr. Conway: Agreed.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can take a look at the Manitoba government's employment package. The province, in 1976, spent about $45 million to $50 million on

direct job creation. It included accelerated capital works and a provincial employment programme which funds municipalities, schools, co-operatives, local groups, farms and so forth for construction-oriented projects. It included special loans to municipalities and labour forgiveness of 50 per cent in the summer and 100 per cent in the winter. It included a Manpower corps in the north, and Manpower counselling and working with the private sector to develop jobs and career opportunities for the target groups.

A similar effort in Ontario would cost in the neighbourhood of $300 milion to $400 million. The $160 million already given to industry in the sales tax exemption would be a start for this kind of money, for a job-creation programme. Other tax breaks for industry could be withdrawn and any handouts which the provincial Treasurer is planning in his new budget could be diverted to this kind of a constructive attack on the unemployment problem.

There is lots of work needed in this province. We could provide funds for reforestation, for home insulation, for energy conservation, for recycling, for anti-pollution programmes. We could provide funds for rehabilitation of senior citizens homes and to increase the middle-income group's opportunity to improve its homes.

I hope we will see some sort of constructive suggestions adopted in the budget and the beginning of an action programme to make jobs available to the young people of this province. I hope they won't have to take Prime Minister Trudeau's advice and go south in pursuit of employment.

An hon. member: Perhaps we should send Pierre south; far south.

Mr. Speaker: We need someone to adjourn the debate. I am not sure who is next on the list. Mr. Conway is the next speaker.

On motion by Mr. Conway, the debate was adjourned.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Kerr, the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

Point of privilege re letters to Mr. Starr, Mr. Martel 211

Royal commission on pensions, statement by Mr. Davis 222

Shipbuilding, statement by Mr. Davis 223

Baseball tickets, statement by Mr. Davis 223

Point of privilege re quotation in Hansard, Mr. Martel 224

Audit legislation, statement by Mr. McKeough 224

Aluminum wiring, statement by Mr. Handleman 225

Farm income stabilization commission, statement by Mr. W. Newman 226

Special education, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 226

Public health nurses, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis, Mr. S. Smith 226

Beer sales at sports events, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Warner, Mr. Samis 227

Canadian history, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Sweeney 228

Special education, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Warner, Mr. Grande 230

Housing programme, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Breaugh 231

Abortions, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Sweeney, Ms. Gigantes 232

Drivers' medical examinations, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Philip, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Cassidy 233

Bilingual court services, question of Mr. Murtry: Mr. Cassidy 234

Wiretapping charge, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Roy 235

Townsend townsite, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Nixon 235

Land speculation tax exemption, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Nixon 236

Court facilities, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Stong 236

Lincoln Place Nursing Home, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Grande 236

Tube Turns strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Spence 236

Benefits rates, questions of Mr. Norton: Ms. Sandeman, Mr. B. Newman 237

Fuel rates for farmers, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Mancini 237

Toronto downtown plan, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. S. Smith 238

WCB rehabilitation programme, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall 239

Point of privilege re AHOP programme, Mr. Breaugh 239

Audit Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 240

Medical Data Bank Act, B. Newman, first reading 240

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Davison, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Drea, Ms. Bryden 240

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Conway, agreed to 266

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Kerr, agreed to 266

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E.; Acting Speaker (Sarnia L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Davison, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Smith, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Government Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)

Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)



No. 8

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, April 7, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1977

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

ENERGY MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I represented Ontario at the energy ministers' conference in Ottawa. I stated Ontario's position in the manner that I outlined in the Legislature last week. I made it very clear that Ontario would not support any increase in the price of crude oil and natural gas this year.

Mr. S. Smith: What did Lougheed say?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I did not gain the support of the government of Canada and the producing provinces. However, I am happy to report that I was supported by almost half of the consumers of Canada who are represented by all three of the political parties. The Ontario position was strongly supported by Manitoba and Nova Scotia.

The question of price was not resolved. It was agreed that all provinces would prepare written suggestions dealing with price and pricing mechanisms. I made it clear that Ontario would not support any price increase this year.

Mr. S. Smith: And did Lougheed threaten to keep it in the ground?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The energy ministers will meet again within four weeks for further discussion.

RAILWAY PASSENGER SERVICE

Hon. Mr. Snow: On behalf of myself and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), I would like to state this government's position with regard to the Canadian Transport Commission's decision to discontinue rail passenger service between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg and between Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie. This discontinuation has been ordered by the CTC effective May 24, 1977.

Mr. Kerrio: How about using Greyhound out there?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Snow: To refresh the members' memory on the background of the proposed discontinuation of this rail service, let me recap briefly.

In January 1976 the Hon. Otto Lang, federal Minister of Transport Canada, announced a programme to rationalize rail passenger services in Canada.

This rationalization process was to have included CTC hearings and subsequent reviews of each of the federally subsidized services in Canada. The way it was explained to us, the objective of these exercises was to reduce the growing subsidies being poured into rail passenger services.

Last week, on Monday, March 21—I guess that's two weeks ago—the CTC announced its decision regarding 11 of these services. Two of these were in Ontario. One is the CP service from Sudbury to Sault Ste. Marie and the other the CN service from Thunder Bay north via Fort Frances to Winnipeg. Both are to be discontinued May 24, 1977.

At this point, I should tell you that the Ontario government was present at both the hearings concerning the services to be affected in the north.

Our position on the Sudbury-Sault Ste. Marie service was that the CTC should completely satisfy itself that the bus service along the corridor be adequate to handle all existing rail traffic plus present and future anticipated bus traffic.

The decision signifies, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the CTC has accepted the adequacy of the bus service in this corridor.

At the Thunder Bay-Winnipeg hearing, we stressed Mr. Lang's directive to the CTC which said: "Rail passenger service should not be abandoned in any case where no other commercial service exists."

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of small communities

in this corridor and while they have road access as well as rail, they do not have bus connections. And when you add to the fact that there are a number of summer camps and resorts along the line such as Owakonze —I don't know whether I said that right. Perhaps the hon. member for Rainy River could tell me—

Mr. Stokes: Owakonze.

Mr. Reid: Owakonze—the jewel of the north.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Oh, forget it—as well as several year-round residents at various points, it becomes clear to us, at least, that these people rely on rail for connections to the outside world. Yet the CTC order, in effect, cuts them off.

Expressed in other words, the CTC has completely ignored Mr. Lang's policy directive to provide public service to those places without alternative commercial services.

Such communities may seem comparatively small to some people but this government will continue to support them until we have a concrete assurance that their problems have been solved in the area of transportation services.

I can tell this House candidly that until the very day that these two decisions were announced, the federal government has not reacted to our offer made during the hearings to sit down and discuss alternative solutions that must be provided to these communities in case of abandonment.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs and I feel that the needs of these communities must be assessed further and a mutually acceptable solution reached. In order to allow the federal government and my officials enough time to properly assess these needs and find solutions, Mr. Bernier and I will be requesting the CTC to delay the termination of this service until at least September 30, 1977.

To be sure, there has been one encouraging note. Since the CTC's announcement there has been some indication that the federal people are ready to talk about alternatives. My staff and staff members of the Ministry of Northern Affairs are now following this up. When these discussions have taken place, we will be in a better position to determine any further action that may be necessary.

MINISTRY OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time later today, the House leader will introduce, on my behalf, legislation to establish a Ministry of Northern Affairs. The minister and deputy minister are in Sault Ste. Marie on government business at this moment.

This legislation represents a renewed commitment on the part of this government to overcome the obstacles of great distances, and relatively dispersed population, to provide comparable services and access to the people of northern Ontario. It is also a recognition of the wishes, which have been expressed by many people in the north, for a ministry which would have special responsibility for ensuring that the problems specific to the vast area of northern Ontario are considered when government decisions are made. The response—

Mr. S. Smith: What about a ministry of southern affairs?

An hon. member: He is being provocative.

Mr. Martel: Save your humour for the ball game.

Mr. S. Smith: Your establishment of this ministry is an admission that you have done nothing for the north; you treat it as a colony.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I heard from the leader of the third party that he wants a ministry of southern affairs. That's part of his new platform? Is that to include the Bahamas and all of those relevant areas, or what is it that he is interested in?

An hon. member: I'm available.

An hon. member: Are you going to the ball game today, Bill?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I am going to the ball game today.

Mr. Deans: This is what is wrong with sitting in the morning.

Mr. Kerrio: I would like a couple in the reds.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't got any more tickets. I am sorry.

Mr. Lewis: I have the money.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm glad; I need it. Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to go on but there are a lot of questions being asked.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. Premier continue with his statement? Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: It was the Premier who answered the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The response from the north has been overwhelmingly positive since the government's intention was made known.

Mr. Breithaupt: They are desperate for anything.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Members will have a chance to vote against it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There will be a question period later. Order; order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Municipal councils, chambers of commerce and individual citizens in the north have expressed strong support for this recognition of the special status of northern Ontario.

The north comprises almost 90 per cent of the land area of this province. Its area would accommodate, for example, France and Germany, with room to spare. It is more than 1,000 miles from parts of northern Ontario to Queen's Park. In fact, Halifax is roughly the same distance from Toronto as some parts of northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: We have been telling you that for years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As part of our commitment—we have been listening and we have been doing something about it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In the member's riding.

Mr. Ruston: He is going to switch over, like Horner.

Mr. Martel: After 34 years.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's get on with the business of the House. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As part of our commitment to make government more accessible to the people of the north, the ministry will be establishing regional and district offices in both northeastern and northwestern Ontario, with an assistant deputy minister resident in each region.

Mr. Stokes: The northwestern office should be in Geraldton.

Mr. Warner: With Bernier as campaign manager.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The location—Mr. Speaker, I can't answer all of these questions.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the House will agree—the interjections are not assisting getting on with the business of the House. Will the Premier continue his statement; and please, wait for the question period?

Mr. Ruston: Get the big stick out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is a very non-provocative statement.

The location of these offices has been the subject of intense interest on the part of the communities of northern Ontario and briefs have been received from many municipal councils expressing support for the concept. These are being studied carefully and a decision on the location of regional and district offices will be made in the near future.

In order to improve community liaison, the 25 northern affairs offices now with the Ministry of Natural Resources will be transferred to this new ministry. With assistance from these local offices, and from the people and organizations of the north, a prime function of the regional assistant deputy ministers will be to identify problems and needs unique to these regions, and to assume a co-ordinating role in resolving them at the local level by bringing together the local interests and the provincial ministries concerned. To help achieve this goal, the assistant deputy ministers will chair the public service advisory boards in these areas, which bring together the regional directors from government ministries operating in the north.

[10:15]

The Ministry of Northern Affairs will take over responsibilities for community and regional priority projects and townsite development in the north, which were formerly the responsibility of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Northern Affairs will also assume responsibility for the northern Ontario resources transportation programme, the resource access roads, as well as the isolated communities assistance programme, formerly administered by the Ministry of Natural Resources. The establishment of priorities for the northern road construction programme will be transferred to Northern Affairs from the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. On July 1 the ministry will assume responsibility for the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, including norOntair and the telecommunications service.

Transportation and tourism go hand in hand and so the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission will become directly involved, along with the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, in promoting and planning new recreational attractions.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There will be time for questions in the question period.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Added impetus will be given to this effort by the delivery to the commission this spring of four modern unit trains. NorOntair, which the House knows, will also take delivery of a seventh aircraft. NorOntair, which is one of the government's initiatives of which I am especially proud, Mr. Speaker, has been expanded until it now serves Sudbury, Timmins, North Bay, Earlton, Kirkland Lake, Kapuskasing, Elliot Lake, Chapleau, the Sault, Wawa, Thunder Bay, Pickle Lake, Kenora, Dryden, Fort Frances and Atikokan.

These initiatives on the part of our government demonstrate that, even as it is determined to preserve the natural and recreational heritage of this vast region of Ontario, it is also determined that the people of the north will share in the mainstream of development of our province.

Mr. Laughren: Not with Leo Bernier. He is the wrong minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all members of this House will join me in welcoming this legislation, and that, in the months ahead, they will demonstrate, in the Legislature and beyond—

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean "and beyond"? What is "and beyond"?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the same spirit of co-operation in assisting the government in implementing our programmes for the north.

Mr. Laughren: Not with Leo Bernier there.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Deans: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you would be good enough to provide for the Minister of Transportation and Communications a copy of page 14, item number 1, which states that two copies of each ministerial statement shall be delivered to the party leaders or their representatives at or before the time the statement is made in the House, in order that they could read it and understand it?

Mr. Speaker: I believe that's one statement to each party, is it not? Has that not been done?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, if that is the case I apologize, because I understood copies of the statement were delivered.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously there was a breakdown in communications.

Mr. S. Smith: And transportation.

Mr. Speaker: And transportation. Anyway that is the instruction, so the hon. minister could move to rectify it and provide the statement, it might be helpful, if that's possible.

Oral questions.

POWER STATION RELIABILITY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy: Is there any special activity, inquiry, investigation that his ministry might now undertake to reduce the pattern of successive, serious, technical breakdowns associated with nuclear technology in the province of Ontario, the latest being the information about Nanticoke. Has the minister reached the point where he regards this—

Mr. Cassidy: Thermal stations.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry, thermal stations, the most recent being Nanticoke. Is he prepared to do something a little more urgent than the repair jobs which have characterized the activity in the past?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the Nanticoke plant, as the Leader of the Opposition has stated, is not nuclear, it's coal-fired.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: As a matter of fact, to my knowledge any of the serious problems have been in the conventional part of the plants. The plants generally are all the same, whether they're nuclear-fuelled, whether they're coal- or oil-fired or gas. Three-quarters of that plant probably is of conventional design and they look very similar.

The problem, of course, in Nanticoke was announced on March 15 by Hydro in connection with the stresses in hangers—that's the principal problem there. I may say that was a design problem. It was thought that the design used there was an improvement. It was, I guess, virtually impossible to determine the various stresses on expansion

of the system as it heats up. That wasn't able to be calculated, and as a result it was discovered that with the heating up of the plant there was an unusual distribution of stress.

The hangers that were designed—and these are stainless steel hangers from two to four inches in diameter—were not adequate to support the system, which all hangs from the roof. It was a technical problem; it's being resolved by the manufacturer in terms of replacement of the rods and the support systems. So, I hardly think that would require any investigation. It's a techincal problem; it's being resolved.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: The minister will concede that these technical problems continue to emerge time and again. I wonder about the design specifications. I wonder about the whole process of the construction of these plants, and who pays ultimately for all of the changes which, in succession, proliferate. Is the cost to the manufacturer, or do we in the province of Ontario bear these costs?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: May I just make some general comments in terms of systems? As you know, Ontario is probably leading the world in many cases in regard to the generation of electricity. This latest plant at Nanticoke was conceived as an improvement, really, in terms of design. What you try to do is get the system a little smaller—you need less area; but there are some stresses that you really have to measure when it's in operation. In connection with these hangers: They had to design a special gauge that would measure the stress when the system was in operation and heat it to a very high temperature. That gauge has been put on the rods to determine what the stresses are, and improvements are being made.

But you learn—let's face it. If you're going to stick 100 per cent with what you have, you'll never make any improvement. I'm not trying to assess blame, or say it's a good thing or a bad thing. What I'm saying is that if you never do anything, you'll never make any mistakes, but you'll never make any improvements, either.

Mr. Breithaupt: The last cabinet shuffle proved that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Now the company is replacing these hangers and doing the necessary work, and I would assume that the company would bear the cost of that.

Mr. Deans: You assume? Don't you know?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Halton-Burlington with a supplementary.

Mr. Reed: I wonder if the minister would take steps to ensure that mechanical breakdowns of this nature are not used by Ontario Hydro as an excuse for the urgency for expansion of the system, as they seem to have done this past winter.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I don't think that's a correct observation. I was in Nanticoke earlier this week. I inspected that particular plant. I looked at the problems, and it was explained to me what had happened there. I can assure the member that it wasn't a question of deliberately shutting down a plant to generate concern for a lack of capacity in our system. It wasn't that at all—it's a legitimate design problem that has been discovered, and is now being rectified.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: If the heat factor, combined with the tension, is what created this problem, what conceivable explanation is there for the fact that the design engineers would not have known in advance that that heat factor was going to be there? Is it a completely new product that they've never had any experience with—and heat?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: No, it's not a new product. The heat, of course, is there in any plant—there are similar temperatures. The problem, as I understand it, was that the design of these particular boilers was such that it was a matter of trying to develop more compact units. The whole system is suspended; because of expansion in operation, rather than push up this immense amount of equipment, it's suspended from the roof. With a change in design of the size of the unit, it was a question of the tensile strength of the hangers and the placement of those particular hangers. This was the new element in terms of this particular manufacturer.

I was told and believe that it's virtually impossible, because there are hundreds of these rods, to calculate the stresses that are generated unless it's in operation because of the expansion of the entire system.

Mr. Deans: I just don't believe that.

Mr. Lewis: I don't believe it.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You don't have to believe it. I'm not an engineer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: You are telling me that modern technology is trial and error.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I'm not an engineer. You may have more knowledge than one.

Mr. Foulds: Certainly more than you.

Mr. Deans: This is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think a very brief question was asked and I would hope that the answer would be brief. If it requires a long, detailed explanation I think it should be tabled, because we've spent almost eight minutes in the House here now.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary.

Mr. G. I. Miller: I think the minister is correct with his assessment of the plant at Nanticoke because it is a new system. The simple question is was it under warranty or wasn't it? Should it not be the responsibility of the manufacturers to guarantee that it will work with the amount of money that's been involved in this particular plant?

Mr. Deans: It is inadequate engineering.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: At the risk of repetition, I would assume that the manufacturer has acknowledged responsibility insofar as—

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean, assume?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —the manufacturer is doing the necessary rectification work or design.

Mr. Lewis: Don't you know? Who designed it?

HALTON LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: How will his food land guidelines apply in the visible and specific case of site F, the controversial landfill site in Halton region, 500 acres of class 1 agricultural land, when there are a great many other sites which might be chosen? How will his guidelines apply to the preservation of that piece of agricultural land?

Hon. W. Newman: As the Leader of the Opposition knows, there will be an Environmental Assessment Board hearing on that particular site. Now that they have decided on it, there will be a hearing. Our people will be called forward at that time to give the appropriate evidence before that hearing. I've already had the same question asked by many people who live in the area and I've pointed out that we will be pointing out how our guidelines would be effective in that area.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: If the ministry people come forward and make advice and then the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) cancels it out so that he reduces the guidelines to nothing, what about it?

Hon. W. Newman: We do have a few independent boards around.

An hon. member: Very few.

Hon. W. Newman: The Environmental Assessment Board will be sitting on this hearing and will be hearing all the evidence from all sides regarding the site. They will be making their decision and recommendation to the Ministry of the Environment.

Mr. Reed: Could the minister tell us exactly how the green paper applies to this situation?

Hon. W. Newman: I would suggest that the member read the guidelines over very carefully and see exactly how they would apply to all situations.

Mr. MacDonald: We have.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister not realize that this is a classic little test case of the irrelevance of the guidelines in that he will appear before the Environmental Assessment Board, perhaps to say it's inappropriate to use those 500 acres in that fashion, but his colleague immediately to his left has already made it known that he and his ministry want that 500 acres as a landfill site? How does the minister allow his guidelines to be handled that way?

Mr. Breithaupt: Don't you talk to each other?

[10:30]

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious the leader of the official opposition wanted it all etched in stone.

Mr. Breaugh: You should be etched in stone.

Hon. W. Newman: What I am saying by our guidelines, whether it applies here or anywhere else, is good common sense must prevail over the whole situation. I said our people would be going before that particular hearing. The members will be picking up

individual cases from time to time that they will bring before us, and that's fine. But the Leader of the Opposition wants it all written into legislation.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. W. Newman: He wants it all written into legislation and to have it his own way.

Interjection.

Hon. W. Newman: But I tell the House there has got to be some flexibility in the guidelines and it is there.

Mr. Lewis: They are flexible all right. They are so flexible they are meaningless.

Hon. W. Newman: Your own people, your caucus said they were great.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Who said so?

Hon. W. Newman: I am not going to tell you who said so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All of your farmers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting time here. Does the hon. minister have a point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) I would like to say there were two copies of my statement delivered to Mr. Lewis's office and Mr. Smith's office by special messenger this morning.

Mr. Deans: When?

Hon. Mr. Snow: This morning.

Hon. W. Newman: Why don't you go to your office?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure they will show up.

Mr. Lewis: Your message disappeared en route.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He went to the ball game.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Regarding the findings of Dr. Botterell, and in particular two of the findings—one regarding the sale of uninspected meat in the province and the other the indiscriminate use of antibiotics—can the minister tell us exactly what his ministry is going to be doing to implement the recommendation for a committee on antibiotics in agriculture for the protection of human and animal health—in particular to make sure that antibiotics indiscriminately used in agriculture do not (a) find their way into the human food chain and (b) result in the development of resistant organisms which will then affect humans without the proper antibiotics to defeat them?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, Dr. Botterell's report, which I released some time ago, contained 132 recommendations. We are at this point in time carrying out many of the recommendations. Many of the recommendations will be carried out—well over half of them in total—and the others are being studied at this point in time.

Regarding the member's question on meat inspection, all meat in the province of Ontario, by and large, at the larger plants is inspected, of course, by federal inspectors. They do inspect it for residue. At the smaller slaughterhouses throughout the province, which are inspected by our inspectors, all animals are inspected before they are slaughtered and are inspected after they are slaughtered. Some tissue samples are taken from any animal about which there is any doubt, and those animals are held until results are made known. So that, by and large, we pick up any particular problems in our smaller slaughterhouses.

Regarding the agricultural people using antibiotics to treat their livestock, all the antibiotics that are issued to the agricultural community today point out very clearly on the labels the time when they should withdraw these antibiotics, especially in milk. By testing the milk that goes into our labs, we can pick up antibiotics. There is a penalty to the milk producer for any milk that is shipped that is carrying antibiotics. As far as any feed is concerned that is set out for the farmers to feed to their livestock and contains antibiotics, there is a tag on it saying how long the livestock should be taken off the feed before they are slaughtered.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, is the minister then saying that he rejects the suggestion by Dr. Botterell that a committee be set up on antibiotics in agriculture and protection of human and animal health—in particular, some of the points that Dr. Botterell brought out about conflict of interest regarding veterinarians who sell the drugs,

where the bulk of some of their income comes from the sale of these drugs, and a very distinct possibility exists that these drugs could enter the human food chain? Why not accept the committee's suggestion, which strikes me as being very sensible? Certainly, as a physician I would feel more protected by that than by the minister's labels on the antibiotics.

Hon. W. Newman: As far as the committees are concerned, Dr. Botterell recommended in his report setting up about 15 or 17 committees. Certainly, we will be looking into that aspect very carefully, as the member well knows. If it is necessary to set up a committee I am certainly not averse to setting up a committee. I'd rather take direct action, if possible, than deal with a committee.

Mr. Riddell: Has the minister been given any indication that dead stock is again finding its way into human food, and that some of the culprits involved are the same ones that were involved before? Has he given any consideration to introducing legislation requiring that dead stock be sent directly to rendering plants, rather than to pet foods and other markets?

Hon. W. Newman: I am aware of the cases that were before us about a year—year and a half ago—where charges were laid regarding the handling of dead beef. It all has to be charcoaled before it is shipped anywhere. By and large, the problem there was that it was going from this province to another province where it was being dealt with, and then to some degree being sent back into this province. Some of those cases are still before the courts, I am not aware of anyone trying, at this point in time, to get involved in this. I heard nothing about it.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Minister of Health: Is it still the ministry's policy to send ambulances with 50,000 miles or over to northern Ontario, unless a hospital has "a proven ability" to maintain their vehicles? And will the minister tell the House exactly how many such vehicles have been sent to northern Ontario over the past several years and what the mileage was on each of them when the vehicle was sent there?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Obviously, I don't have the figures as to the mileage on each ambulance. But the concern of the ambulance branch is to issue a new vehicle—and, by and large, for the last few years that has meant a Chrysler product—to an ambulance operation which is in reasonable proximity to a Chrysler dealer. This way if there are problems during the warranty period they can be attended to very quickly, so that the ambulance is not out of service for an inordinate length of time, and we don't have problems with the warranty.

I'll get the statistics the member wants—as to which ambulances were sent where. I might tell him that this year we will be replacing a significant number of the ambulances throughout the province.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of a brief supplementary: Is the minister aware of the minutes of the Ontario Hospital Association committee on ambulance services, in which they were addressed by the minister's director of ambulance services. The minutes say that Mr. Brubacher stated that generally it is policy to send vehicles with 50,000 miles or over to northern Ontario. There is nothing here about Chrysler dealers and it was my understanding—the minister can correct me if I am wrong—that there are a certain number of Chrysler dealers in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the question has been answered.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The point is that there are ambulance services operating in a number of small communities, not just in northern Ontario, but throughout the province, which are not in close proximity to Chrysler dealers. But we would want to be sure—and it has nothing to do with north or south—that we had exhausted all the potential benefits of a warranty. I'm not sure of the minutes to which the hon. member is referring—I'm not sure how old they are, whether they are recent or several years ago—

Mr. S. Smith: December 14, 1976.

Mr. Riddell: Have you ever thought of replacing Brubacher?

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary on this.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to ask the minister if he, with his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), can get tough with Chrysler and insist that they give service to northern Ontario—if that is what he is implying in his statement?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It's the usual quality of question from over there—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: You can't claim so much for your answers.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, our concern always has to be that the vehicles we put on the road are in a condition to meet the needs of the area, and that we are able to maintain them. And if the hon. member has a concern about maintaining them, that's another problem.

Mr. Foulds: So the ones with 50,000 miles go north; the second-hand ones go north.

WINONA SEWAGE FACILITY

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Recognizing the severity of the sewage problem in the Winona area, and the statement of the minister of two days ago that he intended to spend something up to $4 million over the next four years to try and solve it, is it not possible to bring that programme forward and to implement it much more quickly than the four year period, given that it's going to take perhaps six or seven years in the overall to get the remaining, connecting sewers up to the houses that have to have them?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That line, the pipe, involves about three and a half miles. The region in fact is building the pipe from its present location at the edge of Hamilton about three and a half miles into Winona. They've allocated $1 million for this year and the total cost is about $4 million as the hon. member says. I would think that that should be completed, assuming they allocate funds for the next two or three years, by the end of 1979 or early 1980.

As the hon. member says, the problem is in the village of Winona. The septic systems there are a health menace at present; they've been condemned by the local medical officer of health. Therefore my ministry has allocated around $650,000 or $700,000 for work within the community.

We can finish the work, I would think, in the community itself by the end of next year. But as the hon. member knows, that work won't be any good until it's connected to the pipe that will be going into the Hamilton treatment plant. So it will be a matter of the region stepping up its work. We are paying our usual 15 per cent grant on works like that. If some arrangement can be made to speed up the pipe, having in mind the arrangement as to funds, I would be happy to see that done.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Is it not possible to extend the funds now to the region, on a loan basis if need be, in order that they can proceed and get the work done? So that they can be completed, they can have the trunk sewer ready next year, when the province has the connections ready in the village?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Frankly, I haven't got funds in my budget for more than the 15 per cent grant as far as the pipe is concerned. There is money, as I said, going into the village of Winona. If my friend on my left is generous and will increase my allotment for that particular project for next year, it's possible to advance the completion of construction.

Mr. Deans: Find out if he will give you some money.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, I will.

REFORESTATION

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the minister advise what he's going to do about reforestation in the province in the next few years, in view of the fact it was mentioned in the Throne Speech and in view of the fact that in the last five years we've fallen behind some 370,000 acres in reforesting the province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, of course that last editorial comment was the hon. member's and not necessarily factual.

Mr. Reid: It came from your ministry so I don't believe it either.

Mr. Riddell: It's not the only time your ministry has given out that information.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's a normal indication of looking at a figure and concluding already on the basis of a predetermined thought. I'm learning to speak like the Premier, aren't I?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Now the hon. minister with the answer.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The fact is it may be premature for me to jump to priorities within the ministry, but as I see my most important priority right now it is to improve our efforts at regeneration by other than natural means.

Mr. Martel: Well?

Hon. F. S. Miller: This is tied really not to simply planting trees. I think there's a naive belief that if we got a lot of young kids out with axes or some kind of instrument and put them in the north and put seed in the ground we'd have a lot more trees. I think the hon. member for Sudbury East knows that—he lives up there. It has a great deal to do with harvesting techniques. So I'm discussing the way we manage our forests with the pulp mills, particularly for spruce; I'm determined to see that we will keep on improving.

By the way, this year I'm told we will spend $5 million more for reforestation than we did last year. This I'm told will allow us to have some 45,000 to 50,000 more acres of regeneration this year than last year.

Mr. Martel: If it stays alive, Frank.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Last year we had about 175,000, compared to 30,000 10 years ago. So I think when you put these statistics together we've done a lot to improve reforestation in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: It's still pretty pathetic.

Hon. F. S. Miller: There is a lot still to be learned. I thought that we knew how to replant trees. We don't. There are lots of things that still are not known about certain species.

[10:45]

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on. This beguiling innocence is too much.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'll even—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, they have been planting trees for generations in this world.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, they have.

Mr. Speaker: The question's been asked and an answer's been given.

Mr. S. Smith: Sweden is working on its third forest.

Hon. F. S. Miller: But you know, one of the things about this—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There's no supplementary question yet.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I realize that, but he's stimulating my glands.

Mr. Speaker: I don't know what that has to do with reforestation.

An hon. member: I could use some help with that.

An hon. member: He's in the wrong ministry.

Mr. Lewis: I could reply to that in a way that would have me ejected.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They'll start misconstruing our friendship.

Mr. Lewis: Perish the thought.

Mr. Reid: That certainly explains a lot anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Can the hon. minister be allowed to continue?

Hon. F. S. Miller: They're diverting me. In any case, I can only assure the member I am determined to put a lot of time, effort, and I hope government money—

Mr. Lewis: Into learning how to plant a tree.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —into improving what is already an excellent programme.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the minister said it was an excellent programme and my figures, which weren't refuted by his ministry officials, is that we're something like two million acres short of reforestation in the province. But my supplementary is this: In view of the fact that, even of all the replanting that's been done, there's only a 50 per cent survival rate after five years, can the minister inform us what he's going to do about the technology and ensure that the trees that are planted do survive and are a quality tree?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would think one of the things we have to keep in mind is that when one has a regeneration programme, one is aware that not every seedling is going to take root.

Mr. Reid: Fifty per cent is not a good average.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The fact remains that—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The interjections are not assisting.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —the areas subject to intensive silvicultural techniques, I'm told,

produce about twice the overall volume of timber that naturally regenerated grounds do.

Mr. Stokes: Not with clear cutting, it doesn't.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Ah! Clear cutting is a very useful technique, provided the widths of the clear cutting are managed. As I'm sure the hon. member who interjected knows, we're working on those also. I've discussed those with the presidents of the pulp mills and the forest industry very recently.

Mr. Cassidy: How long?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am told of all the types we're working on—

Mr. Cassidy: How long does the rape go on?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just let me answer. Of all the types we're working on, black spruce in the wet country is still the toughest to work on that requires clear cutting. It requires clear cutting of a managed type rather than simply cutting for very many hundreds of yards with no stands of trees left in the middle.

Mr. Foulds: Miles.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Those are the kinds of things I'm determined to see improved and I'm sure will be.

Mr. Cassidy: The government has been around for 34 years to do it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This has developed into a discussion instead of a question and answer period.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there's a question, we will allow it. This is the final question on this.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to ask the minister, in the programme that he has planned, and I gather he said an additional $5 million—

An hon. member: Twenty-five million dollars.

Mr. Foulds: —in the coming year, how much of that money will be devoted to hiring additional unit foresters, so that the supervision of the management plans in terms of the company cutting and the reforestation actually can take place?

Mr. Martel: That's where the breakdown starts.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I think there's a certain amount extra for management. I was talking about reforestation and I think there's $550,000 more in the budget over last year for management of projects in addition to the amount of money that is being spent on reforestation per se. We're counting them as separate things.

One of the things I have to determine is this: Should government be the agency doing the replanting, or should it simply insist on the replanting being done? That's one of the ones I want to look into.

Mr. Lewis: You are going to look into it, and you took the responsibility five years ago.

Mr. Martel: What a hodge-podge over there.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I announced that as a final supplementary. We've spent quite a bit of time on that one subject.

An hon. member: It's important.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Much of that time would be better spent on new questions.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: You are right.

Mr. Speaker: This is a question and answer period and not a discussion period, I might point out again. The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications has the answer to a question asked previously.

Mr. Lewis: Better have the return of Leo Bernier.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer recent questions asked by the hon. member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham) respecting the Urban Transportation Development Corporation.

I apologize, Mr. Speaker, if this answer may be a little long. You may, I guess, decide that—

Mr. Speaker: Is it the length I see in your hand there?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No.

Mr. Speaker: I point out again there are these complaints about question period. If the answer is a lengthy one then it should be given before the orders of the day, during statements by the ministry. As to what is considered a long answer, I would think anything over two minutes is a long answer. Some of them stretch longer than that.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's true.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is just getting started.

Mr. MacDonald: A good guideline.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we don't want to get down to figures on this.

Mr. Ruston: Next question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're still wasting the time of the question period, I might say, with the interjections. About how long is the answer?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the answer is five pages, but if you wish—

Mr. Speaker: Can you summarize it?

Mr. Peterson: He hasn't read it yet, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No. Mr. Speaker, if that's the feeling of the House I'll be glad to delay the answer until next week.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: If it's too long then I'll add a minute or so on to the question period, but please keep this in mind for both questions and answers.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, why are you allowing this? Why can you not just revert to ministerial statements? Why take it out of the question period?

Mr. Speaker: We'll judge that. We'll see how long it is. The hon. minister will continue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some of it is the answer to a question.

Mr. MacDonald: Two minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I said that was an approximation, but it's a good guide. The hon. minister will start now.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I could have been on page three by now.

Mr. Breithaupt: You are imputing motives.

UTDC FOREIGN CONTRACTS

Hon. Mr. Snow: The hon. member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham) questioned me recently in connection with the Urban Transportation Development Corporation and its bid to have Ontario manufacturers supply the major components of the proposed subway system in Caracas, Venezuela.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the primary concern of the hon. member seemed not to be with the success of the effort but rather with the apparent need of UTDC to deal through a commercial agent.

I feel it is important that the members of the Legislature be aware of the circumstances of this matter. A Canadian consortium consisting of UDTC of Toronto and Hawker/Siddeley Canada Limited of Thunder Bay entered into an agreement to form a joint venture consortium to bid for the supply of major components of the proposed subway system in Caracas, Venezuela. The project is estimated to be for approximately $250 million worth of transit equipment supply.

The joint venture company, named Metro Canada Limited, entered its bid on March 18, 1977. The proposal included the supply of 242 subway cars which would be built in Thunder Bay, Ontario, electrical distribution systems for the complete subway and automatic train control equipment and the design, supply and installation of the complete trackwork. The total project could provide over 2,700 man years of employment for Canadian workers, with the work spread throughout a number of communities in Ontario and, possibly, some in Quebec and other provinces.

The joint venture company, Metro Canada Limited, has received financial support from the governments of Canada, Quebec and Ontario. The consortium's bid was in competition with nine other international consortiums, including the British, French and Japanese.

Metro Canada Limited was formed to meet the Venezuelan requirements for common or joint responsibility among the contracting parties. The Venezuelan procedures also required that the various international bidders be represented by legal representatives domiciled in Venezuela. Therefore, the Canadian consortium engaged the services of a Venezuelan

commercial representative named Venezuelan International Business Consultants. This firm was engaged after extensive interviews and following consultations with a number of Canadian and Venezuelan companies, banking institutions and legal firms. The commercial representative contract meets, and in most cases exceeds, the guidelines recently developed by the federal government for use in engaging foreign representative services.

The particular services and expertise required of the representatives and the information requested by the hon. member is as follows:

He must be familiar with and provide advice on marketing conditions in Caracas as they relate to labour rates and employment practices; the ability to secure especially skilled labour at appropriate times throughout the contract; Venezuelan practices with respect to fringe benefits, labour rates, holidays and working conditions; labour productivity and wage escalation provisions; customs and excise practices and duties, warehousing and local shipping services; subcontractor practices, their payment terms and supervisory practices.

He must be familiar with and provide advice on Venezuelan banking practices and local subcontractors' financing practices. He will provide advice and reports on Venezuelan laws and regulations with respect to public works contracts, municipal services, permits for buildings, electrical codes, worker safety regulations and so on. He will assist in and provide reports for negotiations on acceptable terms and conditions for the prime contract and the various subcontracts to be tendered in Venezuela. He will assist in the administration and conduct of acceptance and commissioning procedures and negotiations and administration of all warranty provisions and customer service.

The management of Metro Canada Limited and the board of directors of UTDC approved the foreign representative's contract and the board of directors of UDTC advised the Ontario government, as UDTC's primary shareholder, of the contract and its provisions. The Ontario government officials examined the documentation and concurred with UDTC's board of directors in the approval of the agreement.

For the further information of the members of the Legislature, I am tabling the following documents: A Management Board of Cabinet document, dated February 25, 1977, entitled Conduct of Business by Agencies, Boards and Commissions; a statement by the Hon. Robert Andras of December 16, 1976, in his capacity as president of the Treasury Board, government of Canada, on the government policy and guidelines concerning the commercial practices of federal Crown corporations; the draft of the commercial representation agreement, dated October 1, 1976; the resolution by the board of directors of UDTC re commercial representation agreement; the report on federal Crown corporation guidelines and the Metro Canada Venezuelan commercial representation agreement; a letter to myself from my deputy minister reporting on this matter, dated December 14, 1976; and a letter from my deputy minister to Mr. Foley, president of UTDC, dated December 20, 1976.

Mr. Speaker: We will add four minutes to the question period.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a supplementary on this?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Cunningham: I did ask in my question what the basis was of the commission or retainer and I have yet to hear this. I am just wondering how much this little soirée to Venezuela cost the Ontario taxpayers?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I felt I already answered in some length. I have stated that I am tabling the contract and I thought that would give the hon. member the information.

Mr. Shore: He can't read.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary: Could the minister advise us as to the success of the—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't hear the hon. member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Warner: Could the minister advise us as to the success of the trip so far to Venezuela, as it is generally understood that they were not successful, they have not achieved a contract and that what is the normal practice for most countries will remain —that is, that the equipment will be built and purchased in the country or by common agreement, such as in the European Common Market, so there is no chance for the sale to be consummated?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Conway: Is the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) going to run in Venezuela?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The bid has been submitted, as I stated, on March 18. There is no decision by the Venezuelan government or no award of contract at this time.

Nine bids were submitted. As the members may be aware, a federal consortium submitted a much larger bid several months ago for a railway contract also in Venezuela. To my knowledge at this moment, no contract has been awarded on that one to date, but certainly my understanding is that things look very good, perhaps not for the total contract but at least for portions of the contract in both those situations.

[11:00]

It's not unnatural in a contract of a size such as this and when many of the bids were perhaps not totally in accordance with the specifications, that the Venezuelan officials will take some lengthy period of time to analyse all these contracts. We don't expect that there'll be any early decision made or any awards made in the immediate future.

TIMMINS HEALTH LAB

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Health: Is the minister in a position to explain why, after his predecessor and his parliamentary assistant have said that the replacement facilities for the provincial health lab in Timmins has top priority in his ministry, that those inadequate facilities which are really a firetrap are still what they're using for the provincial facilities? Can the minister surely not get different and adequate and proper facilities for those workers in the Ontario provincial health lab in Timmins right away?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will be discussing this matter with cabinet next Wednesday and hope late next week to announce our decision.

FLOOD PLAINS

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Since the flood plain criteria and management evaluation study was undertaken last April with the final completion date of August 1976; and since the report is now completed, but according to the ministry officials as of two days ago the minister will not be making any decisions on this matter until the report is printed in its final form; and, since this matter is an urgent one as far as the conservation authorities and many property owners are concerned, would the minister consider dealing with the matter immediately as a priority item rather than waiting for the final glossy print version?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I understand it's ready for printing right now, and in fact it's one of those important topics, as the member has said. I want the chairman's committee of conservation authorities and the PMLC to have a chance to have some input into it; I'm certain the Minister of Housing is going to have some very real interest in it too.

As to proceeding faster, I'll certainly consider it. I've asked that my parliamentary assistant become specifically responsible for conservation authority problems so that some one will have the time to devote to it, perhaps more exclusively than the minister, per se, will, and yet have a political input into it. I hope that his extra efforts will help speed it up.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the flood plain mapping criteria are currently holding up much of the development in my part of the province and in other parts of the province as well, what sort of time frame does the minister see in respect to holding these meetings with the conservation authorities and in finalizing this entire matter?

Hon. F. S. Miller: In all honesty I couldn't give the member a time frame, but I'll be glad to have one worked out for him.

GAS RATES

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy: In view of the fact that the Consumers' Gas Company reported a 33 per cent increase in profits in the three months ended December 31, due to the unusually severe weather last fall, is the minister prepared to suggest to the Ontario Energy Board that it should consider ordering a rebate of these excess profits to customers who have been hit by rate increases both last October and in March of this year?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: As the members of this House know, rates are determined by the Ontario Energy Board. That unusual income will no doubt be taken into consideration in the determination of the rates and, of course, will consequently flow through to the consumer—I would assume in the form of a lesser rate than they would have suffered because of those added revenues.

In other words, yes indeed, the consumer will benefit from that.

Ms. Bryden: Supplementary: Could I ask the minister how this situation differs from the situation in northern Ontario, where the Northern and Central Gas Corporation has been ordered to make a rebate of excess profits to the customers there in a similar situation?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It is my understanding that the rebates, if we can call them rebates, are in effect a deduction from what the rate otherwise would be; in other words, it's reflected in current rates permitted by the Ontario Energy Board. All of the rates of the gas distributors have to go before the Ontario Energy Board, where there's a public hearing—and of course representations are made, intervenors are there—and the board sets the rate of return to the company, and accordingly fixes what the rates will be.

If there is an unusual profit—in this case because of an unusual volume of sales—then that will be reflected in the current rate, or the rate that is determined by the board. So in effect there is a rebate, but it may be done in a different manner than a member may have heard was the case in another jurisdiction, where a cheque for $5 or $10 may be sent out to customers.

FINANCIAL PROTECTION FOR FARMERS

Mr. Riddell: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, if I can get his attention.

With the financial collapse of Essex Packers and the consequential hardships and near bankruptcies of beef producers being the motivating factor behind the establishment of the financial protection task force, what action is the minister going to take to reduce the financial risk that is so inherent in the transfer of ownership of food products from the farmer to the purchasers, as was indicated in this report of the task force?

Hon. W. Newman: I think there are eight or nine recommendations in that report. There were some suggestions that we should ask for changes in The Bank Act. We will be pursuing that, though we have given up, almost, pursuing amendments to The Bank Act, because we've been trying for so many years. That's why I set up a task force, so that we could get these recommendations.

There are several schemes that could be worked out under our present legislation, The Farm Products Marketing Board Act. As members know, the Ontario Milk Marketing Board has a programme in place. I look back to what happened last year; but the total loss is 0.007 per cent of sales, which is very low, however that still doesn't help those individual farmers who get into a particular problem.

I'm looking at all the recommendations at this point in time. Some of them involve other ministries. We are talking to the other ministries and are pursuing the matter with them. We hope we will come up with a single programme of some sort that will try and encompass as many of those recommendations as possible.

I think they did an excellent job in the report; they have come up with some very good recommendations.

Mr. Riddell: In this same connection, recalling a speech the minister made at the time Essex Packers went into receivership, advising the farmers not to accept the first offer, I have now been led to believe that on the advice of the minister, those farmers who refused the 15 cents on the dollar will now not receive one red cent; and those farmers who did accept the 15 cents on the dollar will receive in the neighbourhood of nine cents on the dollar. Is this information factual; is the government now prepared to admit making a very serious blunder in leasing its facilities to Essex Packers in the first place; and what is the minister going to do to help these farmers?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as far as the leasing of the plant is concerned, that does not come under my purview. As the member well knows, it comes under the Ministry of Correctional Services.

But as far as the individual farmers are concerned, yes I did say, at a meeting a year or so ago—of whatever it was, I believe it was the cattlemen's association—that I thought they should hold on. I was led to believe, maybe wrongly so—and occasionally we do this, you know; sometimes we stick our neck out on behalf of what we think is the best thing for the farmer.

Mr. Breithaupt: You have had lots of practice at making mistakes.

Hon. W. Newman: None of us are perfect, and I take the full responsibility for what happened.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You're wasting valuable time.

Hon. W. Newman: I accept the responsibility. On the understanding of phone calls that I had received, there was to be some better and firmer offers coming in, which did not materialize. But I accept that responsibility as an individual—

Mr. MacDonald: But not as a minister.

Mr. Breithaupt: What are you going to do about it now?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, I did do it. Maybe I jumped the gun; I did what I thought was right at that time. We were told there were better offers coming, which did not come forward at that time.

Mr. Reid: Do what's right now: resign.

Hon. W. Newman: Subsequent to the Essex Packers and other situations that have occurred in the past or could occur in the future, I set up this task force and I intend to implement many of its recommendations.

Some hon. members: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary; the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: One supplementary: Since he was clearly speaking to that group in his capacity as Minister of Agriculture and Food and, inadvertently or otherwise, may have misled them, does the minister not feel a governmental responsibility now to meet at least the nine-cent level, which others apparently will be paid but many will miss as a result of the minister's specific advice? I understand it wasn't made deliberately, but surely some compensation is forthcoming.

Mr. Riddell: That's inflation for you.

Hon. W. Newman: I've forgotten the exact wording, but at that time I indicated to the producers at that meeting, and I don't deny it, that I thought a better offer was coming and that I would suggest—or however I worded it—that perhaps it would be better if they waited. Some of those who did, unfortunately, did not make out as well as those who didn't. But certainly I did not deliberately or intentionally mislead anyone. I thought they would and I was hoping they would—

Mr. Reid: Nobody is arguing that.

Hon. W. Newman: As a matter of fact, I personally talked afterward to some of these people who had indicated they would come forward with a better offer. I won't tell the hon. member what I told them, but certainly they heard very loudly, and clearly from me.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: We've had a lot of supplementaries. We'll allow a final supplementary. The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: The minister having done what he thought was right at that time with the information he then had, would the minister now do the right thing again and arrange, either through additional funds for his ministry or in some form, to compensate those persons who took his advice or suggestion in good faith?

Mr. Speaker: I believe that question was just asked and answered.

Mr. S. Smith: No, it wasn't.

Mr. Lewis: It wasn't answered.

Mr. Peterson: What is the answer then?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: I don't believe I have any legal authority to do such a thing, but there are recommendations in this report which would prohibit some of these things from happening down the road. Look, we're going to have bankruptcies—I don't care whether it's in the private sector or in the agricultural sector—across this country from time to time.

Mr. Peterson: The whole province.

Hon. W. Newman: There are hundreds of them a week. We are trying to make it a little better. If we could get an amendment—I won't say from the Liberals' friends any more, but from the federal government in Ottawa—to change The Bank Act, as we've been trying to do for a long time, we wouldn't even have had to have this report and we wouldn't have had that problem.

Mr. Breithaupt: Jack Horner's friends.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No. The hon. member for Welland-Thorold.

Mr. Gaunt: It is a very important matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gaunt: It's very important.

Mr. Speaker: I realize that—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is just one person supposed to be asking questions here, and I had announced that that was the last supplementary because we're nearly at the finish of the question period. If there is any time left, then we'll allow further questions.

The member for Welland-Thorold.

DAYTON FORGING AND HEAT TREATING COMPANY

Mr. Swart: My question is to the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Would the minister explain why his ministry would approach the heat treat companies in the United States, particularly one with which I am familiar, the Dayton Forging and Heat Treating Company of Dayton, Ohio, to establish a facility in Ontario to supply a certain major customer here? Instead, why wouldn't his ministry approach our existing Ontario heat treat companies who have the capacity and know-how to look after the requirements and who have employees on layoff?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I'll have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, because I'm not even aware of the particular case the hon. member is referring to. If he would like to supply me with that information, I shall make an inquiry through the ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps you might send it across.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If there can be on that answer.

Mr. Swart: There is a supplementary on that answer. I ask the minister if he is not aware of a letter that was sent to him some three weeks ago by H and S Heat Treating in Welland concerning this matter. Would he also, when he is looking into it, find out why information was refused by Mr. Murray Berlin of his ministry's office in Cleveland to H and S Heat Treating? They called to get information on this matter and it was completely refused. Could the minister look into that matter?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I'll take the question as notice.

LOCAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. S. Smith: A question to the Minister of Health: What is the minister's response to the request by North End Residents Organization in Hamilton for assistance from his ministry for the establishment of a medical project to provide local health services in the north end of Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I don't believe that that has come to me. It may have gone to the branch of the ministry that looks at requests for grants. But I'll take that question as notice and find out. I have not seen that request.

Mr. S. Smith: A supplementary for clarification: I take it, then, that the Premier has not been in touch with the minister about that, and that the minister will look at the ministry branch that might be responsible and report back. Is that correct?

[11:15]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That's right. Often, Mr. Speaker, the correspondence that comes in, rather than it being all put upon my desk immediately is put out for investigation so that it comes back to my desk not only with the request but also the answer.

Mr. Peterson: You shuffle paper, Dennis. You just admitted it all. You just admitted you are a glorified mailman.

PAN-AMERICAN GAMES

Mr. Mackenzie: To the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet. In the absence of the Premier, I am wondering if he could respond to these questions. The mayor of Hamilton has indicated that the province of Ontario has committed itself to better than $17 million to the city of Hamilton for the promotion of the Pan-Am Games based on a cost of approximately $55 million. Is this a firm commitment of the province of Ontario? Will the province increase its commitment in the event that the cost of the 1983 project escalates, and to what extent would the province increase its commitment in the event of a cost escalation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I can't answer those questions. I will attempt to get the information or pass the questions along to the Premier. I am not aware of the details of whatever negotiations are going on.

UTDC FOREIGN CONTRACTS

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In response to my question

of March 31 regarding the Venezuelan UTDC deal, he indicated our bid was "very unlikely to be accepted." When is the minister going to admit that the UTDC is a complete failure and that we are wasting millions of Ontario taxpayers' dollars?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe those statements are factual at all. I did say I did not believe the UTDC bid as submitted would be successful because there were lower bids submitted. But I understand now that some of the lower bids that were submitted are conditional bids, so the whole matter will have to await the full consideration by the Venezuelan government of all the bids received. So we are not writing off the fact, certainly now, that none of our bids will be acceptable.

Mr. Cunningham: Supplementary, if I may: I am just wondering if the minister would indicate to the members of the House, and through us I suppose to the people of Ontario who have been supporting this fiasco for so long, just what substantial contracts we do have awaiting us here, and what progress is UTDC making? What real contracts are we going to expect to see here?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I really don't know what the hon. member is referring to. This is the only contract that I am aware of where the UTDC has joined with the private sector and with the federal Department of Industry where we are attempting to generate major foreign export business for Canadian industries. This to my knowledge is the first bid of this type that has been made.

FOREST FIRES

Mr. Foulds: In the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources, who I assume is already out planting trees while the others go to the ball game, I would like to direct a question to the resources secretary. In view of the continuing serious drought situation throughout northwestern Ontario, in which we have now 60 winter fires still burning, can the minister tell this House what steps have been taken for increased training of potential firefighting crews, for the establishment of standby crews, and for the seconding of other ministry personnel to these firefighting responsibilities as the situation arises?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the seriousness of the situation, but I do not know what steps have been taken and will be pleased to get that information to the hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, if I might: While the minister is seeking that information, could he find out if the plans of the ministry include the seconding of the forest management unit foresters and all the people involved in the reforestation programme to the firefighting situation should that need arise? Will that mean a cancelling of the reforestation programme as mentioned in the Throne Speech?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will make sure, Mr. Speaker, that that also is determined.

Mr. Reid: Would the minister also ensure that there is some co-ordination and liaison between his ministry or the Ministry of Natural Resources people and the various towns and municipalities and unorganized townships, because the whole place could be wiped out unless we have a fairly good programme?

NANTICOKE WATER LINE EXTENSION

Mr. G. I. Miller: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Is there any possibility of extending the water line from the Nanticoke water intake which has already been established to the municipalities of Jarvis and Hagersville, due to the fact that the correctional boys' school at Hagersville is on that line and there is a real need for better water quality in Hagersville and a shortage of water in Jarvis?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the proposed water line or extension of a water line to Jarvis, for example, is more or less tied into the future development of the Townsend area, and in the event that Townsend goes ahead it will be, of course, necessary to provide serviced lots within that new community. As Jarvis and Hagersville are in that area, it is natural to expect that the line would be extended to serve those two communities.

If Townsend doesn't go ahead the line will be a very expensive one as far as the users would be concerned in those two communities. So once a decision is made regarding Townsend, then in the event we don't go ahead with the new community we will have to make up our minds whether or not to service those areas. I appreciate the need for water, particularly in Jarvis, and if we can do something about the high rates that will

result from that line, we will consider the extension.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, could I ask one supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

REPORTS

Mrs. Campbell from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient: Webwood Investments Limited. The Trustees of the Toronto General Burying Grounds. Canada Trustco Mortgage Company. Borough of York. Village of Erie Beach. John A. Schmalz Agencies Limited. Borough of Scarborough. Fred LeBlond Cement Products Limited. Borough of East York. Brockville General Hospital. Kevalaine Corporation Limited. Township of Dover. Monsignor Zoel Lambert, Casgrain township. Roman Catholic Episcopal Church, Diocese of Alexandria. County of Peterborough. Frank Postl Enterprises Limited. City of Ottawa. Lombardo Furniture and Appliances Limited. City of Sault Ste. Marie. Perfume and Cosmetic Bars.

Your committee further recommends that copies of the Canadian Parliamentary Guide be purchased for distribution to the members of the assembly.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

MINISTRY OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS ACT

Hon. Mr. Welch, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Davis, moved first reading of Bill 26, An Act to establish the Ministry of Northern Affairs.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Conway: All Leo needs is Jeanette MacDonald.

EMPLOYEES' HEALTH AND SAFETY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Laughren moved first reading of Bill 27, An Act to amend The Employees' Health and Safety Act, 1976.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to discontinue the use of a collective bargaining agreement as a means for obtaining an exemption from the provision allowing an employee to continue to refuse to do work which he has reason to believe is unsafe. If I might say, we know this is a provisional bill, but it does serve notice as to how we think it should be changed for the omnibus legislation.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand, P. M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1978, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, April 7, 1977.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before calling the orders of the day—in keeping with the new rules, perhaps this might be an appropriate time to indicate the order of business for next week. The House will not, of course, sit on Monday. We will be sitting Tuesday and Thursday evenings next week. Tuesday afternoon and Tuesday evening, Thursday evening and Friday morning will be Throne Speech debate. Thursday afternoon will be the first session for the private members' public bills, at which time we will be calling orders 15 and 16. According to the motion, of course, the House does not sit on Wednesday. So the order next week would be Throne Speech debate, except for Thursday afternoon when we will do the private members' hour.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, having due regard to the constraints of time I shall be careful to leave room for my hon. colleague from Downsview (Mr. di Santo) who I know

is as eager as I to participate in the discussion this morning.

I'm happy to see that we now have the Deputy Speaker who has somehow survived the evening after that praise from the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) —which I thought was effusive, to say the least.

Mr. Breithaupt: Precisely on point, though.

Mr. Conway: I should like to join with my colleagues in highlighting that praise, which is obviously and appropriately given, and particularly encourage the hon. Deputy Speaker in the efforts that he has so carefully and successfully undertaken in this assembly, the new rules notwithstanding.

Likewise, it is a pleasure for me, as a relative newcomer to this august assembly, to speak briefly this morning on the address of Her Honour tabled and read in this assembly on Tuesday, March 29, 1977. To be sure, and not surprisingly, it is a desk-thumping assertion that babies are beautiful and that God is in his heaven and that the Progressive Conservatives are alive and well in Ontario.

Mr. Ruston: It's questionable about that.

Mr. Conway: Nothing is new.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You are taking lessons on how to whistle in the dark.

Mr. Conway: Some things are about to change. I must say as a member of this assembly I cannot take exception with any substantial point in this motherhood statement. I will repeat briefly the points that have been made and will no doubt be remade time and time again throughout this Throne Speech debate. After all, how does one, for example, take issue with something as motherhood as "the faith and optimism which Ontarians share with respect to Canadian Confederation emerge from a deep conviction about Canada and about Ontario's place within Canada."

[11:30]

I go on to the comments about: "We must ensure, as the province of opportunity, that each citizen can participate fully in all aspects of life in Ontario, because we recognize equality of opportunity as the springboard of significant achievement." And so it goes. It's not the sort of thing about which one can take a great deal of exception and certainly one does not feel the need for any great amount of political umbrage.

Mr. Moffatt: Are you going to support it?

Mr. Conway: I must say the document is, as has been stated by my leader and others in this assembly, some measure of testament to the quality of minority government. I know the hon. member for London North (Mr. Shore) was ecstatic in his praise, as was the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Handleman), about the government's wholehearted support for the extension of rent control, something near and dear to the hearts of those two particular government members. I know that hon. members on this side of the House share with them the concern for and the emphasis on this particularly important aspect of our urban community particularly.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You are going to vote for it?

Mr. Conway: The fact that we now have an admission by the government that the children's services of the province of Ontario need desperately to be overhauled, to be improved and, most importantly, to be consolidated, is something about which we in this party feel an especial pride.

I must say in that connection that it is significant and positive that our good friend from Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton) has been recently appointed to that ministry, not so much because of what he has to offer, and indeed in personal and political terms I would suggest that he has indeed a significant contribution to make, but more importantly, he is a welcome change from his predecessor who was unfortunate and was granted a short-term appointment to that very important social portfolio. He has now been sent to the nondescript pastures of Energy, there to rummage and ruminate as he will and does, as I see this morning, on Canada AM, which will at least be to my pleasure if not that of the government.

Mr. Reed: He won't be there long either.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You are getting personal.

Mr. Conway: I was pleased to see that among the suggestions put forward was a motion for the call for freedom of information. It is interesting that in its inimitable style the government should see fit to appoint a commission. I must say there is a commission not only to study the freedom of information and its viability and possibility, but also a commission to investigate The Workmen's Compensation Act, a commission to investigate the pension plans in the province and commissions of such kind.

This particular business of freedom of information seems to be a much-talked-about point. I probably differ from many people in the opposition in fundamental terms that, while I can appreciate the direction of freedom of information and the peculiar turn of the bureaucratic mind that would keep all information from us if possible, I do not share the view of particularly the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), I believe, and others, who somehow feel freedom of information is something of a golden answer to the problems of the difficulty involved.

Mr. Warner: No, but it would help.

Mr. Conway: I certainly think it will help, but I do not expect freedom of information to fundamentally change the process. I do hope, however—and I would suggest as a fitting place to begin in the discussion of freedom of information because I think it is a significant indication of government's intention—that we might apply it, when the commission is final in its analysis, to The Election Finances Reform Act, for example.

I've always felt the need and the utility in bringing to bear the concept of freedom of information to, let us say, the funds that may be available to those of us as politicians and political parties. What better place to put this freedom of information as a concept into place? I don't know what is so sacrosanct about that date in mid-February 1975, which is as a genesis to the election expenses discussion.

I am sure that the PC fund, for example, existed prior to that date, and I think that that might be a good place to start in applying the freedom of information concept. It is a small, perhaps a moot, point but I am impressed with the government's direction. To the extent that one humble member from these lonely back benches might suggest to that government a place to start with that commission, I might respectfully suggest The Election Finances Reform Act as a fitting beginning.

An hon. member: Not only back-benchers are humble.

Mr. Conway: I mentioned earlier the personal approval I have for the appointment of the new Minister of Community and Social Services and the very major tasks he was assigned in the Throne Speech. However, there is a counterweight, as we would expect, in the Throne Speech and in the government programme, relating to another ministry, in this case, a reconstituted ministry involving another minister. As a member of this assembly who has a riding that straddles the southern and northern Ontario regions, having, for example, a significant if not too heavily populated part of the district of Nipissing in my riding, I have then some measure of interest in this new portfolio, the legislation for which was introduced just a few moments ago by the government.

Clearly, if ever a sop and morsel were offered to the good people of northern Ontario—and I know, Mr. Speaker, that you have a special concern for this particular matter—if ever we were thrown a sop and a morsel it is this political frill and whitewash that we are now to believe is the Minister of Northern Affairs. I only hope that we can restrict the machinations and travels, for my particular constituency's point of view, of this new minister to north of the French River. They are certainly welcome to him. God bless him in his deliberations, but below the French River I hope and pray he will not travel.

Mr. Breaugh: How about in the French River?

Mr. Conway: The hon. member for Oshawa has gone further to suggest putting him or perhaps keeping him above water but in the French River.

Mr. Breaugh: What's so bad about water?

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, it being Lent I cannot be so uncharitable.

Mr. Bullbrook: It's Holy Thursday.

Mr. Conway: I'm glad to see the member for Sarnia here, because in that chair last night he would not claim credit for me politically or otherwise. I'm glad to see that.

Mr. Bullbrook: I do now.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You are taking all the blame are you, Jim?

An hon. member: That's your problem.

Mr. Bullbrook: I regard you as a little brother.

Mr. Breaugh: Thank God he said "brother."

Mr. Conway: The point, of course, about the Ministry of Northern Affairs is simply that it is a clear admission on behalf of particularly the Premier of this province that he has a particular, peculiar political difficulty in the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) and, in fact, the new ministry is a testament to the banishment of that particular gentleman particularly from southern Ontario.

Regrettably, the recent cabinet shuffle, which I think is related in these matters, is

in its own particular regard an admission of other problems that this government has had and no doubt will continue to have. Like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I take a cynical delight in the fact that we now have the hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) as Minister of Revenue. If that does not put, as one columnist suggested the other day, "a drag on the political upward mobility of the hon. Treasurer" (Mr. McKeough) then surely nothing in God's creation can do so.

I have said, and I continue to say, that from my own particular interest of eastern Ontario it's clear from much of this government's policy—and I speak now of cabinet representation, and I am delighted to have my colleague from Carleton here with me today, knowing, as I do, he has a very trying afternoon before him.

Mr. Ruston: At the ballpark.

An hon. member: A dry one.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Not if they win, he won't.

Mr. Conway: But eastern Ontario continues to be to this government what northern Ontario has more visibly been presented as over the past few years in this assembly. The feeling of alienation in eastern Ontario is, in fact, increasing and I would now suggest has reached a level outside perhaps the boundaries of Carleton, so well looked after by our dearly beloved federal government. But for the rest of eastern Ontario there is now a sense of regional disparity and regional alienation that I would suggest approximates that which has been historically the case in northern Ontario.

I must say this, that while we do have our problems in that government, while we do have the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources, and while we do have our dearly beloved minister of wander and squander, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), and while we do have resignations from the cabinet bench, I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those million-plus people in my region: I do not want this government ever to give consideration to giving us the like of the new Minister of Northern Affairs. We are bad and our state is not too quickly improving, but that we neither want nor I suspect can stand. Indeed, secession might be justified.

An hon. member: Be careful; they might give you Oriole.

Mr. Conway: Now what have we in the rest of this document? I don't want to belabour the point, and quite frankly I am pleased to see the government's ongoing commitment to the Anti-Inflation Board for reasons that have I think been made clear over the past few months in this assembly.

I am happy to see the government's commitment, and surely we all are, to the emphasis being placed on French-language education in this province and of that I would speak in more general terms later if time allows.

I am pleased to see the government's recognition of job creation. I am disappointed, of course, that there is absolutely nothing concrete to match the promise with performance.

I am pleased, I must say, with the statement on page 11 of Her Honour's address that "the impetus for effective economic development east of Metropolitan Toronto and eastern Ontario will be provided by significant government operations in selected areas. Details will be presented to the House early in the session." Well, we had those details earlier this week, and essentially I can offer my full support of that.

Particularly I am pleased to see the significant infusion of government employment into the heartland of eastern Ontario, particularly with the relocation of the government's Ontario Hospital Insurance programme offices in Kingston. While I can understand the reason for moving the revenue people into the Durham region and how that relates to the Toronto-centred region plan, I do hope that somewhere down the road the government will be impressed by the realities of far-eastern Ontario—for example, Pembroke, Cornwall and such centres of economic activity that have been identified as needing that kind of an infusion, and I would certainly encourage the hon. Treasurer to expedite to the extent that is possible his Go East strategy.

Indeed, it was with some irony that I listened to the Treasurer the other day and I was thinking it is surprising that we should have in this day and age Horace Greeley in reverse and that in fact it should come from the mouth of the hon. provincial Treasurer. It is interesting, I suppose, from at least an anecdotal point of view. The hon. Treasurer is a dear and close friend, I know, of all of us in this assembly.

Mr. Warner: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Conway: I am further concerned about the eastern Ontario economic aspect and I wanted very briefly this morning to highlight that Go East strategy and what I expect from that strategy, quite frankly.

Mr. Warner: You should be a minister.

Mr. Conway: I think it is high time this government decided to do something concrete for those areas, and I speak not only of the smaller communities in my riding but I can speak I think for my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Samis) and other such far-eastern constituencies that have not received their fair share of the economic attention from this government. I only hope, as I said earlier, that places like Pembroke can expect in the future, and hopefully in the not-too-distant future, their share of this reallocation of Ontario government services.

As for the employment problems of eastern Ontario and Renfrew county, despite all the commissions and government agencies that are being appointed and will no doubt depreciate the unemployment concerns in a very selected part of the Ontario work force, I must say that the long and extended recess back home in Renfrew county certainly impressed upon me once again the extreme seriousness of the economic situation, particularly as it relates to job creation and unemployment.

[11:45]

Figures, for example, released not so long ago from the Pembroke UIC office indicate the following: In January of this year, 2,084 males and 1,349 females were registered at the Manpower centre in Pembroke as looking for employment. That week there were 12 jobs listed in that same employment office.

We have then a situation of unpredecented unemployment that can be validated and supported by a very considerable array of statistics, which I do not feel the need to go into today; but I do feel, from my own personal experience particularly over this past winter, that this government has a responsibility, not concretely addressed in specific programmes in this Throne Speech, to job creation, particularly in those areas of Ontario, and mine is an outstanding example for job creation, at least in the short term until the general economic climate, of North America particularly, improves.

Mr. di Santo: That's not good enough.

Mr. Conway: It may, in fact, as my friend from Downsview says, be not good enough. One particular area that concerned me in the December weeks of this sitting was the fact that the ARDA commitment of this particular provincial government as it relates to my county and my region in terms of the job creation and the jobs involved, 1976-1977 as opposed to the previous year, there were considerably fewer jobs made available through that programme in Renfrew county this past winter as opposed to the previous winter. It was a clear and obvious cutback at a most inappropriate time.

While it is easy for us all to lay whatever, and I must say justifiable, blame we might like at the doorstep of the federal Minister of Finance and the federal government, this assembly has its own responsibilities in that regard. This Throne Speech has not done very much, particularly in eastern Ontario, to encourage the serious employment requirements of which we are all keenly aware.

I want to say, as many predecessors in this debate have said—and I speak with a very peculiar sense of concern in this regard, and it relates to the serious crisis we now have in terms of unemployment in the young persons category, that category between 16 and 29—as I say, I have a special concern, both because it is to that age group that I belong and because this business of which I am now a participant makes me always wary of what employment might await those of us who might be somehow disposed of by the vagaries of party politics.

Mr. MacDonald: You are a realist.

An hon. member: Every cloud does have a silver lining.

Mr. Moffatt: And become a pessimist overnight.

Mr. Conway: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it is most important for a society and a political system and an economic system to pay particular attention to that category, because it is that category that is most dynamic, that is most formative. If that group is disappointed, disillusioned, frustrated and turned sour and cynical, I think we will reap a whirlwind down the road that will be serious indeed.

On another related topic, I suppose if nothing else disturbs me about our problems in La Belle Province it is that the federalists have lost that category, have lost the 16-to-25-to 35-year-olds, and I think that will have a very serious implication indeed. In this province, in economic terms I think that is extremely important that we pay par-

ticular attention to job creation for young people. I must say in the strongest possible language that I can use in this august assembly that the insulting remarks of the Prime Minister, not so very long ago and not so very far away, as to what graduates from our post-secondary institutions might and should do in the light of these circumstances are both flippant and totally unacceptable on the strongest possible grounds. I would disagree and, in fact, disparage the position and the remarks in particular.

Mr. Kerrio: We're freer than you guys are.

Mr. Moffatt: He is a Liberal Prime Minister.

Mr. Warner: That's what the democratic principle is all about.

Mr. Conway: What then, Mr. Speaker, with all due non-partisan respect, do we have in terms of a comment on this Speech from the Throne? Well, to be sure, our colleagues and my friends—if I might be so loose as to call you that, sir—in Her Majesty's loyal opposition, offered, I thought with no little bit of attention to the peculiar hypocrisies which they and sometimes they alone can muster, an interesting comment. I was impressed. I must say I was impressed when I watched my television set on Tuesday of last week, having regard to the statement which, in economic terms, goes on at great length to talk about how important the anti-inflation programme is to the economic health and well-being of this province, in particular as it is referred to in this Throne Speech, and all the other comments. I was very interested, having particular regard to that, to see my good friend from Scarborough West reported, visually and orally, on the televisions of Ontario that night saying to the effect that indeed, "This is great, minority government is working, and there is not one thing in that document which," I think if I can quote him roughly, "inspires any anger in my heart."

Mr. Reed: He's the world's greatest flip-flop artist.

Mr. Conway: I thought that was a very interesting statement, made only more interesting when the next day I picked up some of the provincial press to read, "The official opposition move want of confidence in the government." I think that is some comment upon the anger in their heart—

Mr. Reed: It was his greatest flip-flop.

Mr. Ruston: He can recheck his line.

Mr. Conway: —because that want of confidence certainly does not dovetail or relate in any way to the position taken by their esteemed leader the preceding day.

So we have this two-page statement issued, I guess late last week. It's interesting, to be sure. It is an interesting testament to the age-old if nostalgic nostrums that call for the imminent creation of the Co-operative Commonwealth. It is in its own way a reinforcement of motherhood and apple pie. It is, I think, a significant comment on many things about which I can express some support. But it is, as I would be wont to say, transparent in its political character, and I think and I know it will be treated by the majority in this House as in fact it should be.

Just one comment on subsection (d) of section 1, actually, if I can refer to it as such: The first part of the paper calls for an intensive programme of secondary and tertiary manufacturing based on our resource sector. I just picked that out this afternoon or this morning, because of your particular interest, Mr. Speaker, in that kind of comment. I wonder what an embellishment of that sentence might have to mean for the resource sector to which I am so closely and personally related. I hope and pray that it has no nationalizing implications. I hope it doesn't.

Mr. Moffatt: Are you opposed to it?

Mr. Conway: To be sure I am opposed to nationalization of our resource sector, and I know my friend from Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) is as well.

Mr. Moffatt: Goodness gracious; leave it all to the Americans.

Mr. Conway: As I say, the nostalgic nostrums calling for the Co-operative Commonwealth—it is nice to have them around but it's obviously not a significant comment in political terms at this point in time.

As far as my response as a member of this assembly is concerned, I do think, as I said earlier, that this is in fact a testament to the workings of minority government. We all know what the real issues are in terms of the spring of 1977. I think we have a document that is, if not specific, at least suggestive, and I as one member of this assembly am quite prepared and quite anxious to get on with the job of pursuing the legislative programme that is talked about in this 29-page document.

Mr. Davison: We will have an election.

Mr. Conway: My colleague from Hamilton Centre makes some tangential reference to a division, something about going to the polls.

Well, as a practising party politician I must say that I am not insensitive to elections. I have said in this assembly before, and I probably will continue to say in the future, that when you have my kind of personal mandate you probably are more sensitive than most to the imminence and possible result of an election. But unlike my friends to the right—

Mr. McKessock: We are to the left.

Mr. Conway: —who are to the left—

Mr. McKessock: Who are right.

Mr. Conway: Well, it depends of whom you speak—

Mr. McKessock: You would never know.

Mr. Conway: I'm sure my hon. friends from Lake Nipigon and Cornwall, for example, might indeed differ in their ideological perspectives from my good and hon. friend from Downsview.

Mr. Reed: I should hope so.

Mr. Conway: To say nothing of the moderating impact of these sunny days as to how they relate to our friend the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Warner: You left me out.

Mr. Conway: I speak only of that which is relevant, my good friend.

To the extent that we have economic problems in eastern Ontario, I wanted to speak today of the one particular offering that we have had since the appointment of my good friend from Renfrew South to the parliamentary secretaryship for Natural Resources. The one specific commitment that we have had from this government as to our economic future—and I must stop there, Mr. Speaker, and introduce a personal, non-partisan note:

Since we last gathered in December 1976, we in eastern Ontario have had two or three social notes which deserve the commendation of one and all in this assembly. As we all know, my good friend from Renfrew South and our good friend from Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) have, or are about to enter into nuptials. I think we should certainly congratulate them in absentia for such an initiative. Indeed, as I was saying to my good friend from Renfrew South, perhaps, I shall learn the ways and means in the not so distant future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You want to watch—it may be contagious.

Mr. Conway: I must say, Mr. Speaker, with all the candour that I can muster, we Liberals have a very great and growing concern about marital relations in these trying times of the spring of 1977.

Mr. Warner: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. Ruston: Give 'em hell.

Mr. Conway: What have we had? Well, we've had an interesting statement from the Minister of Industry and Tourism made in February 1977. Eastern Ontario, as I have said—and I will say as long as I am here—is an area of real economic disparity. We have not had from this government our fair share of economic opportunity, despite the blandishments of my friend from Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) who was going on at some length last night about the province of opportunity, because for eastern Ontario and for northern Ontario this has not been the province of opportunity.

Mr. Warner: It's got worse since you came here.

Mr. Conway: I must say that the offering we have had in the past nine or 10 weeks does not encourage me one whit about the future. On February 14, I believe, in the community of Arnprior we had convened, at the leisure of the county council and the Minister of Industry and Tourism, a major press conference which I'm sure had no political import—a press conference that produced for us all the panacea that we were to have. It was called Timbertown. Timbertown, for those of you who may not be yet aware of this significant initiative, is an $8 million to $10 million project, funded by the private sector to create 300 to 400 jobs in the tourist sector on a 600-acre site, the southeastern corner of Renfrew county; a site that will re-create the historical lumber-timber past of my forebears.

Well, it's interesting. First of all, we have, of course, nothing concrete, and that is not new. We have a statement that it will take $8 million or $10 million of start-up capital, all of which must come from the private sector, all of which must be in place before we can begin, all of which contribute if completely put in place—300 to 400 jobs in the tourist sector, 80 per cent of which are seasonal employment and to that extent will solve absolutely none of the deep-seated economic difficulties that we have had, and no doubt will continue to have.

[12:00]

Timbertown: I am a young man—a young person, a young member—and I quite frankly expect to be an old, old man before Timbertown etches its majesty across the southern sky of Renfrew county. It is a pipe dream that only this government could concoct. It is a political sop yet again, dragged before the good and honourable people of Renfrew county, no doubt in this pre-election circumstance; that I hope will succeed. To the extent that I hope it will succeed, I must say I do not support it conceptually, because it does absolutely nothing to redress those serious economic problems in the job-creation sector of our local economy.

After all, Mr. Speaker, consider for one moment a project that, if completed—and I am just fascinated at the suggestion that the private sector is going to cough up $8 million for this kind of peripheral tourist complex in eastern Ontario. I must say that it is not my recollection or my information, that we have ever, either publicly or privately, certainly in the recent past, attracted $8 million or $10 million of private capital for any other project. In these economically difficult and trying times I am fascinated at the prospect of bringing such capital to our area for such a project.

If this government is capable of such attraction, if the newly-married Minister of Industry and Tourism can in fact produce that $8 million or $10 million, he is a wunderkind of something I never imagined. I wish him well in his endeavour.

The land assembly policy for which this government is famous—and we have all kinds of specific examples of this in the not too distant past—the land assembly policy that they entertained in this Timbertown project is really fascinating.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it has been talked about for a great length of time, this Timbertown. The question was put, over the past year, as to where it was going to be, which local community could expect the largess next door. Well of course I asked questions to this effect in this House, of my friends opposite; and in one of his rare flashes of parliamentary brilliance, the Minister of Industry and Tourism indicated to me we could not announce the site until we had some measure of control over the 600 acres involved.

That made an awful lot of sense to me, as a quiet country boy with not a great deal of business experience. It struck me as sensible and sound that you would not announce the site of this kind of a project without some control, in terms of options or indeed purchase. I believe in early November 1976, in response to a question that I put in this assembly, the hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism said exactly that; and I proceeded on those grounds, Mr. Speaker.

So what happened? In Arnprior, in February, 1977, but three months later, my good friends opposite have the courage, the effrontery and the candour, to stand before us and say: "Yes, Timbertown will be located on 600 acres in Horton township near the little hamlet of Castleford."

My first question, Mr. Speaker, is: "Well thank you very much; did you have any trouble optioning the land, or getting control of the land?" To which there came a rather tame and lame response: "Well unfortunately, we have no options, we have no control. We will not proceed if there is in fact any speculation." That latter was a caveat put well in advance.

That is a concept of convolution and land assembly that only this government is capable of; and I hope it has not seriously compromised the future of this project. That is just one small example of the offerings that this government has had in terms of economic opportunity for eastern Ontario. Before I get off the topic, I must say that the whole project, of course, has been shot through with local and provincial Conservative politics in a way that I would thoroughly expect. But we had what I thought was an interesting admission of how politics in government are controlled and operated in my part of this great province.

Of course, there was a great debate about where this project would be located; and that does not have undue regard to the constituencies involved. I happen to represent the northern part of that constituency—and, of course, I am not a government member—and the southern half of the riding is, in fact, represented by a government member.

I would like to read into the record an article—and, quite frankly, it has not been refuted—which appeared in the Renfrew Mercury on February 16, 1977.

"Paul Yakabuski, MPP for Renfrew South, was instrumental in having the Timbertown project located in the southern part of the county. Mr. Yakabuski said that last year he heard reports"—he heard reports!—"that the tourist attraction was being located in the Petawawa area." In other words, in North Renfrew. "After checking with the ministers involved and not receiving a denial, he composed a letter that said he would leave the party if the decision was not changed."

Mr. Kerrio: I thought they would jump at the chance.

Mr. Gaunt: Now there's a threat for you.

Mr. Conway: That makes the member for London North (Mr. Shore) look statesmanlike.

"Mr. Yakabuski said that 'the letter said if the attraction was not in the south part of the county, he would ask the Speaker to rearrange the seating plan to enable him to sit as an independent until the end of his term'." I was not quite sure that he hadn't been an independent for the last 15 years or whatever, but he said that would be his course.

"He explained that he thought it would be unfair to have the Timbertown project located at the north end of the county" and so on. Interesting. Perhaps not that significant but, if nothing else, picayune in its interest and suggestive as to how politics operates in dear old Renfrew county.

Mr. Gregory: Too bad the north hasn't got a good member like the south has.

Mr. Conway: Well, the member for Mississauga East comments about the government offering in this regard. I must say that while it may be many things, it is at least historic and consistent, because that's how the pork barrel has been rolled down Renfrew county and the Ottawa Valley for lo, these many years.

Mr. Ruston: Give 'em hell.

Mr. Conway: The hon. member should just make sure, though, that he does not lie in its wake, because it could be a flattening prospect if he is so unfortunate as to reap the whirlwind.

I have been cynical and, I must say, I have probably been uncomplimentary in some of the things I have had to say about the way this government has made appointments in eastern Ontario. But they made a good appointment yesterday. I just want to digress to congratulate my good friend, the Minister of Agriculture and Food, for his appointment to Ellard Powers from Beachburg to the Farm Income Stabilization Commission.

Mr. Gregory: You just made it suspect.

Mr. Conway: Of his politics I am surely not aware, but I must say there is no agricultural personality in Renfrew county, and indeed in Ontario, save the member for York South, who has the competence, the commitment and the personal background enabling him to make a real and genuine offering to this important commission. I congratulate the government for its consideration and good sense in making that appointment.

Mr. Gregory: We will start to worry about him now.

Mr. Conway: A non-partisan I am not.

Mr. Gregory: He has begun to be suspect.

Mr. Conway: I must say just one other thing: The election of September 1975 has had all kinds of interesting and salutory effects for those of us in Renfrew county. We have had a flypast of Tory cabinet ministers that would impress the most urbane southern Ontarian. The only junket that we have yet to expect will surely come with the member for London North and his travelling committee on small business. That's the only impressive representative opposite we have not yet had.

We have had the Premier, we have had the Treasurer, we were going to have the Minister of Housing—unfortunately he got lost, not realizing that Pembroke wasn't Perth—we were going to have the Minister of Agriculture and Food in the next week or so. We had the Minister of Education, invited somehow, Mr. Speaker, surprisingly at the explicit invitation of the Progressive Conservative candidate, who arranged an official meeting with the local boards of education.

These Tories in eastern Ontario are surprising me, because as we all know Bill Kelly has a bit of money. I hear he's making low-interest loans to needy opposition business because his fund is so flowing over. But the Minister of Education came to Pembroke and through the Conservative association did his official business, seriously for a moment, as disgusting in its import and implications as that is.

I was glad to see him there, and I know the local boards of education were delighted to see him there and they were very happy and anxious and pleased with the opportunity to meet him. But the fact that this government felt the need to arrange such a meeting with the duly elected local school boards through the nominated Progressive Conservative candidate is I think disgusting in its implications.

I think it is absolutely acceptable that the Minister of Education in his capacity come as a Conservative and do Conservative business and I applaud him for that initiative. I am glad to see and I respect totally the very serious and ongoing efforts made by my good friend the local Progressive Conservative candidate in his ongoing efforts to displace me. That is an initiative which I know gentlemen opposite can applaud. But I do not accept the political implications of con-

fusing the official business of that ministry, of my government and of the people of Ontario with the local pre-election antics of the Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We will fix that next time.

Mr. Conway: I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, that the election of 1975, in proving as it did the status of non-Conservative membership in this assembly, has gone a very significant way and distance in taking the real and legitimate concern of eastern Ontario off the Conservative back benches where they have reposed for, lo, these 34 years. I'll tell you that will be a major issue in the next election in Renfrew North and I don't mind being parochial for a moment in saying that.

While I personally can respect the personal contributions made by my colleagues opposite —and I have a great deal of respect for the contributions made by many of their long standing members from eastern Ontario who are with us this morning, and I am not ashamed nor afraid to make that confession— no region has been as good politically to this government and to this party over the last three decades as eastern Ontario. It has consistently, prior to 1975, provided a bulk of 20 or 25 seats that have sustained that government and that party through good times and bad, and what have we got in return? We have been given a diet of neglect, more sops and morsels than any other region, perhaps northern Ontario included. Because at least they've had a strong regional cabinet spokesperson over the last few years, and with all due respect, eastern Ontario continues to be without a strong regional spokesman, though I have some hope that the new Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) might begin to fill the void.

The ministers from Carleton and Ottawa South and formerly from Carleton-Grenville are no answer in articulate political terms to the problems of which I speak this morning. As an opposition member at this point in time I am not afraid to say that a major question in our election debate whenever that may occur will be the whole question of this diet of neglect which we have been force-fed in the past 34 years will be a very significant part of the public debate if and when it should occur in the not too distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude this morning with a reference or two—

Mr. Haggerty: Keep going.

Mr. Gaunt: More, more.

Mr. Ruston: Give 'em hell.

[12:15]

Mr. Conway: —with a reference or two to what we might call the Canada and Canadian question. I do this for a variety of reasons, one of them is self-interest in the question.

I was invited, I was intrigued, I was interested, I was impressed—I was sometimes depressed—by my distinguished friend, the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) last night, who truly, and in his inimitable style, entertained those of us who were here with a speech on the Canadian question. I agree with my friends here who would say that we must not overdo the question, and we must not, Mr. Speaker. I hope that all members of all parties will be sensitive to the politics of that question, that none of us would ever feel the need, for personal political reasons or gain, to prostitute ourselves, our Parliament, our process and our community, for whatever personal gain politically there might be out of this fascinatingly complex and emotional issue.

But because I come from the Ottawa Valley, because when I look out of my riding office window I see La Belle Province across the river, because in my community of Pembroke and in my riding there is a substantial French-Canadian involvement and representation; I do feel that it is incumbent on me this morning to take a few moments to express some very personal views on this question. I have done so in the past, perhaps somewhat intemperately in my first speech here 18 months ago, but I wanted to talk this morning about the question very briefly.

My friend from Scarborough Centre last night spoke in a way and in a style that was truly reminiscent of what D'Arcy McGee must have been all about. There was an Irish madness in it all that was truly something to behold.

There was, Mr. Speaker—and I don't believe you were here—for a time last night something of an Irish conspiracy involving the members for Scarborough Centre, Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), and only parenthetically myself.

The member for Scarborough Centre spoke consistently of the national dream, and he spoke of the national fervour, and this great concept of Canada and Confederation; and I wanted just to footnote some of his comments because they were, very honestly, very well put, to the extent that they were coherent and sometimes they weren't, and I must differ with my hon. friend to that ex-

tent. But he made some extremely significant and salient points last night, that I hope were not lost on those of us who, while heckling, were listening in part.

He talked of a national dream, Mr. Speaker. You know I'm impressed by this country and its national dream. Not so very long ago the national dream was, I think, very interestingly popularized before us all by our good friend Pierre Berton.

Think for a moment about our national dream. Can you think of another country that has a national dream that's a railroad? Think of it. Our national dream is the Canadian Pacific railroad; and I think that's a symbolic reflection of the society and the economy that Confederation anticipated.

Think about the national dream that my friend spoke of last night, and I would suggest that is really in the essence of what the national dream, as Pierre Berton has said and we have all read, is essentially all about. Take that national dream, the railroad; pretty mechanical business, isn't it? Pretty transcontinental in its dimension; but pretty serious in its implication, both economically and regionally.

If that be our national dream, think for a moment that that national dream has been the political sore point of at least four provinces since its very inception. To the extent that we have a national dream, we're told it's the CPR; and I'll tell you west of North Bay you cannot find one item in our past or present that inspires such antipathy, such genuine disgust, and sometimes hatred, as the mention of that national dream. Just a small point when we wax eloquent about our dreams.

I take a great interest in the debate today on this Canadian question and I was impressed again by some of the comments of my friend from Scarborough Centre last night when he talked in this regard. There's an awful lot of complaint this very week about Monsieur Laurin's white paper on language in La Belle Province.

It's interesting. Before we talk about the white paper I wanted to reflect just for a moment on the irony of an even more interesting debate that continues this very day on the economic balance sheet of Confederation.

Monsieur Tremblay's statement of about a week ago to the effect that the real good reason, economically, or the real good reason why Quebec should get out of Confederation is because, taking as a beginning and end point, 1961 and 1975, Confederation as an arrangement has cost the people of Quebec—if my memory serves me correctly—his 225-page report indicated a $4.3 billion deficit.

In other words, we're being told by this government in Quebec today that the reason for Quebec to get out of Confederation is because it is costing too much money and, in fact, the money is not being spent locally but is being spent—I think he indicated to the benefit of the rest of Canada, but particularly to Ontario.

There is a great and fascinating irony about that point, Mr. Speaker, because whether you are aware of the fact or not, almost to the syllable, that was the very reason why Ontario wanted and ultimately got Confederation in the first place.

I wanted to quote today, very briefly—and I'll finish that if I can for a second—let none of us here forget, if we have not already made ourselves acquainted with the rather significant fact, particularly when we talk about the national dream, that for Ontario Confederation was an explicit act of political and cultural separation. There was very little of a dream involved.

And the arguments put—and I'm going to put one of them very briefly this morning because I think that while it is historical in its suggestion it is very relevant in terms of its implication. The most important, I would argue, father of Confederation—and I don't want to sound political or partisan in this respect—with all due regard to Macdonald and Cartier, the really significant character in the whole proposition was the founder of the Toronto Globe, George Brown. Without George Brown's participation there would have been no Confederation at that point in time.

Having regard to what I have just said about Confederation and about what the Quebec government is now telling us as to why Quebec should opt out on those economic grounds, I want to quote from the Confederation debate of February, 1865, and the comments made by the senior Ontario representative, George Brown. See if this doesn't ring relevant today. He said:

"But, Mr. Speaker, the second feature of this Confederation scheme, as a remedial measure, is that it removes to a large extent the injustice of which Upper Canada has complained in financial matters. We in Upper Canada have complained that though we paid into the public treasury more than three-fourths of the whole revenue, we had less control over the system of taxation and expenditure of the public moneys than the people of Lower Canada. Well, sir, the scheme in your hands remedies that."

Remember that, just remember that when you get exercised and excited about Monsieur Tremblay. Remember, when you talk of a national dream, that Confederation, as we now have it presented to us, was not a beginning of something entirely new; that the Canada to which we now address ourselves and which we very justifiably want to protect, was not a new nationality born of wedlock. It was rather an admission of failure. It was, quite frankly, a compromise constitution built out of obvious failure and deadlock.

Confederation in 1867 was for Ontario, two things: It was hoped to be an end to French and Quebec dominance and, quite frankly and maybe more important, it was an effort to get our greedy little paws on western Canada and to exploit it to the hilt.

I think my friend from Durham East (Mr. Moffatt) says with some import that it was one historian's view—most historians would probably agree with me to a large extent, and I just want my hon. friends to remember that—that insofar as the Confederation of 1867 is concerned, it was not a question of a great national dream; it was really a product of a very frustrated and expansionary Ontario mentality and, quite honestly, it was a mentality that was very tired of Lower Canada.

Interesting, too, was the fact that Confederation was the fifth constitutional arrangement over 107 years. It was an admission that the previous constitution had failed abjectly, obviously and totally. When we talk in the upcoming debate, as I hope we will, about our Canada and about our national dream, I would suggest going back and reading this, small, cheap, document.

If I can quote from one other contribution in that document, because I think it has a very significant relevance to us here today, the most eloquent speech made in that pretty important debate came from an English-speaking farmer; and I know my colleagues here will certainly appreciate that. He was the member for Brougham, and he said that the Confederation scheme was a total disaster. He went on to outline many of the reasons.

I want my colleagues, as members of a provincial assembly, to bear with me while I read briefly from one of the arguments he put as to why the Confederation of Macdonald and Cartier was bound to fail. He says—and I quote:

"But there is another result about which there can be no question. The provincial governments will in a quiet way want money, and the provincial legislators and people will want it yet more. Grants for roads and bridges, for schools, for charities, for salaries, for contingencies of the legislative bodies"—he anticipated Wintario—"for all manner of ends they will be wanting money. And where is it to come from?

"Whether the constitution of the provincial executive savours at all of responsible government or not, be sure it will not be anxious to bring itself more under control of the Legislature or to make itself more odious than it can help, and the easiest way for provincial legislators to get money will be from the central government.

"I am not sure either but that most members of the provincial legislatures will make it that way the best. Gentlemen will go to their constituents provincially with an easy conscience, telling them: True, we had not much to do in the provincial Legislature, and you need not ask very closely what else we did, but I tell you what, we got the federal government to increase the subvention to our province by five cents a head and see what this gives you—$500 to that road, $1,000 to that charity, so much here and so much there. That we have done and we have done well.

"I am afraid [said Duncan in concluding] the provincial constituencies, Legislatures and governments will all show a most calf-like appetite for the milking of this one magnificent government cow."

I want to conclude by thanking my colleagues for their forbearance in this regard, because it might be less than interesting to them to listen to a student out of water waxing historical about these alleged irrelevancies, if indeed they judge them that; but there is an awful lot to remember when we talk about our beloved Canada and our Confederation.

[12:30]

It is all too easy for us to walk through our ridings and talk very euphemistically about what it is we might have had and what it is we should like in the future; because separatism does not owe its origin to the province of Quebec. Ontario, in economic circumstances, and in constitutional arguments, proceeded from 1867 to lay a beautiful basis for the arguments which will now be put by the province of Quebec through its separatist government. Separatist governments have prospered not so much in Quebec as they have in western Canada and, certainly, in Nova Scotia. I must say, apologetically, that the reform tradition from which I flow must bear a very significant measure of responsibility for the

problems that our constitution has faced in its evolution.

But, remember, colleagues in the assembly, it is one thing to talk about the national dream, but I caution you to remember, and to take a serious look at what the national dream of 1867 was all about. When we talk about the white paper on French-language rights in the province of Quebec today, there is a great effort, very calculatingly put by Monsieur Laurin, as to what has happened in Ontario and Manitoba. But we're not talking about a new concept of minority rights as a reflection of language. Provinces other than Quebec have minority rights relating to education.

You can make an exceptionally good argument that those are the rights not of language but of denomination, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, it is interesting that my neighbouring county across the river, in Quebec-Pontiac county—which is significantly anglophone, does have an English-speaking school board that is not public. But that's not the Pontiac English-speaking school board. As I was saying to some of my colleagues yesterday, there's a little bit of significance in the fact that it's called the Pontiac Protestant School Board. A small, rather significant comment about how minority rights began and how they have evolved.

As members of this assembly, we must pay cognizance and respect to the fact that language rights are important, and I am delighted to see them commented upon in this Throne Speech, But language rights are not always a question of minority rights; they are to be considered, both in past and in present—and I'm sure they will be in this upcoming debate with Ottawa and Quebec City—as a matter of minority rights. Interestingly, they will become, I think, a matter of provincial right. I know our friends in Quebec City are sitting there waiting, just waiting—as were the governments in Manitoba 75 or 85 years ago—for the federal government to disallow a provincial Act.

Canada is a frailty that is not to be forgotten. It has always been so, and I suspect it will continue.

I just want to end—and I will end, after taking more than my time—by using a statement which I like to use in this regard. It grows out of the Confederation debates, again, as to the Canadian nationality, the national dream, or whatever. I want to emphasize, yet again, that we, as Ontarians, really were the architects of Confederation; we were the aggressive reason for Confederation.

I want you all, in your own way, to examine the cause at that time. There was not a great mandate for nationalism; it has never been so. I suppose we had been beleaguered with the nationalisms of other communities. But it has not been our peculiar role in society to have had it so.

It is a very difficult, ongoing, and sometimes not very heroic effort, to build a national community out of two groups that have neither a common cultural experience nor—in the beginning or now—a common language or religion. It is, in fact, a bilingual, bicultural experiment that will always be difficult to maintain. It will always be essentially fragile in its composition. I'm prepared to accept that and to live with that.

To conclude, I would suggest to you an interesting comment made by a Quebecker—not French-Canadian-born but a French-born Quebecker—who was Protestant in his religion, which was far more important then than now, and he felt, like Christopher Duncan, that the Confederation scheme was a not-too-worthwhile project. With tongue in cheek he spoke very eloquently of the frailty of the Canadian nationality and the national dream that was being so well-espoused by many of his colleagues and he suggested a symbol that would best comment upon the national dream. He said, and I quote:

"I propose the adoption of the rainbow as our national emblem. By the endless variety of its tints, the rainbow will give an excellent idea of the diversity of races, religions, sentiments, and interests of the different parts of our Canadian Confederation. By its slender and elongated form, the rainbow would effect a perfect representation of the geographical configuration of this Confederation. By its lack of consistence, an image without substance, the rainbow would represent aptly the solidity of our Confederation. An emblem we must have, for every great empire has one. Let us adopt a rainbow."

My colleagues, our challenge is the challenge of 1867 and it will be the challenge of three generations in the future, to make this national dream, of whatever particular and peculiar variant, more than a rainbow, more than an image without substance. I thank you for your forbearance.

Mr. di Santo: I rise in support of our amendment to the Throne Speech, because I think it was illustrated by the leader of my party that the programme presented by the government to this Legislature, even though it contains important points that we agree with, doesn't respond essentially to the basic

problems that this province and Canada are faced with at this time. I mean the economic problems.

Yesterday a columnist said that the Conservatives have been a party of economic boom, but the present situation proves that this government and this party is unable to deal with the issues that we are faced with today, in 1977, because they are not equipped to deal with the economy in a deep crisis like today. The situation in Ontario is bad and growing worse. For the first time the increase in unemployment in Ontario last December exceeded the rest of Canada. There were, in February, 316,000 people unemployed in this province, and the Conference Board of Canada yesterday predicted that unemployment in Ontario will be in the range of seven per cent during 1977 and that the growth will be three per cent. So much for the predictions of the Treasurer of this province last year, who predicted that the growth will be about five per cent.

This is quite clearly intolerable. Unemployment of seven per cent is a needless waste of human resources and industrial capacity. According to a new ECD report, Canada's economic growth this year will still average three per cent at most. Even countries like Norway, Greece and Finland will surpass Canada's growth in 1977.

We are, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly in a situation which is critical, even though this government doesn't realize it. It doesn't do any good for the Treasurer of this province to use trite Tory rhetoric portraying us and the socialist policies we put forth as one of the causes that brought England to its present condition.

I want to quote what the federal Conservative critic, Mr. Sinclair Stevens said the other day in the Commons: "With a million unemployed, comparable to the entire working population of the Toronto region, Canada had the worst record among industrial nations for unemployment and one of the worst in the world for inflation.

"In the past two years this country's current account trade deficit was higher than any nation in the world. In fact, it was higher than the total deficit position of the United States, Germany, Japan, France, Italy and the United Kingdom put together. Those six nations represent approximately 50 per cent of the world's wealth, while we have less than three per cent. This country can pretend no longer that we are prosperous."

This is the sad situation in which Canada is today, in which Ontario is today, after 34 years of Tory government.

I should also add, Mr. Speaker, that the preoccupation of both federal and provincial governments with wage controls and the phoney Anti-Inflation Board has brought the economy to a standstill. Prices to the consumers are rising despite the fact that officially the inflation rate is down. Just yesterday we were informed that the cost of living went up again last month because oil prices and food prices went up, both of them not controlled by the Anti-Inflation Board. As you know, Mr. Speaker, for a time lower food prices and the international situation contributed to lowering of the inflation rate; however, the inflation rate could have been further lowered if the Anti-Inflation Board had dealt with prices and profits.

As it is, the major sources of inflation have been exempt from the control of the Anti-Inflation Board—as I said, food, energy and housing. The main preoccupation of the Anti-Inflation Board has been with trimming wages. Other countries have brought down inflation to a greater extent than we have without controls. The United States, for one, has today a lower rate of inflation and a lower rate of unemployment.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is much more difficult for this government to deal with unemployment than with inflation. In the last 18 months that I have been in this House we heard, time and time again, the ministers, the Premier and the Treasurer blame everybody else for inflation; the international situation, the federal government. But to deal with unemployment in Ontario today means to deal with the failure of this government to enact policies in Ontario directed at having economic growth which would provide this province with enough jobs and which, essentially, would avoid the situation we are facing now in this province.

[12:45]

For more than 30 years during which this government has been in power, it has chosen an industrial strategy with results which appear every day as a startling failure. After three decades of Tory rule in Ontario, we have an economic structure which is proving to be weaker and weaker as time goes by.

As a part of the branch-plant economy developed within the federal framework, this government has been unable to develop a sound manufacturing sector. Worse than that, this government has developed the service and finance sector to a proportion which is not only unacceptable but is becoming dangerous. One of the Treasurer's economists pointed out last year that in Ontario the

manufacturing sector occupies only 36 per cent of workers, while the service sector has been inflated to 55 per cent. In a modern economy this is not only unsound but it is becoming increasingly dangerous, because the people who are producing are becoming less and less important in our economic structure while the number of people employed in the service and finance sector is increasing, which means we are consuming more and are producing less.

The manufacturing sector is a basic sector in every modern economy and that is where this government has failed more than anywhere else. Today, it is sad to say, we are unable to develop the manufacturing sector in the province of Ontario for two basic reasons: We don't have enough investments to be made in our economy in order to develop it, and the foreign investments that we receive are needed to finance our foreign debts.

In 1976, in fact, our debt was $9.2 billion. What does that mean for the economy of this province? It means that in order to repay that debt, we should increase our exports by $500 million a year. Quite obviously we are unable to do that. Since we cannot increase our exports to that extent, we are forced to refinance our debt with the money that comes to Canada for investments. One of the big borrowers in Ontario is Ontario Hydro, whose consolidated debt in 1976 was $7,262 million. Along with Quebec Hydro, Ontario Hydro is probably the biggest borrower on the North American market.

The consequences of this situation are that New York bankers are dictating our economic and financial policies; they can pull out short-term loans and, if that happens, the Canadian dollar will fall. This is obviously a prospect that neither the federal government nor the provincial government can accept in Canada. This is one of the reasons why the provincial government so cynically accepted and endorsed the Anti-Inflation Board, which was the result of our financial situation toward the New York market. In fact, the logic of the Anti-Inflation Board is that if controls are removed then what most likely will happen is that workers will have higher settlements, and if workers have higher settlements then they will be able to buy more durable goods like houses, refrigerators, cars, et cetera, and then Canada must increase imports and, therefore, must increase our foreign debt. Absurd as it is, Mr. Speaker, unemployment costs less to Canada than to have people employed in the non-manufacturing sector. This is the basic reason why the provincial government is endorsing the anti-inflation programme at this time when everybody knows that it is not working, that is not reducing inflation, that it is increasing unemployment in Canada and in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Kerrio: Your party supported the AIB.

Mr. di Santo: What the member for Niagara Falls thinks it is worth is quite irrelevant in view of the figures that we have and in view of the figures that I mentioned related to the unemployment in the province of Ontario.

There are two more reasons why this government is unable to deal with the problems of job creation and the economy in general in the province of Ontario. One of the reasons is the price of oil. This morning the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) told us how he opposed a new oil price increase and, of course, we agree with that. We actually urged the government last year to oppose any oil price increase, but this is a very late decision made by the government which is following a policy that is lasting since 1973, a policy which is wrong, which has been proved wrong, that we opposed all along.

I want to mention for the record the position taken by the Premier of this province when, in March 1974, he participated in a conference of the Premiers where an increase in the price of oil was decided. On March 28, 1974, he told the House:

"In spite of this cost which will have to be faced by consumers in Ontario, I am convinced that we have preserved for Canada the benefits of this country's vast energy resources. The increased price will permit rapid development of new energy resources; the lower-than-world price will maintain a competitive advantage for Canadian industry; consumers in the eastern provinces will be protected from the high cost of imported oil, the western provinces will have a base on which to diversify their economic development, Canadians will have a stable oil price for at least a year"—and he was right in that case because the next year the price went up again—"while the rest of the world faces uncertainty, and Canada will be spared a potentially divisive constitutional confrontation. I think yesterday was a reasonable solution for this province and Canada."

I think that day was the start of the troubles we are now faced with and, of course, the Premier of this province didn't realize at that time that we were going toward increases in oil prices that are now reaching the world

level. So his assumption was wrong and, of course, the consequences that we are having now are dreadful.

The provincial government until this time has always endorsed oil price increases. Last year, as you remember, Mr. Speaker, the then Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) suggested a blended price which was a laughable proposition and was rejected. As a result of that conference we had a price increase which cost Ontario between 45,000 and 50,000 jobs. In fact according to the projections of the Ministry of the Treasurer of Ontario, and in particular Mr. Clifford Jutlah who is an economist with Treasury, we lose 7,400 jobs for each dollar of oil price increase; and if we go to the world level of $11 per barrel in Ontario we lose 45,000 to 50,000 jobs.

Of course, we have this situation in Canada, and Canada is the only oil producing nation in this situation—not even Venezeula and Mexico are adopting this kind of crazy policy—we have this situation because the federal government is accepting all the company positions on cost of oil per barrel, cost of exploration, drilling and marketing of oil. There is no way that the government of Canada, and perhaps it's the only government in the world in this position, can become equipped to ascertain, on its own, the cost of a barrel of oil.

The same thing happens for gas. I have to point out to the House that this government has never taken a public position on the construction of the northern pipeline. I think this is extremely important for the province of Ontario, because if the northern pipeline were built, and we will get the figures in two weeks, the increase of the cost of gas will be terrific and Ontario will pay an unnecessary, gigantic amount of money because of the building of the pipeline.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have a surplus of gas. We are exporting, actually, one trillion cubic feet of gas to the United States, so there is no economic justification for the building of the pipeline. What we will have is a drainage of money which is needed for building the pipeline, money which is necessary for investments in southern Ontario. One of the results, if we build the northern pipeline, will be that there will be very little money left for investments and job creation in southern Ontario—in southern Canada, I should say rather, Mr. Speaker. The second negative consequence will be that the increase of the price of gas will produce an increase in the cost of products and therefore a less competitive position for Canadian industries, and therefore loss of jobs.

On motion by Mr. di Santo, the debate was adjourned.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 7, 1977

Energy ministers' conference, statement by Mr. Taylor 273

Railway passenger service, statement by Mr. Snow 273

Ministry of Northern Affairs, statement by Mr. Davis 274

Point of order re ministerial statements, Mr. Deans 276

Power station reliability, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reed, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. G. I. Miller 276

Halton landfill site, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Reed 278

Point of order re ministerial statements, Mr. Snow 279

Meat inspection, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Riddell 279

Ambulance services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Foulds 280

Winona sewage facility, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Deans 281

Reforestation, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Reid, Mr. Foulds 281

UTDC foreign contracts, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Warner 284

Timmins health lab, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Ferrier 286

Flood plains, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Gaunt 286

Gas rates, questions of Mr. Taylor: Ms. Bryden 286

Financial protection for farmers, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Breithaupt 287

Dayton Forging and Heat Treating Company, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Swart 289

Local health services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith 289

Pan-American games, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Mackenzie 289

UTDC foreign contracts, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Cunningham 289

Forest fires, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Foulds, Mr. Reid 290

Nanticoke water line extension, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. G. I. Miller 290

Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mrs. Campbell 291

Ministry of Northern Affairs Act, Mr. Welch, first reading 291

Employees' Health and Safety Amendment Act, Mr. Laughren, first reading 291

Transmitting estimates of certain sums required, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 291

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. Conway, Mr. di Santo 291

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. di Santo, agreed to 306

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 306

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Brunelle, Hon. R., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Davison, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)



No. 9

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 12, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

RENT REVIEW

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, later today I will be introducing The Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, 1977.

Mr. Angus: Also your resignation.

Mr. S. Smith: Is it a little messy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'm interested in the comments, Mr. Speaker, let them go.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will continue with his statement.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The purpose of the bill is to extend the rent review programme until the scheduled end of the national anti-inflation programme. The amendments are also designed to simplify, clarify and make more equitable various procedures in the rent review process.

Mr. Lewis: Slower, slower, much slower. We want to savour it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: As noted in the Speech from the Throne—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It rolls off the tongue with a certain amount of glibness, Mr. Speaker.

As noted in the Speech from the Throne, rent control acts as a negative force in the government's aim to create new rental units in significant numbers. However, the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) will soon announce the details of a programme to encourage rental construction in areas of low vacancies.

Concurrently, provincial co-operation with federal and municipal governments will continue in order to increase the amount of rental housing for senior citizens and low-income families, and through the newly-merged AHOP/HOME programme to assist moderate-income families to buy their own homes, thereby freeing currently-occupied rental units.

The legislation will remain enforceable after December 31, 1978, for rent increases or orders extending beyond the expiry date. Also, applications and appeals for rent review, which are filed before the expiry date, will be heard and orders will be made after December 31, 1978.

Under the previous Act, any rent increases remained in effect for 12 months unless a landlord applied for and was granted a further increase within that time. Under the amendment, all increases of any amount, with or without an order, must remain in effect for one year from the effective date of the previous increase and no landlord may apply for a further increase during that year. This will prevent sudden rent increases when the Act expires.

A discontinuance of a service is not to be considered as a rent increase during such a 12-month period—

Mr. Moffatt: What?

Mrs. Campbell: What?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —but tenants may continue to apply for rent reduction as compensation for such a discontinuance, as in the present Act.

An important new requirement is the obligation now placed on landlords to provide written information about rents and rental agreements if required by a rent review officer in the course of his or her dealing with applications.

New punishable offences have been defined and corporations guilty of offences may be fined up to $25,000, while individual directors are subject to $2,000 maximum fines upon conviction.

Other amendments in the bill are:

The maximum rent that may be charged pending an appeal to the board will now be the same as the rent chargeable pending a hearing before a rent review officer.

The notice that landlords must give to tenants justifying a rent increase may now be in writing in the same manner as under The Landlord and Tenant Act.

No order can be nullified on the ground of improper notice unless that point was raised at the rent review hearing. The rent review board will be empowered to review its own decisions when satisfied that serious error has occurred.

Where it can be shown that persons were unable to attend a rent review hearing because of circumstances beyond their control, they may apply to the board for permission to appeal. Formerly, non-attendance at the original hearing eliminated the right of appeal.

Many of these amendments should serve to improve the effectiveness of the programme as well as eliminate some of the irritants which have come to light during the first two years of its operation. Between now and December 31, 1978, the government will be putting forward for discussion a number of policy options which will lead eventually to a return to a free market in the Ontario rental industry.

Mr. Martel: Has the Premier (Mr. Davis) accepted your resignation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Lewis: You know who the biggest irritant is, the biggest single irritant?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) who should be here today.

Mrs. Campbell: Call the minister to order.

Mr. Roy: That is a strange statement for a guy who was going to resign.

SUCCESSOR RIGHTS

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, later this afternoon I propose to introduce a bill entitled The Successor Rights Crown Transfers Act, 1977. This bill preserves the representation and bargaining rights or organizations representing employees employed in undertakings transferred from the Crown to other employers and in undertakings transferred from other employers to the Crown.

The bill provides for the determination of questions that may arise on such a transfer. Where a transfer is to an employer other than the Crown, the determinations are to be made by the Ontario Labour Relations Board. Where the transfer is to the Crown, the determinations are to be made by the Ontario Public Service Labour Relations Tribunal. Where a trade union or council of trade unions is the certified bargaining agent in respect of an undertaking transferred to the Crown, the trade union or council of trade unions is required to qualify as an employee organization within the meaning of The Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, 1972. Where an employee organization has representation rights in respect of an undertaking transferred from the Crown to another employer, the employee organization is required to qualify as a trade union or council of trade unions under The Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR FRENCH-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Mr. Lewis: I'd like to put a question to the Minister of Education, if I may, which, unaccustomed as though this may be, Mr. Speaker, is designed to elicit information rather than bestir controversy.

What exactly did the minister say on CBC radio this morning about the distribution of federal moneys for the teaching of French to parts of the school system in Ontario—I gather, the private system in Ontario? Can he define his terms and explain to the Legislature exactly what it was that he asked the cabinet to reconsider?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I don't remember using the words "asked the cabinet to reconsider" or anything of that nature. It was pretty early in the morning, but as I recall, what I said, and I think I've said it many times other than on the CBC show this morning, was that the matter of the bilingual grants from the federal government—which, of course, we accept; something in the nature of somewhere around, as I recall, $23 million or $24 million for the teaching of French as a second language and for minority-language education in this province—that the matter of those grants being paid to private schools in this province—for example, the Hawthorne school—was something that was still under discussion by this government and that we hadn't made any determination as to whether or not we would allow the federal government to pay those grants in the same manner as it is now doing, I think, in Manitoba and British Columbia.

In other words, in those provinces, as I understand it, they are not paying the grants

to the private schools, although the situation is changing in British Columbia now, but the money is paid directly from the federal government to the private schools.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary may I ask, perhaps for further definition, is the minister making a distinction among various schools when he says that? Is he referring specifically and solely to schools like Hawthorne or the French School which have, in the private sector, a large component of French-language instruction now? Or does he mean to extend it beyond that—I needn't set it out for him; he understands the implications—but is he now being further selective or is he broad in his interpretation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's a rather major policy decision. I'm certainly being selective in that I'm not referring to the grade 13 grants that people talk about—that's a completely different subject.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But I suppose the French grants which would be payable to the Hawthorne school or the Toronto French School —there are a number of other private schools, e.g., Catholic private schools, Upper Canada College, Ridley and others—

Mr. Singer: Yes, yes. Upper Canada College.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's called socialist realism.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —which would also qualify if they wish to ask for the money from the federal government, if we decided to allow that to happen.

Mr. Lewis: So, in fact you are including other schools.

Mr. Singer: Do you think Upper Canada should have it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A supplementary has been asked and the answer given.

Mr. S. Smith: In view of the fact that the minister has now been considering this matter for some years, I believe, can he tell us why there is a need for further delay before he permits what is a national policy—namely, to have this money available for the teaching of French—to be applied at the level of every student in Ontario irrespective of what school he's attending? Why doesn't he just get on with it?

Mr. Singer: Don't pick on Upper Canada.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If my friend had listened to the radio programme this morning he would have heard my explanation.

Mr. Breithaupt: He did, and so did I.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has, till this point in time, been this government's feeling that even to allow those grants to be paid to private schools in Ontario would violate our basic policy of no public tax money for private schools.

Mr. S. Smith: They go to private schools—

Hon. Mr. Wells: We felt that that was an overriding factor in this matter and, therefore, we have not seen fit to allow even that kind of an arrangement to happen, which needs our concurrence for the federal government to pay that money to private schools. But as I indicated on the programme, it's a matter that we're still looking at.

[2:15]

Mr. Lewis: Since I assume the minister mentioned Upper Canada only because he is a member of the board of directors, or governors, or whatever they're called, I won't pursue it with him. May I ask, when does he intend to provide the Legislature with an actual decision, since, obviously, if this money is available to the Catholic system, the private system, and those parts of it which are bilingual and French specifically, it does mean a very major shift in government policy? When does the minister expect to make the announcement?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would differ with my friend, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it represents a major shift in government policy.

Mr. Foulds: Just a refinement.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's right, my friend said "a refinement." I have not indicated what the government's policy will be in this matter; I have just indicated it's something that's being looked at. I think that in presenting our total programme for teaching French as a second language, and with that the kinds of things that we are going to have to do to help convince Ottawa—and I don't think they'll take too much convincing—to increase their grants, I will also have to answer this question at that time, and I hope I can answer them all when we bring forward our programme in a week or so.

Mr. S. Smith: Does the minister not acknowledge that right now Ontario taxpayers are paying, via the federal government, to support the teaching of French in private schools throughout the rest of the country, with the exception possibly of New Brunswick? Doesn't that in some way contradict his present policy? And, if, in fact, this is not a major shift, why is it taking him years to make up his mind? And if it is a major shift, why is he saying it isn't?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, certainly I am aware of that. I am also aware, for instance, that the taxpayers of this province who choose to send their children to private schools are also paying taxes for the public system, but there is good and just reason why we do not pay grants to the private school system.

CANCER AND ASBESTOS

Mr. Lewis: A question, if I may, to the Minister of Labour—

Hon. B. Stephenson: You may.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you so much. Can I ask the minister to re-examine the letter from Dr. Miller on the question of laryngeal cancer and its potential compensable quality, on the basis that on close reading of this letter there is enough uncertainty in Dr. Miller's own mind—there are obviously arguments on both sides—that the benefit of the doubt could legitimately and compassionately be extended in this instance to cover the case of Aime Bertrand and perhaps others in similar circumstances?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I should be happy to re-examine Dr. Miller's letter again. This will be not just the second time but the tenth or eleventh time. The one specific statement which Dr. Miller has made is that at this time he can find no evidence of direct causal relationship, which I think is the important and the operative phrase. I should be very pleased to look at it again, but I doubt very much that a re-examination is going to change either Dr. Miller's opinion about this, or my understanding of what his opinion is.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, perhaps the minister, when she takes a look at it, could also comment on his equally compelling observation that "the difference between observed and expected for the total population is statistically significant." Beyond that, maybe via Dr. Miller she could explain to the House what he means by the comparison group between white workers and black workers in the population under observation. What new matter has Dr. Miller discovered in white and black workers as distinctions which would draw these conclusions?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that Dr. Miller has discovered any particular item specifically, except that there are in certain other medical problems specific racial differences which have to be considered in establishing any kind of epidemiological study.

Mr. Lewis: In this?

Hon. B. Stephenson: In this? I'm not sure about this. I think he was making a general statement about this—

Mr. Deans: He was not.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —in that Dr. Selikoff had not separated the individual workers into racial background.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: I wonder if the minister could explain to this House how she interprets the phrase "the benefit of the doubt to the worker," because I can't understand it the way it's operating? Perhaps she'd explain.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, when there is question about whether indeed an accident has occurred on the property of the employer, whether it has been work-related or not, if there is doubt, if there is a question raised by the employer or by others, the benefit of that doubt is given to the employee. However, in the establishment of those illnesses which can be considered to be compensable because they are work-related, the rule has to be laid down first before the benefit of the doubt can indeed be applied to the worker.

At this time, regarding laryngeal cancer and its relationship to asbestos, no such rule has as yet been established. It has been established in other health-related problems —such things as mesothelioma, carcinoma of the lungs, gastro-intestinal carcinoma—but it has not as yet been established in the area of laryngeal cancer.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: In view of the fact that there are, indeed, no contradictory epidemiological studies, and in view of the fact as well that there is sympathetic medical evidence to support laryngeal cancer as a compensable disease, and in view of the rather questionable, if not distasteful, implications in Dr. Miller's letter

to Dr. McCracken concerning socio-economic status and race, would the minister consider the appointment of a medical referee acceptable to Mr. Bertrand to determine the merits of this case and whether or not laryngeal cancer should indeed be compensable?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I'm not entirely sure all of the hon. member's "in view of the facts" are valid in any way, I have stated—

An hon. member: They are.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and I will restate today that I will re-examine Mr. Bertrand's case as I had promised to do.

Mr. Warner: We've heard that before.

Hon. B. Stephenson: That I shall do. If I feel that I require supportive or otherwise medical expertise, that I shall endeavour to find as well.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No. Order, please. Final supplementary, the member for St. George. We can come back to this later if there is time.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you. Could the minister have someone in her ministry review those cases which are now acceptable as compensable diseases, and how long it took before we were able to lay down that rule and hence get to the benefit of the doubt?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I think it's entirely possible that we should be able to do that. I would remind the hon. member for St. George that indeed Ontario has led in compensation for industrially-related diseases. It has been far ahead of almost any other jurisdiction in this area, in Canada and in the United States.

Mr. Nixon: We have more cases in Ontario.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, we don't have more cases. We have fewer.

CONDITIONS AT DON JAIL

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of Correctional Services with regard to conditions at the Don Jail: Would the minister report to the House on the alleged beating of one Michael McKinnon by certain guards in the Don Jail in February, and would he comment on the letter written by six Don Jail inmates in which they said that neither they nor visitors to the jail who witnessed the alleged assault on McKinnon were questioned during the inquiry which followed?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, he might at the same time look into their claim that this sort of incident happens "every day." Would he further comment with regard to the Don Jail on the opinion of the director of the Ontario Humane Society who reports that primates housed at the San Antonio Zoo, for instance, would never have cages smaller than six by eight feet, whereas the cells of three by eight used in the old section of the Don Jail might well constitute cruelty to animals?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of reading a copy of the letter signed by Mr. Cowper-Smith and I could see his tongue in his cheek throughout the entire letter. But I'll be pleased to comment on that in due course.

Mr. S. Smith: No, it wasn't.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Does the minister not understand that the exchanges between June Callwood and Dr. Cowper-Smith, in those letters, were entirely serious, and that the only ridicule being directed was at the government, not at the subject? Good grief, what is wrong with the minister?

Mr. Warner: Do something about that place.

Mr. S. Smith: Just by way of final supplementary, is the minister in fact aware of the exchange between June Callwood and Dr. Cowper-Smith, and the fact that the letter from Miss Callwood, which I will gladly table or read into the record, is one of the most passionate and touching letters that I have ever received?

Mr. Lewis: An inspired exchange.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I have read both of those letters and I have indicated that I would touch on the reply in due course, when I make my other response.

WATER SUPPLY AT BEETON

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Minister of the Environment: In view of the fact that

after six years, and I guess it is about a quarter of a million dollars if I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, the village of Beeton still does not have an acceptable water supply, can the minister inform us whether any financial aid will be forthcoming to assist that particular village in obtaining a proper water supply?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the problem is the taste of the water from some of the wells in that community. The water is clean, it is fit to drink; it just has a taste that my ministry is having great difficulty in removing and improving on in that village.

Mr. Lewis: The colour too.

Mr. Singer: It just looks like dirty water, it really isn't.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We have even dug new wells in the hope of improving the taste of the water supply. At the present time my ministry is undertaking a rather extensive analysis, not only in connection with existing wells but involving the possibility of opening new wells.

Mr. Peterson: Are you prepared to swim in it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If that doesn't improve the situation we will have to put some type of communal system in there, which could be quite expensive, because the closest body of water is at least two or three miles away.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary: The minister refers to taste. Can the minister confirm whether the photographs I have been sent showing distinctly brown-coloured water are in fact authentic? Can he furthermore give an undertaking that this communal water supply will be established for the village of Beeton and in short order? They have been waiting a very long time.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the samples the hon. member has must be quite old. We have corrected the cloudy or muddy appearance of the water. The answer to the second part of the question is yes, if we don't improve the taste we may have to build a communal system.

Mr. Sargent: Would you swim in it?

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Mr. Laughren: A question of the Minister of Labour: Why has the minister refused to recognize safety committees or safety reps at the Inco installations in Sudbury, despite the fact that they have been requested by the United Steelworkers more than two weeks ago and despite the provisions of Bill 139?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I have not so refused at this time.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why has the minister not agreed to appoint the committees, despite the request of the union? Further, while she is on her feet, would she tell us why, despite the fact that she clearly promised that mediators would be sent to Sudbury to resolve the new disputes so that Bill 139 can work before the omnibus legislation comes in, she has refused to do that either?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's words are quite ill chosen. I have not refused to do so in either case.

Indeed, the request did arrive in my office from the union in Sudbury regarding the establishment of safety and health committees, and safety representatives, on the basis of the provisions of Bill 139. It is incumbent upon the minister to examine all of the factors included in Bill 139 to decide whether such an action would be appropriate or not; that process is ongoing at this time.

In addition to that, the mediation services which I had suggested would be reasonable for the situation in Sudbury began approximately one week after my first visit to Sudbury.

Mr. Laughren: Not true.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: They were carried on by representatives of my ministry.

Mr. Laughren: Not true.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it is the truth.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister is giving her answer; she is the only one who has the floor.

[2:30]

Hon. B. Stephenson: Representatives of my ministry were involved in discussing the matter, both with the union and with management. I was involved in one set of discussions. As a result of those discussions we have asked both union and management to get back together to resolve their problems, with our help, if necessary.

We are awaiting some word that indeed they have got back together at this time, and

if they have not, then we shall take further action.

Mr. Warner: Why do you pass legislation you never intend to support? It is ridiculous.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It is not ridiculous, it is fact.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: In the letter to the minister from the union dated March 25 it states it seems that the minister has "seen fit not to follow through on this commitment as was given to us in Sudbury." Now, is there difficulty in people in the union field understanding this minister when she makes promises, because obviously they misinterpret what she was telling them as well, as in the case of my colleague from Sault Ste. Marie recently? There seems to be great difficulty in understanding her use of the English language.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I try very diligently to be precise in my use of the English language, which is a trait that I wish some of the members across the floor would exercise from time to time.

Interjections.

Hon. B. Stephenson: However, at the time of my visit to Sudbury, in my discussions directly with the union I suggested that indeed this problem looked as though it would be an appropriate area in which the ministry could attempt to mediate, to attempt to help solve the problem. We have undertaken that role.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Apparently the union felt I had said that I personally would mediate. I made no such statement.

Mr. Laughren: No, no. Not true. Two mediators.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: That is what was contained in the letter.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: However, we have made attempts to resolve this problem with the two groups separately and have suggested to both groups that as a result of these attempts they now meet together to resolve the problem together as they should be able to do—as any group of intelligent people in this province should be able to do—at this time about this very important matter. If they are not capable of doing that as I suggested, we shall reconsider our position and decide whether indeed further mediation is necessary.

Mr. Singer: Or whether they are intelligent or not.

TOWNSEND TOWNSITE

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Does he recall the Premier (Mr. Davis) saying a week ago today that there would be a statement from the Ministry of Housing on the development of Townsend City, the proposed new city? Is he under the impression that his response to a question later last week took the place of that statement? Or is he not aware that the municipal officials in the area are very much concerned indeed as to what government policy will be on the development of that $30-million site?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As I understood the response that was given by the Premier to the question from the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. G. I. Miller) it was that I would reply to his question in the House and that is what I did when I responded last week. I did not interpret the Premier's response at that time as meaning that I would be making a statement concerning Townsend.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the Premier did use the word "statement," I believe, there may have been some misunderstanding. However, would the minister undertake to prepare a statement of government policy on the development of the proposed new city, since his reference to the possibility of spending an additional $40 million for servicing the land, with there being a possibility of perhaps only 250 lots in the foreseeable future, left some of the local municipal officials somewhat confused—to say nothing of the member, who as the minister knows, is from time to time confused on those matters.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: By the way, I am the member.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I understand that. I wasn't sure, Mr. Speaker, who the member was until he admitted that the member was sometimes confused. Then I knew who it was.

Mr. Nixon: I don't admit it, I assert it.

Mr. Sargent: At least he is still in the same party.

Mr. Mancini: He was confused listening to you, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I would not be in a position to make a statement on the policy as it relates to Townsend at this time because of the fact, as I believe I said in the House last week, we have been having discussions and will continue to have discussions for a short while with the regional council, who certainly have indicated, as the hon. member knows, some concern. In essence they have disagreed with some of the figures that we have been working with and we have been trying to resolve why we have come apart on the numbers as to expansion in the area when the source of the numbers we have both been working with has been the Steel Company of Canada.

Mr. Singer: Did you ever find out what John White really wanted? That is a key to that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's my intention to have those discussions, to talk with them and, hopefully, to resolve the concerns that have been expressed. At that time, we would make a statement in the House as well as in the area as to what our policy is. I also said last week that we would be sending the final planning report to the region for their consideration and for public discussion. To make a statement on the content of that report or any policy that may evolve from it, I think would be improper at this time.

Mr. Nixon: I'd just like to ask the minister if he would not agree that part of the confusion may lie in the figures that the government has provided, indicating that as well as the $30 million invested in that one city site—and as my colleague wants to indicate there's another city site just a few miles away—

Mr. Singer: It's called the White City site after John White.

Mr. Nixon: —the government is proposing spending $40 million on servicing when there are really less than 500 lots to be proposed by the government in its last statement. Surely some clarification has to be put forward without delay in that connection.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't want to comment on the $40-million figure. That figure, as I believe I said again last week in response to a question, would be the maximum amount. I will defer to my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, to deal with more specifics.

Mr. Singer: The polluter will pay.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We've been talking about a lesser amount to be spent initially to provide basic services for the Townsend community and, at the same time, to bring water into two communities that need water, namely, Jarvis and Hagersville, which the hon. member well knows.

Mr. Nixon: That's got to be done anyway.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's right; we understand that it must be done. I think what we're trying to do is not only to provide the water facilities to those two communities but, at the same time, to bring the services into Townsend.

Mr. Sargent: You are trying to bail yourselves out.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There is nothing to be bailed out about. It is a matter of trying to develop that site in which, I say with the greatest of respect, the hon. member has shown a considerable interest and, I believe, has reasonably supported the position.

Mr. Nixon: No, no.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you tell the truth? You don't know what the hell you are doing.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, so that you won't be misled, my position from the first was that the surrounding communities should be developed and that we should stop wasting money on that Townsend site.

RENT REVIEW

Mr. Breaugh: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. His statement again today firmly tied The Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act very tightly in with the federal anti-inflation programme. Could he explain to the House why he did not accept the six per cent guideline that is so strongly in the AIB?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'm not aware of any six per cent guideline in the AIB except and in so far as it relates to wages.

Mr. Warner: The minister of corporate protection.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have not tied the rent review programme into the AIB

philosophy. We've said that there is an anti-inflation programme in existence federally and that this province is committed to supporting it as long as it's there. Therefore, we've extended our Act to the scheduled end of that programme.

The figures in each Act have been completely independent ever since the inception of both Acts.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the problem.

Mr. Lewis: How do you choose eight per cent?

Mr. Breaugh: Would the minister explain to the House why he chose to put in a termination date as opposed to an indication of when the vacancy rate rises, which would clearly be an indication that the problem is solved? Why did he choose a particular date in time as opposed to tying it to a vacancy rate?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'd be very pleased to debate the bill with the hon. member, if that's what he wants to do right now. However, if I may just respond to that question, if the hon. member will tell us how to calculate vacancy, then I'd be glad to debate it with him. Nobody has been able to do it in any efficient way to date and I'm quite sure the NDP doesn't have the answer to that one.

Mr. Warner: Let's hear your answer.

Mr. Cassidy: You are ridiculous.

Mr. Nixon: It is the number of vacancies.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: How do you do it in Ottawa?

Mr. Peterson: You could count your feet and divide by two.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: CMHC issues those statistics every month and you put them in your bulletin. If they are no good, why do you quote them?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We don't do them. CMHC does.

Mr. Singer: Sure you do.

Mr. S. Smith: How are you going to do it in your programme to build new houses in low-vacancy-rate areas?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: I wonder if the minister would be prepared to table before the Legislature the statistical information used by the ministry to determine that the eight per cent level should be sustained during the year that the Act will be maintained in operation?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We will do that when we're debating the bill.

Mr. Makarchuk: Table them now.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If the hon. member will examine the bill, he will see that we are not married to the eight per cent. We put it in as a maximum. It can be reduced by order in council at any time, which is a change from the original bill when it could have been increased by order in council at any time. What we've said is that the information we now have indicates an eight per cent figure is a good guideline but not a ceiling. It has never been a ceiling; one can go over eight per cent at all times. However, we'll be glad to table that information if the hon. member wants it.

Mr. Nixon: Sounds pretty messy.

Mr. S. Smith: You know it's restrictive.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Now we're getting into debate on the bill which will come up in the House later.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: No, I said that was the final supplementary and we're getting into the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: No. No.

Mr. S. Smith: There's no point of order.

Mr. Singer: Throw him out again.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East with his question.

Mr. Cassidy: You never tabled that last year, you know. That information never came out.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: Throw him out.

Mr. Cassidy: You were asked for it.

GASOLINE TAX

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue: Would the minister advise whether she has been in touch with her counterpart in the province of Quebec

about the threat to post inspectors on bridges and roads to the province of Ontario to ensure that out-of-province commercial vehicles either buy their fuel in Quebec or pay the 19 cents fuel tax under what they call their 1972 Fuel Tax Act? Has the minister been in touch with her counterpart in Quebec and can she report and allay the fears of the people concerned? There is much traffic, as she knows, in the Ottawa-Hull area.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Yes, I have been in touch with Mr. Parizeau and my deputy has been in touch with his deputy. This matter is under discussion and I believe I can expect it to be resolved satisfactorily for our two provinces very shortly. The only thing that is holding it up at the moment is that Mr. Parizeau brings in his budget this evening and our discussion had to be put aside for a few days until his budget could be completed.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary: Would the minister please advise when, in fact, she'll report on this? Secondly, did she advise Mr. Parizeau about the fact that it was totally unacceptable that they start posting inspectors on either the Ontario or the Quebec side checking every vehicle that goes over and across the bridge? There are about 15,000 civil servants who travel that route every day.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, various aspects of the problem have been discussed.

OPP NATIVE CONSTABLES

Mr. Angus: A question for the Solicitor General regarding the native constable programme: Could the minister please advise this House why there is a lower salary scale for constables in the native constable programme as compared to regular constables with the Ontario Provincial Police, and further, could he advise why the same fringe benefit package, particularly provisions for life insurance and pension, are also not available to these special native constables?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Very briefly, the native constables are not subject to the same income tax provisions as are the regular constables, and for that reason there are some differences in their pay scales.

Mr. Angus: Supplementary: Would the minister be prepared to negotiate with the federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development at least to alleviate the difference in the lack of life insurance and pension programmes for these individuals, particularly life insurance, because they are in the same type of job, they in fact assist regular OPP forces and are, in fact, in the same type of danger?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Sir, we'll take it under advisement.

VIOLENCE IN THE HOME

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General: In view of the fact that the Attorney General has taken such an interest in violence in hockey and violence on television, could he advise this House whether he is prepared at this point to spend some money for some crisis intervention because of violence in the home?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has some specific proposal to recommend to the government, I'm sure I'd be very interested in hearing it, as, I'm sure, would the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton). This whole business of crisis intervention in the home is obviously a serious problem, but I'd like to hear the hon. member's proposals for a solution.

Mr. Warner: Because you have run out of ideas.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: Do I take it then that the initiative of the Attorney General is not addressed to this problem as it was to the others? Is it because the others were simpler to resolve?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't think that question deserves an answer, or attempt to answer. It's nonsense.

Mr. Ruston: Your headlines are hockey, eh, Roy?

[2:45]

WOOD IMPORTS

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. If the minister's reforestation programme is as effective as he claimed last week, why did the mills in Thunder Bay feel it is necessary to import 48,000 cords of spruce, jackpine and poplar from the US in the past year?

Hon. F. S. Miller: It may be entirely a question of price; but I'll be glad to find out. It's my understanding that the cost per cunit of wood in Ontario is as much as 50 per cent

more than the cost per cunit of wood in the States.

Mr. Foulds: By the way, that's not so in the situation at Thunder Bay.

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Foulds: Can the minister further indicate why MacMillan Bloedel has unilaterally reduced the quantities of wood it is accepting from independent cutters in the Thunder Bay area—contrary to its wood purchase agreements as designed by this ministry and forced on the independent cutters three years ago—so that they have to deliver all of their wood to MacMillan Bloedel? Why is it necessary for MacMillan Bloedel still to import wood from the US? And will the minister allow the independent cutters to sell their wood to other mills as long as they do not exceed the allowable cut designed by his ministry for their licences?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points in that question, some of which I obviously can't answer without checking. I'll be glad to check those things necessary. I can't speculate as to why the cuts were reduced unless, perhaps, there is some clause in the overall agreement between the company and its own forestry staff to guarantee employment for a certain number of people. I think one of the problems we've had in subletting cuts to independent operators has been a certain number of union agreements which require a level of production from their own staff. That may be the case in this particular instance. I can easily find out.

Mr. Foulds: If the minister's hypothesis is accurate, why is it that MacMillan Bloedel is still importing wood from the US? Does he understand that it was his ministry that forced all of the independent cutters in the Thunder Bay area to deliver wood only to MacMillan Bloedel?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't like the word "forced." I will gladly check and find out the current terms of that agreement. There are times I'd like to have the force but I don't have it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

HOME WARRANTY PLAN

Mr. O'Neil: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. As local municipalities will not grant building permits to builders who are not registered with the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada, is the minister aware that the present six to eight weeks waiting period for registration of builders seriously affects the construction industry, and that this backlog of applications contributes greatly to unemployment and stagnation in the building industry in this province?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: As I understand the question—am I aware of the fact that this has some detrimental effect on building?

Mr. Warner: What are you going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, it does. I should point out to the hon. member that the whole programme is administered by the private sector which, for years, has complained about government red tape in administering programmes. I think this indicates that red tape is not always easily cut, and the private sector is finding that out as well as we are.

Mr. O'Neil: I don't really go along with the answer of the minister, because this group comes under his staff.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You don't debate it. Do you have any further questions?

Mr. O'Neil: Okay. It comes under his ministry. Is the minister prepared to do something about this backlog, to see that something is done in this province to get some of these builders registered and to get building going in the province?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have already asked the board of directors of the corporation designated to administer the programme to put on additional staff, to process the applications faster and to do whatever is possible to catch up to the backlog.

Mr. Good: And what about a change of address?

Mrs. Campbell: What do you do?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: One thing we have not done is accept the fact that the government should administer a programme that the private sector wanted to; and that party voted for it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Because you are an expert on red tape yourself.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am getting rid of it.

Mr. Bullbrook: You are an expert on it.

Mr. O'Neil: Supplementary: I wonder if the minister would look at this carefully. I think it is a very serious problem in the province and, surely, between his ministry and HUDAC he could come up with some solutions—make sure that these builders are registered right away and building can get on in the province.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, not only are we prepared to look at it carefully; and we have looked at it carefully, we have discussed it with HUDAC and will continue to do that to speed up the process.

SUPPLY OF MEMORIAL WREATHS

Mr. Johnson: A question of the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker, in two parts: First, is the minister aware that the government of Ontario has for more than 20 years recognized the great contribution and sacrifice made by Canadian veterans by directly purchasing, without tender, memorial wreaths made by disabled veterans employed by Vetcraft Industries? Second, what is the minister's intention with respect to this policy; does he intend to let the contract out for tender, which might cause the loss of jobs for disabled veterans?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I understand this has been discussed lately in Sault Ste. Marie and other places. I have every intention of continuing the practice of supplying to the members of this House, and to others, the traditional Royal Canadian Legion Vetcraft wreath of maple leaves and the traditional red poppy. I have no intention of asking for other tenders or other suppliers.

Mr. Johnson: In view of the minister's response, would he consider informing the Ontario command of the Royal Canadian Legion that the Ontario government will continue to purchase wreaths directly without tender from Vetcraft Industries?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to and to say how we appreciate what it stands for in this ongoing very fine programme of the Legion.

MAYO REPORT

Ms. Gigantes: A question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker: I wonder, while he and the cabinet are considering whether they will accept federal money for French-language training in private schools, would he also think about and ask cabinet to consider those recommendations of the Mayo report on Ottawa-Carleton regional government concerning the pooling and equitable sharing of property taxes collected by the four Ottawa-Carleton boards of education?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think what we are doing in regard to the Mayo report is what my colleague, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), is doing. We are at the present time getting input from the various school boards concerned about the suggestions that Mayo has put forward. Once we have that process completed, we will then consider what, if any, action should be taken on the recommendations.

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does this mean that the ministry is open to the proposition of the pooling and sharing of property taxes among the four boards?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that particular recommendation, of course, may not necessarily be completely unique to that area of the province and may have ramifications generally for taxation, which of course is all being looked at based on the recommendations of the Blair commission. I really don't know yet, we will have to wait until we get the comments in.

TOURISM

Mr. Eakins: A question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism, Mr. Speaker: In preparation for the coming tourist season and in view of the continual decline in tourism visitations from the United States, will he be recommending to the Treasurer a temporary removal of the retail sales tax from accommodation rental in Ontario, from May through October inclusive?

An hon. member: A good question.

Mr. S. Smith: That's a good idea.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not.

An hon. member: Do you want the tourists here, Claude?

Mr. Eakins: In this area, what incentives or what will the ministry be undertaking, other than a massive advertising campaign, to help the sagging tourist industry in Ontario this summer?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I have already made some recommendations to the Treasurer as to what I think he should include in his speech of next Tuesday evening. Like other members of this Legislature, I shall wait until Tuesday night to find out whether some of the suggestions are being followed by the Treasurer.

OPERATING RULES FOR PRIVATE RAILWAYS

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Labour: Recently, Mr. Adelard Bruyere was killed at the Inco Clarabelle mill when he was crushed between a moving train of ore cars and a rotary car dumper. Is the minister aware that if the operating rules governing the CN-CP had been applied, the train would have stopped immediately the engineer lost sight of the conductor? And is the minister further aware that for six years I have requested this government to include that as part of the operating rules, which would have prevented this type of accident occurring?

Hon. B. Stephenson: In response to the hon. member's last question, no, I was not aware of his action in this area. But I shall be very pleased to examine the case of Mr. Bruyere, which has been noted by the hon. member for Sudbury East, and I shall report to the House on the developments of that examination.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: Can the minister indicate at the same time when the study, which was undertaken between the unions and the companies with respect to operating rules for private railways, will be introduced as legislation, if it has been completed?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, I can't at this point in time, but I shall try to find out and report.

ALUMINUM WIRING

Mr. Kerrio: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. In an answer he gave me the other day on the dangers of aluminum wiring, he suggested that it wasn't available for purchase in this province. I would ask him to explain a conversation I had this morning with one of the extremely large suppliers of electrical cable here in Ontario. When I queried him about the availability of aluminum wiring, he said: "How much would you like?" Could the minister explain that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I don't recall—I would have to check Hansard—but I don't believe I said it wasn't available. I said it wasn't being used; and that's probably the reason why the manufacturer has a great amount on hand to sell.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary: In the conversation, he suggested to me that it could be used for replacement as well; so I'll pose this question to the minister again: With the dangers that exist, would he consider banning it until such time as it's proven safe and not vice versa?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I don't see much point in setting up a public inquiry and then saying to the public inquiry that we've already made up our minds that a danger exists. The reason for the public inquiry is to inquire into the problem; to determine the degree of danger, if any, and to suggest action to be taken by this government and other levels of government. That's the announcement that I mentioned would be taking place when I answered the hon. member a few days ago.

An hon. member: You're burning the evidence.

Mr. Moffatt: Supplementary: In view of the minister's answer, are we then to presume that this government will assume liability for any accident which occurs as a result of aluminum wiring between the date of the announcement of that committee and its recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We'll wait until the commissioner has reported and then we'll determine what action has to be taken.

LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Mr. Grande: My question is to the Minister of Education: Would the minister explain, in more detail than there is in the Throne Speech, what a heritage language programme is? Would he further explain how he manages to fund programmes—and I'm quoting from the Throne Speech—to encourage "children to understand the language and culture of their parents [through] a continuing education offering," which, as far as I understand it, is adult education? I don't understand that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that's very understandable. Of course, I didn't write the speech —Her Honour wrote the speech—

An hon. member: Do you write any of your stuff?

Hon. Mr. Wells: —or use the very fine language that was in it. But, in answer to

my friend's question, the details of that programme will be announced very shortly.

[3.00]

WATER AND SEWAGE PROJECTS

Mr. McKessock: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. In view of the fact that there are some 70 sewage and water projects across the province that are held up by the government for lack of funds; in view of the fact that some of these are health hazards to the community and the communities have received word from the health authorities saying they must complete these projects—projects such as those at Meaford and Neustadt—and in view of the fact that funds are coming through from other ministries for projects that don't seem to have the same priority, why are funds not coming through the Ministry of the Environment for these sewage projects?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We've got well over 100 projects in 100 different municipalities during this coming fiscal year. It may be just physically impossible to do all the work that has to be done this particular year. As for the projects the hon. member is talking about, at Meaford, for example, we're going ahead with engineering this year and I would expect that within a year's time the actual expansion of the sewage treatment plant there will be undertaken. As far as Neustadt is concerned—I believe it's water there—the question of priority again comes into this whole picture, given the amount of money allocated to me. As a result of a meeting last week with some representatives from the Collingwood area, I have indicated that, hopefully, Neustadt will start next year as well.

Mr. McKessock: In view of the fact that it is a health hazard and also that it's holding up home construction, which is badly needed, does the minister not feel that this is of sufficient importance to call upon the Premier (Mr. Davis) to bring the situation before the Management Board?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Those areas where there is a health hazard are included in my budget estimates for the coming year, that is the first priority. The growth or expansion of subdivisions is after that particular priority, and Neustadt just does not have quite the high priority of many other municipalities in the province as far as health is concerned, although it does have a high rating; and that's why, hopefully, we will start next year.

Mr. McKessock: In view of the fact that Neustadt has a letter from the health authority saying that this is a health hazard in their community, would the minister see that this programme is put ahead in priority?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Without underrating the opinion of the local medical officer of health, I've had a number of letters of that kind when there's some pressure to clean up a particular situation. As a result of correspondence of that kind, of course, my ministry officials have to go into the community and analyse the situation on their own; we've done that in Neustadt.

There's no question that some of the wells need cleaning up, shall we say; but by servicing those wells, in many respects we could postpone, at least, a very expensive communal system for a small village of that kind. The member is talking $3 million and $4 million for a community of maybe 500 or 600 people. If the wells or the septic systems can be cleaned up by individual attention, hopefully that communal system can wait until next year when funds will be available.

ALLEGED LINK BETWEEN FLUORIDE AND CANCER

Mr. Deans: A question of the Minister of Health: Will the Ministry of Health review the information used to justify the recent statement that came from the United States that links the use of fluoride with cancer? And will the minister, on behalf of the ministry and the government, make a statement to either refute or authenticate the claims that are being made before more people die of heart attacks and fear than die of cancer?

Mr. Roy: Or get grey hairs.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I've seen nothing, in discussions with my staff I've seen no documentation, to support that assertion made by one individual in the United States.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Since the minister hasn't seen it and I haven't seen it, and since a lot of people are concerned about it, does the minister think it might be too much to ask that his ministry obtain the findings and obtain the information and review it over and against what is generally accepted medical information, to determine whether or not there's any validity at all to it?

Mr. Reid: Fluoride makes your hair go straight.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The hon. member knows there is hardly a day of the week

passes that somebody, somewhere in the world, doesn't make an assertion, based on whatever amount of research or simple thought processes, that something might be related to the causes of cancer.

Mr. Breithaupt: Brown suits are bad, too.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: And if the member is suggesting that I table a statement every time, in this Legislature, that somebody makes that kind of a statement somewhere in the world, then that's all you'd ever hear in this Legislature. On this specific point, I've seen no evidence to indicate that there's anything to substantiate that assertion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are just about out of time, and there are several people who have more questions. A final supplementary from the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: Since the minister must be aware that there are many communities in the province that have been using fluorides for many years—for example, Brantford, since 1946—would he not think that this is a special matter that must concern those citizens very much indeed; that it would be a great and useful service if, as Minister of Health, he could provide the information which would refute what I consider to be the irresponsible statement from that American source which has been carried so extensively by the media in the province?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will take the hon. member's suggestion under advisement.

HIGHWAY 402

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question on behalf of myself and the Chairman of Cabinet (Mr. Henderson) to the Minister of Transportation and Communication. Today, marking the ninth anniversary of the announcement of Highway 402 east of Sarnia and that particular highway never having been violated by a motor vehicle yet, I'm wondering, since the government has spent about $60 million on pre-engineering, land acquisition, engineering overpasses and the road itself, could the ministry consider paving it to Komoka so that we could do away with what the Hon. Charles McNaughton rightly characterized as "that death strip going out of Sarnia"?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the hon. member knows, there is a great deal of activity on Highway 402 at this time.

Mr. Nixon: Birds fly around it; dust blows.

Hon. Mr. Snow: There are a number of contracts under way. Two new major contracts have been awarded this spring and they are proceeding as fast as resources will allow them to go.

An hon. member: Answer the question.

Mr. Bullbrook: I appreciate the minister's indulging me. Would it be too much just to ask him to answer the question? Would he consider paving it? Everything is there to Komoka; would he consider just paving it this year?

Mr. Eaton: It doesn't even go to Komoka, Jim.

Mr. Hodgson: Why don't you ask Warner for the information and he'll tell you.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm sorry—not to Komoka. My colleague points out I am completely in error—to Warwick Village. He's quite right.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, now that I know where the hon. member is referring to, there are—

Mr. Bullbrook: I apologize.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —there are three contracts starting from Sarnia and going easterly. There is a grading contract that was awarded last year—awarded, I guess, in 1975; it will be totally complete this year—and a paving contract will be awarded this year, for 6.6 miles, as soon as the grading contract on that section is completed.

Mr. Roy: Is that for paving?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The grading contract is being done by Marentette, if that tells the member which one it is.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That's in the member's riding.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Following that, Mr. Speaker, the next contract under way is a paving contract. It will be completed in the summer of 1977. It is a further seven miles and is being carried out by Armbro Construction.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That's in my riding.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yours is probably paved in gold.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Following that there's a paving contract that was awarded in January of 1977 for the completion in the fall of 1977 at the earliest, if they have a good year. This is a further 7.4 miles, to Warwick, and

this contract has been let to Huron Construction.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are making progress, by the turn of the century we will get it.

Mr. Nixon: It will be nine years.

Mr. Bullbrook: A year a mile, and $2 million.

Mr. Martel: The Timmins highway took 30 years.

Hon. Mr. Snow: So those contracts, Mr. Speaker, are under way and I am sure that—

Mr. Lewis: What about Komoka?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That is in Indiana, isn't it?

LAND SPECULATION TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. Makarchuk: A question of the Minister of Revenue: Now that the matter of Ronto has been brought to her attention, about a week and a half ago, has the minister acquainted herself with the auditor's opinion that the land speculation tax on this particular transaction should be collected? If so, is the minister prepared to make that collection?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: This property, Mr. Speaker, has been exempted from tax.

Mr. Speaker: We'll allow a brief supplementary: the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: Is the minister consulting with the Premier (Mr. Davis) over the establishment of a select committee of the Legislature to look into the matter as is referred to in the recommendation of the standing committee on public accounts, which appears in Votes and Proceedings, No. 1 of this session?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I am not aware that there is a request before us at the present time for such an investigation.

Mr. Reid: What?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: And I am not consulting with the Premier on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Mr. Nixon: Since the minister indicated she was not aware of what appears in Votes and Proceedings, No. 1—

Mr. Speaker: I heard the hon. minister say she would check into it.

Mr. Nixon: —it is on page 14.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Thank you very much, there is nothing really out of order.

Mr. Deans: On a different point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. Deans: Earlier today I asked the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations if he would table information with regard to the statement that he made. I want to draw to his attention that standing order 23(8) requires that there be a compendium of information made available after a policy statement or introduction of a government bill. I would ask the minister to comply with that and provide a compendium of information.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It has been provided.

Mr. Deans: Where is it then?

Mr. Speaker: I think we might clarify this.

Mr. S. Smith: I don't have it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It has been sent to the official critics as required under the rules. Get your critic in the House.

Mr. Speaker: There may have been a breakdown of communications; you had better check into it.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The same point of order?

Mr. Lewis: On the same point of order, I believe the minister is confusing two matters. I think he means the copy of the statement which he made in the House today—

Mr. Deans: That is not what we are after.

Mr. Lewis: —which we duly received. However, there is now a new rule in the Legislature which requires the information which supports the statement of policy—and it cer-

tainly was a statement of policy—to be given to the House at the time the statement of policy has been made.

The provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) indicated that he intended to do that in relation to a statement he made last week. Therefore, my colleague for Wentworth asks, under the rules, where is the minister's supporting documentation?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: On the point of order, it was not a statement of policy. It was a statement prior to the introduction of a bill. My understanding of the rule is the compendium can be distributed when the bill is introduced. It will be introduced as soon as we get through arguing this point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I understand this has now been tabled.

Mr. Breithaupt: On a point of order with respect, as well, to an involvement in the new rules: Referring to the new item 10, which appears with rule 27 concerning the indication to the House, within 14 days, with respect to whether answers to questions will be costly or time-consuming to prepare, on the order paper today there is now item No. 1, an inquiry of the ministry, which has its 14 days now expired; by Thursday there will be some 19 more items whose time will have expired with respect to answers, if in fact they are going to be lengthy or time-consuming. Could you, Mr. Speaker, take up with the particular ministries involved the concerns of the members as to the answering of the questions so that this rule will allow the information to come forward, in the absence of the difficulty that might exist to prepare detailed answers?

Mr. Speaker: I trust that the comments will be noted by the ministry. If there has been a delay, I haven't noted.

Mr. Reed: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you may be aware of this, but on this day of all days, when the sun is shining so gloriously outside the heat is still on in Queen's Park. I wonder if Mr. Speaker would be good enough to bring this to the attention of our resident custodian, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. J. R. Smith) in order to set the example for conservation in this province?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure if that is a point of order or privilege.

Presenting reports.

MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Mr. R. S. Smith replace Mr. Gaunt on the resources development committee, and that Mr. Gaunt replace Mr. R. S. Smith on the general government committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lewis: An excellent suggestion.

[3:15]

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend the Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975, Second Session.

Motion agreed to.

BOROUGH OF YORK ACT

Mr. MacDonald moved first reading of Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Motion agreed to.

LOMBARDO FURNITURE AND APPLIANCE LIMITED ACT

Mr. Burr moved first reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting Lombardo Furniture and Appliances Limited.

Motion agreed to.

TORONTO GENERAL BURYING GROUNDS ACT

Mr. Drea moved first reading of Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Trustees of the Toronto General Burying Grounds.

Motion agreed to.

FRED LEBLOND CEMENT PRODUCTS LIMITED ACT

Mr. Drea, on behalf of Mr. Morrow, moved first reading of Bill Pr16, An Act respecting Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited.

Motion agreed to.

SUCCESSOR RIGHTS (CROWN TRANSFERS) ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moved first reading of Bill 29, An Act to provide for Successor Rights

on the transfer of an undertaking to or from the Crown.

Motion agreed to.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. S. Smith moved first reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend The Municipal Elections Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, the bill removes the property qualification which creates a distinction between those persons in a municipality who are qualified to vote for municipal representatives and those who are qualified to vote on money by-laws.

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK ACT

Mr. Leluk moved first reading of Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of East York.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA TRUSTCO MORTGAGE COMPANY ACT

Mr. Peterson moved first reading of Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Canada Trustco Mortgage Company.

Motion agreed to.

BROCKVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL ACT

Mr. McCague moved first reading of Bill Pr7, An Act respecting the Brockville General Hospital.

Motion agreed to.

VILLAGE OF ERIE BEACH ACT

Mr. Spence moved first reading of Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the Village of Erie Beach.

Motion agreed to.

ROMAN CATHOLIC EPISCOPAL CORPORATION (DIOCESE OF ALEXANDRIA) ACT

Mr. Villeneuve moved first reading of Bill Pr19, An Act Respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation for the Diocese of Alexandria in Ontario, Canada.

Motion agreed to.

FRANK POSTL ENTERPRISES LIMITED ACT

Mr. Lane, in the absence of Mr. Johnston, moved first reading of Bill Pr24, An Act Respecting Frank Postl Enterprises Limited.

Motion agreed to.

WEBWOOD INVESTMENTS LIMITED ACT

Mr. B. Newman, in the absence of Mr. Stong, moved first reading of Bill Pr6, An Act Respecting Webwood Investments Limited.

Motion agreed to.

KEVALAINE CORPORATION LIMITED ACT

Mr. Grossman moved first reading of Bill Pr13, An Act Respecting Kevalaine Corporation Limited.

Motion agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, just before calling the orders for today, I wonder if the House would bear with me.

The House leaders felt it might be helpful if we read into the record the results of a number of meetings with committee chairmen and others to establish the schedule for committees and the schedule for the House. Until otherwise agreed, the schedule for committee mettings will be as follows:

On Monday morning, of course, there will be no meetings. On Monday afternoon, social development, procedural affairs and members' services are scheduled to meet. Therefore, it's understood that if the social committee is dealing with estimates or legislation, there will be no social development field ministers' business in the House on Monday afternoon, as provided in provisional rule 31. On Monday night, there are no meetings.

On Tuesday morning, the various caucuses will meet. Tuesday afternoon, there will be social development committee and members' services. Therefore, once again, there will be

no social development ministries having business in the House on Tuesday afternoon. On Tuesday night, general government and statutory instruments will meet, therefore, if the general government committee is dealing with estimates or legislation, there will not be any business of the general government field ministries in the House on Tuesday night.

[3:30]

Wednesday morning, the general government, resources development and justice committees will meet—it being understood that only two of these committees may consider estimates or legislation at the same time. On Wednesday afternoon, it will be general government and social development; and of course there are no meetings on Wednesday evening.

On Thursday morning, it is resources development, the public accounts committee and the procedural affairs committee; and of course in the afternoon it will be the justice committee, it being understood they are to finish by 5.45 since that's private members' afternoon. As a result, as well, no justice ministries will have business in the House on Thursday afternoon.

It is of course understood that there is a requirement for full attendance in the House by 5:45 on Thursday because of the new procedures dealing with private members' valid items.

On Thursday night it will be the justice committee and the statutory instruments committee; therefore no justice field ministries will have business in the House on Thursday night.

On Friday morning there will be the resources committee and public accounts committee; it being understood, as well, that there are no resource field ministries having business in the House on Friday morning.

Members can see why there is some advantage to having this on the record so that they can read it and understand what is a very interesting schedule. I want to commend the chairman for working out all these details.

With respect to the House, as a result of the above committee schedule and provisional rule 31, until further notice, it has been agreed that the following weekly schedule for House business will be followed:

On Monday afternoon the House will be in committee of supply to deal with estimates; on Tuesday afternoon, the House will deal with legislation—that is in the resources, justice or general government area—and on Tuesday night we'll deal with legislation in the resources, justice or social area. On Thursday afternoon, of course, there will be the private members' ballot business. On Thursday night it will be budget debate, or a report on committee reports or other special debates. On Friday morning the House will be in committee of supply to consider estimates.

According to the time table, this weekly schedule will take effect the week of May 2. That's the first order.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, before you call the order, there are two comments I'd like to make with regard to the announcement of the House leader that I think might be important.

First of all, it's been very difficult for all of the people concerned to find a way to accommodate all of the new rules and to bring about the House business in an orderly fashion. I think that the caution that we have to put before the Legislature is simply this: These rules are not written on tablets of stone and if there are problems with the workings of the new rules, all of us who are concerned with those matters would be quite prepared to hear representation and to make whatever adjustments are required to be made.

In addition to that, I also want to say to the government House leader something that has been on my mind. The fact that they're called provisional rules shouldn't be considered by anyone, now or in the future, to be an interpretation that they are intended only to serve the minority government. They're provisional to the extent that we want to try them out and make adjustments to them, but at some point in the future when we are the majority government in the province of Ontario—

Mr. Ruston: Not in your time, never.

Mr. Deans: —it would be our wish to keep these rules in place because they're intended to facilitate the work of the members of the Legislature. I hope that would be the intention of both of the other parties in the unlikely event that they found themselves in that position.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, going back to reality now for a moment—

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Mr. Sweeney: Let's be serious.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we'll hear a few brief comments from the member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Certainly over the last several weeks the House leaders, and I must say particularly each of their executive assistants, as well as the table officers, and of course, you Mr. Speaker, and your deputies, have worked hard in an attempt to develop a pattern of meetings, both within the House and within committees, to allow a balance of the individual members in the conduct of business within the House and committees inside a framework to make sure there was no duplication or more difficulty than there would have to be.

We recognize that there are a number of members, because of the present makeup of the House, who have to serve on two, and sometimes even three, committees, so there are going to be certain conflicts in order to ensure that the business is conducted in the right place at the right time. But certainly my colleagues, the other two House leaders, have attempted, with me and with our other advisers, to come up with a pattern that will encourage the greatest individual opportunity for committees to meet and do their work within the necessary framework that the business of the House must also be conducted.

It is in the nature of an experiment at this point. I would hope we will receive the goodwill of all the members to ensure that these rules continue not only for the balance of this parliament but whatever may befall in the next parliament.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Orders of the day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my understanding that when we adjourned on Friday the hon. member for Downsview had the floor. He may continue.

Mr. di Santo: The second reason this government is unable to cope with the problems of the economy of this province, and in particular with the problems of industrial development and job creation in the productive sector, is related to the auto pact and the crucial importance that the auto pact has for the province of Ontario. In fact, in Ontario is located 90 per cent of the automobile industry in Canada. Even though this industry since the inception continued to exhibit the characteristic features of branch plant industrialism, in the first years of the pact, despite the deepening parts deficit, the growing assembly surpluses meant that the overall trade picture was improving for Canada and therefore for Ontario.

In 1970 and 1971, Canada achieved more surpluses in its overall auto trade with the United States. Beginning in 1972 though, our auto trade performance has sharply altered. In 1975, the deficit reached a staggering $1.9 billion. After a decade under the automotive trade agreement, Canada had returned to the kind of trade deficit that had been the reason for entering the pact in the first place.

The 1975 deficit in auto parts trade with the US was just under $2.5 billion, a figure so high as to point to the near collapse of Canada's auto parts industry. Whereas in 1972 the Canadian auto parts industry manufactured products worth 90.8 per cent of the value of parts produced—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will you keep your private conversations down, please? I want to listen to the member for Downsview.

Mr. di Santo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad you want to listen because I think that it's quite important for the province of Ontario. In 1975, the proportion of parts manufactured in Canada dropped dramatically to 55.1 per cent. What accounted for the stunning turn-around in Canada's auto trade with the United States and what are its implications for future Canadian economic performance?

Both short-term and long-term factors underlie the new auto trade deficits. The most important short-term factor in the trade turn-around was the relatively greater collapse of the US market during the recession years of 1974 and 1975. While the relatively greater collapse of the US market during the recession of the mid-Seventies accounted for the exceptionally high Canadian auto deficit in 1975, the deficit remained at the level of $1 billion even in 1976, a year during which this short-term factor was no longer operative. The 1976 deficit pointed to the operation of long-term factors that make it unlikely that Canada's trade with the US would return to a state of balance. The slowdown in capital investment, noticeably in auto parts plants in Canada, is part of a long-term trend that has nothing to do with the momentary ups and downs of the auto market in the US and Canada. Auto industry investment has shifted

to the US for two major reasons: the economics of the auto industry and the result of US government measures designed to lead to just such a shift.

As you remember, Mr. Speaker, writing off taxes on export sales has had an especially important impact on Canadian-American auto trade. While the list of American companies operating under the DISC tax plan has not been made public, former industry minister Jean-Luc Pepin told the House of Commons that both Ford and Chrysler have been exporting products to Canada under DISC plans.

The productivity gap and US government incentives to shift auto investment to the United States are not the only long-run problems facing the Canadian auto industry. The automobile is experiencing a long-term relative decline in North America, and the relative decline of the auto industry has three basic causes: the overdevelopment of auto production facilities in the industrial world in relation to markets; the problem of the automobile as a mode of transit in congested urban centres, and rapidly rising fuel prices.

The problem of urban congestion contributes to placing limits on the potential size of the auto market. And, finally, the energy price increases affect the auto market in several ways. Higher gasoline prices tend to favour other modes of transportation over the automobile and thereby become a factor in limiting market size. Moreover, energy price increases affect the cost of producing automobiles.

Auto production, as I said before, remains the hub of manufacturing in Ontario. In this province, almost 100,000 people work in the industry, producing about one ninth of the gross national product. The consequences of the continued dependence of Ontario manufacturing on auto production are serious. The auto industry is in a state of relative decline in North America and Canada's share of North American auto production is likely to remain well below the country's share of consumption of North American-produced automobiles.

Two final factors should be taken into account in any assessment of the future role of the auto industry in the Canadian economy: the switch to smaller, fuel-saving automobiles, and the tendency of the auto industry to shift auto parts production to low-wage countries.

Throughout this decade, first in response to the invasion of North American markets by European and Japanese compact cars and later in response to the escalation of gasoline prices, American auto manufacturers have been shifting the balance of their output from large and intermediate cars to smaller offerings. While Ford and Chrysler held the lead in the conversion until 1974, General Motors, the largest automaker, has been spending hundreds of millions of dollars retooling its facilities to shift its production to smaller-sized cars. Such a shift will only reinforce the other tendencies in the industry, already discussed, that are leading to large-scale auto trade deficits for Canada in the foreseeable future.

In the years ahead the auto trade will exacerbate the critical problem of Canada's and Ontario's current account deficit, as mentioned at the beginning of my speech. The relative stagnation of the industry will have a weakening effect on the entire development of Canadian manufacturing.

[3:45]

The poor prospects for the Canadian and Ontario auto industry are becoming alarming. To its 1976 budget, the Ontario government and the Treasurer appended an analysis of Canada's record under the auto pact. The report warned that while Canada's performance in the first years of the automobile agreement was satisfactory, major problems have developed since 1969. But while the Ontario government's study of the auto pact pointed to three major difficulties facing the Canadian industry, it did not propose any major restructuring of the agreement.

The three major points that the Treasurer made in his budget presentation were the failure of the industry to improve productivity, the steady loss of Canada's share of North American auto assembly activity and the rapid growth of the auto parts trade deficit. It concluded by calling for a regular review of Canada's performance under the pact.

As we pointed out at that time, we do not think a regular review of the pact is either sufficient or useful at this time because, as I said before, in the province of Ontario and in Canada we are producing only 55.1 per cent of the auto parts and the trade deficit in the auto parts industry in 1975 amounted to $2.5 billion, with a net loss of almost 30,000 jobs in Canada, and specifically in southwestern Ontario, as has been estimated by Mr. Patrick Lavelle, who is the president of the auto parts industry association.

The auto industry is crucial to the development and growth of the economy of this province, but, unfortunately, this government does not understand the problem. I think the problem of unemployment should be dealt with in long-term solutions, as I have proposed before; even though, as the leader

of my party pointed out in his speech, there are some decisions that can be made by the government at this time which can help to overcome the immediate problems of unemployment in the short term.

It has been the practice of governments at all levels—provincial, federal, and municipal —to step up construction of capital projects during periods of relative economic boom, when revenues are rising. In the past, the coincidence of public demand and financial means resulted in project approvals at the same time that the private-sector construction activity was at its peak. This, of course, contributed to inflationary pressures. But now that we are in a crisis, especially in the construction industry, the government is reducing its share in funding public works and therefore is contributing to aggravate the situation of unemployment in this province.

We think public capital projects should be scheduled on a counter-cyclical basis to minimize inflationary pressures in boom periods and maintain employment during excess production capacity and potentially slack periods. This is a time of high unemployment, as I said before, especially in the construction and building materials industry. The government should step in at such a period of slackness to bolster the economy, utilize the unused productive capacity and create employment.

I want to point out that the problem is especially acute in Metropolitan Toronto, where 30 per cent of the workers in the construction industry are unemployed and have no prospect of any change in the immediate future. I should also point out that most of the workers in the construction industry are immigrants who are hard hit because they have no other skills and no possibility of alternative employment because the market doesn't offer any alternative at all. Immigrants are the hardest hit in this society because they have been working in this trade for years—since they came to Canada after World War II. They are penalized because of the lack of commitment of the government in providing adequate funds for this basic industry of our province.

I'd like to point out what long-term proposals I think this government should make in order to face the present economic problems and solve our economic problems. One is the renegotiation of the auto pact. I think this is basic to the development of the industrial sector in this province, and especially of southern Ontario. I think we should also develop a capital goods sector within an economic programme aimed at producing machinery in Ontario. Our major trade deficit is in the machinery sector; last year Canada had a $10-billion deficit in this sector.

We should have a programme aimed at producing machinery in Ontario and Canada, so that in a 10-year period we can eliminate our dependency on foreign countries. We should keep down the oil price. This is the direction Ontario has to take if it wants to look forward to solving its economic problems, while at the same time outlining a concrete plan for the future development of the economy of the province.

I urge the government to take action in those areas affecting immigrants in the province of Ontario and in Metropolitan Toronto in particular. Immigrants, because of their condition, are one of the most vulnerable groups in our society. They are suffering the consequences of the present economic crisis, and they are paying a very high price in human, economic and social terms.

Unemployment among immigrant workers in the construction industry, in Metropolitan Toronto and throughout the province, has reached unparalleled and frightening heights in recent months. Thousands of immigrants occupied in marginal jobs, often the only ones available to them, have been laid off and do not find an opportunity to get back to work. A high number of immigrants, especially women, are exploited, working at minimum wage, thanks to the complacency of the government and to its lack of interest and care in introducing and implementing legislation aimed at removing legal, psychological and cultural obstacles to their real integration in our society.

The rate of accidents at the workplace is extremely high among immigrant workers because of the inability of the government to cope with their particular needs in the area of accident prevention. Immigrant workers are also victims of insenstitive government policies regarding disabled injured workers. They are receiving totally inadequate benefits from the Workmen's Compensation Board, and are deprived of any provision to match the increase in the cost of living. They are denied any kind of serious rehabilitation, have no right whatsoever to return to their jobs and are seriously handicapped by their cultural and language differences.

Immigrant working women are forced into inhuman experiences in order to accommodate their children during working hours because of the failure of the government to provide adequate day-care centres.

For these reasons, I support our motion and will vote in favour of the motion of no confidence.

Mr. Gaunt: First of all, as is traditional in these debates, I want to pay tribute to the Speaker and to the Deputy Speaker for the work which both do on behalf of the assembly in trying to maintain some semblance of order to the proceedings.

Since you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are in the chair at the moment I want to say to you that you do a very effective job on behalf of the members here. Your rulings are even handed and we appreciate the effort and the fairness with which you deliver the hand of judgement on the occasions that we sit in here.

I want to say to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne that I listened to both speeches with some interest and I want to congratulate both members. To my friend from Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. Johnson) I extend my congratulations because we are political neighbours. I understand the mover particularly is chosen as a person who is on the way up. I want to keep an eye on my friend from Wellington-Dufferin-Peel as he progresses through the halls of power around here. I wish him well.

I wanted to make a few preliminary remarks on a number of topics. I will touch on them very briefly and then move on to the matter with which I wanted to deal at more length, that being the matter of energy and how this province is reacting to what I would call a crisis in the energy field.

Before I get to that, however, I wanted to mention the matter of the Essex Packers affair about which my colleague from Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) asked the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) last week. I want to say to the government that almost everything—indeed everything that I can recall—which we in this party predicted would happen with respect to that matter and the agreement entered into by the government with Better Beef has happened.

First of all, on the matter of jobs, the assignment was given on the basis that 200 jobs in Hamilton would be preserved. Those jobs are gone. Those two plants are closed. That is exactly what we said would happen.

In terms of the creditors, the creditors who agreed to take the 15 cents on the dollar have not been paid the 15 cents. The assets have been dissipated and there isn't enough money to pay the 15 cents. The creditors who refused to take the offer are not going to get anything at all. That is exactly what we predicted would happen with respect to this matter.

In my mind, there is no question that this entire affair has been a disaster from beginning to end. The first mistake was made by the government when it entered into an agreement with Essex Packers, a company which was very shaky financially at that time. Ultimately, they went into receivership and Better Beef came up with a proposal to save the company and, at the same time, to maintain the 200 jobs in the Hamilton plants, neither of which has been accomplished.

[4:00]

I say that in terms of the government's responsibility and its actions in this respect, it certainly hasn't been looking after the public interest in any way, shape or form.

The other brief matter with which I want to deal is the matter of flood plain mapping. I've had some continuing discussion with the government in respect to this matter. Flood plain mapping is of particular interest in my part of the province because we have two conservation authorities in the area which I happen to have the honour to represent, and the conservation authorities are very much wrapped up in this flood plain mapping.

As it turns out, a lot of the land that could be developed, and should be developed, is seen to be in the flood plain, and hence cannot be developed. It seems to me that where we've got land that hasn't flooded in 100 years or more, even in Hurricane Hazel times, which is the criterion that is being used, it should be allowed to be developed. Indeed, it should be taken out of the flood plain and be allowed to develop, because when it comes right down to the fine point there is no possible way in which the government or anyone else can protect all of our citizens against the eventuality of a flood, no matter when it comes, no matter what time of the year.

To try to do so is sheer folly because it doesn't really accomplish very much, other than drive up land costs and ultimately the price of housing, because it means the available land for such uses is lessened. There isn't as much of it available, and hence the price is greater.

I realize the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. F. S. Miller) is new in the portfolio and that it takes some time to get familiar with these issues. But I say to my friend in Natural Resources that as far as I am concerned the criteria for flood plain mapping are too severe and the government should reassess that entire programme.

In terms of protection and in terms of eventualities, the acts of God if you like,

there is no possible way—even if we were to use the entire money resident with the Treasury over there—to make sure that everyone that is sitting on a piece of property isn't going to get flooded at some time or other. No possible way. All we can do is lessen the risk.

With that proposition, I agree. But to place a lot of the land which is now in the flood plain zone in this province out of reach, in my view does not really make good economic or insurance sense. I just don't think one can take all of the risk out of these things by entering into a programme of this nature. After all, we live in a world where we are faced with risks every day. When one drives down the freeway it's possible for one to have a car accident. When one flies in a plane it is possible to be involved in a plane crash.

Mr. Nixon: That's enough to make a guy stay home on the farm.

Mr. Gaunt: Just to say that because we have the odd car accident and a few people get killed from time to time, no one is going to use a car, or because someone gets killed in a plane crash no one is going to fly, seems to me to be indeed stretching the point.

I want to turn now to the matter of energy, and what we are doing with respect to it in this province. The underpinning of the industrial and agricultural advances in this province over the years has been a cheap energy policy which has seen our development grow and mushroom over the course of the past 30 to 35 years. This period has passed and it's about time that the government recognized it, admitted it and took steps to prepare for the dawning of a new era based on the new objectives and new goals and new technology and some government thrust.

In the longer term, Canada and the world are going to run out of oil and gas. The Ontario government has reacted to this situation by planning for electricity to fill that gap. Fair enough. Electricity is the energy of the future. Since most of the large-scale accessible hydro sites in Ontario are utilized and we have no coal suitable for generating electricity, the provincial government has decided that the only option—and that's the quarrel that I have—decided that the only option was to use uranium to generate electricity via the CANDU reactor.

Indeed, the provincial government's plan is to spend $40 billion over the next 10 or 15 years on nuclear reactors, transmission lines, and heavy water plants—all the back-up facilities that are needed for this kind of generation. That's $5,000 for every man, woman and child in the province. This represents nearly a seven-fold increase of Ontario's present $6-billion assets and over 100 times Canada's share of the St. Lawrence Seaway cost.

The consequences of this massive commitment of money, technical expertise, materials and institutional management are becoming apparent to many people in the province. There are those who say—and I'm one of them—that while nuclear power is one acceptable alternative to produce electricity, it is by no means the only alternative, and that to pursue it as the only alternative is going to be just as dangerous for us as if we had stuck to oil and gas as our major sources until all supplies of both were exhausted.

To pursue Ontario Hydro's and the Ontario government's present course in energy production is going to lead us down the path to disaster. Nuclear power production should be one arsenal in the total energy programme of the government. But the alternative energy programmes of conservation and solar energy would provide some balance to the programme.

For example, if Ontario invests $11 billion over the next 20 years in conservation, by making appliances, homes, offices and industries more energy efficient, we would save $22 billion in nuclear investment. Appliances can be made 15 to 40 per cent more efficient. That costs money, but it costs less than trying to build more nuclear stations to continue to supply inefficient appliances.

Similarly, with residential and office heating it costs money to insulate and to build more efficiently in the first place. Yet with Hydro rates going up 60 per cent in the next three years—and more moderately thereafter, I hope—it simply means people will not be able to afford electricity for residence energy and industry, because using large quantities of energy will simply mean becoming even less competitive than we are now.

We can't afford to have all our eggs in the nuclear basket; this government had better wake up to that fact soon. A greater use of renewable energy sources, particularly solar heating, is a must.

As John Bulloch Jr. has said—and there are many things with which I disagree. John Bulloch is a very intelligent individual; he is rather right-wing at times and certainly all of the things he says I don't endorse, but with this one I think he has hit it pretty well on the head.

John Bulloch has said: "Nuclear power means high-capacity, centralized generating

stations in the hands of big government or its agencies." Nuclear power, in other words, is synonymous with a philosophy of concentration of power. Mr. Bulloch continued: "Solar power, on the other hand, is ideally suited for deconcentration of population and growth of smaller communities, because each home or community would have, in effect, its own generating station. Solar-powered homes and communities can be located anywhere without concern for loss of power and transmission, and the manufacture, installation and servicing of these solar power systems would provide work for tens of thousands of small firms."

And, after all, the cornerstone of this province is the small businessman, not the multi-national corporation.

Mr. Ferrier: I thought it was the farmer, Murray.

Mr. Gaunt: This is one industry—well, the farmer's a small businessman.

Mr. Roy: You should know that. I guess maybe you shouldn't.

Mr. Nixon: I hear you're a full-time member.

Mr. Gaunt: "This is one industry that should be Canadian owned and controlled. The choice is clear: by opting for nuclear power, we will have tied ourselves to big institutions. Solar power provides the flexibility needed in the future. Solar power, therefore, is the perfect example of appropriate technology in Canada."

There has been opposition to nuclear power production on the basis of the dangers of radioactive emissions, the problems of storage and disposal of the high-level radioactive waste, the possibility of reactor accidents and, hence, thermal pollution. All of these things are the subject of justifiable public debate.

However, the major point of opposition at this point is clear and easily understood. We simply can't afford an all-nuclear system. Nuclear power is 50 to 100 times as capital intensive as the traditional direct fossil fuel system on which industrial economies have been built. This capital intensity is much greater than for the big fossil fuel electrical systems, but both kinds are so costly to build that, as the strategic planners of the Shell Group in London concluded several years ago, "No major country outside the Persian Gulf can afford ever to electrify most of its economy." Nuclear power, like coal synthetics, oil shale and tar sands, is so complex and costly that nobody can afford it on a big scale. It is a future technology whose time has passed.

In the same article, it goes on to say that because of this great capital intensity, if we try to build many reactors, electricity must become so dear that people cannot afford to buy much of it or else not enough money will be left over in the economy to build the non-energy devices that were supposed to use all the electricity or both.

For example, President Ford's 1976-1985 US energy programme would cost a current GNP year one trillion dollars in today's dollars, three-quarters of it for electrification. Thus, nearly two-thirds of all money traditionally available for the US investment in houses, roads, schools, hospitals, factories, everything else outside the energy sector, would have to be consumed by that sector alone. The author goes on to say that for fundamental economic as well as political reason, nuclear power is already dead in the United States. Mr. Carter's energy policy will be coming out on April 20. I guess that's next week. Perhaps we'll have a better insight into just what's going to happen south of the border with respect to new energy directions.

[4:15]

Last June, I had the privilege of attending the Habitat conference in British Columbia—the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, in Vancouver. One of the many speeches that was delivered at that time was on the nuclear question and was given by Amory Lovins, who is a consultant physicist concentrating on energy and resource strategy. He has collaborated with several UN agencies, the International Federation of Institutes for Advanced Study and the Science Council of Canada. He is a very eminent gentleman indeed and certainly a very well-qualified person to speak on this topic.

Some of his observations are worth noting. Mr. Lovins stated that conserving energy, especially in developed countries—which covers the United States and Canada—is a much cheaper, more benign, more effective supplement to fossil fuels than is nuclear power during the period of bridging to whatever comes next and is, indeed, essential. He states that a diverse range of soft energy technologies, those that rely on energy income rather than energy capital, could meet practically all our energy needs about 50 years from now at reasonable cost and with essentially zero risk of technical failure.

Because these soft technologies are comparatively small and simple, we could build them much faster than an equivalent capacity of high technology. Enough soft technologies are already available and enough others soon will be so that we could start deploying them now.

Mr. Lovins stated that if we continue the nuclear power course much longer we foreclose—and I think this is important—we foreclose the soft option by delaying it so long that we shall no longer have enough readily available fossil fuels to form a credible bridge.

Mr. Lovins saw a three-pronged energy strategy as the answer: First, a wide-ranging energy conservation programme. Second, start without delay a large programme to develop, demonstrate and deploy a wide range of small-scale energy income technologies, making full use of existing technological resources. Top priority should go first to solar heating and cooling; organic conversion, especially methanol, for the transport section; and sophisticated wind technologies. Progress on harder technologies, such as geothermal and photothermal conversion, has been very rapid lately and people who say soft technologies are all far in the future are very much out of touch.

Efficient solar heating is commercially available and is now cheaper than electric heating in the United States, most of Europe and even in Canada. In some areas, it is cheaper than direct fuel heating. The barriers to its use are no longer technical or economical but institutional—the building codes, the architects who really haven't caught up yet, mortgage regulations—all of those sorts of things.

Third, during the 40 to 50 years it takes to construct an economy of energy income, we should use fossil fuels in transitional technologies adaptable to the soft technologies, so that we can plug them in as they arrive.

Lovins predicts the United States will move in the next five years—it's that close he thinks—to turn off nuclear power all over the world. Such an effort could succeed because essentially all countries' nuclear programmes depend on each other and, ultimately, on the United States for either technical or political support. In essence, Lovins proposed a prompt redirection of national resources towards the wise and efficient use of energy and towards its extraction from renewable sources.

Finally, he concluded that we choose technologies that reflect human values under human control and not those promoted by technologists who can't distinguish "can" from "should."

I suggest that Lovins has an excellent grasp of the issues and has thought the matter through very carefully. It seems to me, in summary, that Ontario and Canada have basically three alternative directions for energy policy decisions.

One, we can continue with our present policy of promoting large-scale energy developments in which large amounts of energy and capital are invested. This option, in my view, will lead to disaster economically, politically and socially for all of us.

Two is a modified version of the first but with heavier emphasis on conservation. However, this still would entail heavy investment in the nuclear programme, which I think would be unwise and would make us and our energy supply vulnerable since we would have essentially all our eggs in one basket.

Three would put the major emphasis on renewable sources of energy. They have the advantage of diversity. Development costs in terms of money and energy are lower than with conventional fuels. This change obviously will not be made overnight. A combination of serious energy conservation and efficient use of fossil fuels would be used as a bridge to the point where renewable energy has been broadly introduced.

These are important issues for this government. I have stated before that, in my view, in the next five to six years the most important ministries in this government are the ministries of Energy and Environment, and I maintain that that is so. I think the next few years are crucial. If this province is going to maintain its industrial base at all, then we have to come to grips with our environment and with these energy questions. If we don't, then I suggest that our standard of living is going to suffer, our unemployment is going to continue to rise and we are going to recede dramatically as an industrial province in this country.

The Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) has an unusually heavy responsibility to give leadership in this vital area. Unfortunately, so far his performance has done little to inspire me.

Mr. Roy: All of us.

Mr. Gaunt: I think he is going to have to come to grips with some of these things which he hasn't dealt with so far. These things are certainly not going to be accomplished by mediocre leadership. The problem is that

really this whole government is afflicted with the mediocrity syndrome.

Mr. Roy: A terrible sickness.

Mr. Nixon: Mediocrity.

Mr. Gaunt: I suppose one could say it's a collection of mediocrity with only a slight dash of humility, although many on the government front benches have much to be humble about indeed.

Mr. Ruston: Look at the Provincial Secretary for National Resources over there.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You don't mean that.

Mr. Nixon: He can still smile anyway. It is a very humble front bench right now.

Mr. Maeck: Somebody must have written that for him. That doesn't sound like the member for Huron-Bruce. He never speaks like that.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: He had great difficulty because he didn't have his heart in that.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue and ignore the interjections.

Mr. Gaunt: I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General would want me to repeat that in case he missed it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I was listening very carefully.

Mr. Gaunt: I am not saying he would be included in that comment.

Mr. Roy: He would, no doubt.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member will continue and ignore the interjections.

Mr. Roy: His track record as AG or as a counsel leaves something to be desired.

Mr. Gaunt: In any event, I am almost through but I do want to impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, that in my view the question of energy is a vital one. I would urge the government to come to grips with it immediately. I don't think we have any time to waste and that our survival as an industrial province is at stake.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am very honoured, very privileged, and very pleased to participate in this very important debate.

I think it goes without saying that the quality of administration of justice in this province is of paramount concern to all of the members of the Legislature. I should say, in opening, that I, personally, have been very pleased—during the 18 months in which I've had the privilege of occupying my office—with the very genuine interest that has been expressed by the members on all sides of the House in relation to the many problems facing the administration of justice in this province.

In particular, I'd like to express my own personal gratitude to the justice critics in the two opposition parties for their very helpful suggestions from time to time, and to express the view that at all times I have felt they have been truly motivated by what was in the best interests of the public of Ontario in relation to the administration of justice. Partisan politics, at all times, achieved a very small dimension in their participation.

Mr. Laughren: They would make good ministers.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, I think both of them would, at the appropriate time, whenever that may be.

Mr. Lawlor: We justice people are above party animosity.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Exactly, Mr. Speaker. At the same time, I would also like to express, through them, my appreciation to the members of the justice committee for the very positive manner in which they've approached matters. We've had occasions when we've had the opportunity of sharing, whether it be estimates or very important family law legislation before the House.

Her Honour, in the Speech from the Throne, announced the intention of the government to proceed with legislation to reorganize the administration of the courts in the province of Ontario. During the last session of the assembly I tabled a white paper on courts administration. The white paper introduced a new concept for the reorganization of the administration of justice in Ontario. As the members know, the white paper also included a draft statute and invited comment from the public and from those particularly interested in the subject of court administration.

Since the tabling of these proposals, I have received comment from a number of quarters. I have met with a number of law associations, representatives of the Advocates' Society—on two occasions that I can recall—as well as having a number of meetings with senior judges and judges throughout the sys-

tem. As a result of that comment and further consideration, I will be introducing to this assembly a slightly revised bill which will, however, reflect the principles of the original proposals.

The new statute, when reintroduced, will stress two principles: The independence of the judiciary and the public ministerial accountability of the government to this assembly for the administration of justice. While I will soon have the privilege of placing the new legislation before you, I would like to take this opportunity to bring home to you the general approach of the government as outlined in the white paper.

I would like to put this approach in the general context of the experience of courts administrations systems, particularly in the United States and, perhaps more particularly, in Great Britain, because the white paper adopts a good deal of the approach taken in the English Courts Act of 1971. Because of that, I took the opportunity recently to have a look at the English system, particularly at the office of the Lord Chancellor, which provides a unique administrative focus for the entire English legal system.

[4:30]

One of my most important areas of exploration was a series of discussions with the staff of the Lord Chancellor and with the Lord Chancellor himself—Lord Elwyn-Jones—who, despite his social leanings, is truly a most distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Lawlor: It is because of them, for heaven's sake. He's the most contemporary person in the modern world. That is where you get lost.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am very proud to report to the members of this House that Lord Elwyn-Jones and his senior staff demonstrated a very deep interest in the problems of the administration of justice in Ontario and, more particularly, in the approach taken in our white paper.

Many of the very exciting court reforms which have taken place in England since 1971 depend for their working effectiveness on the unique institution of the Lord Chancellor and his office. Because we lack the structure and the tradition of that unique constitutional office, it is necessary to examine the actual function of that office to ensure that we provide in Ontario a structure suitable to our traditions, which will fulfil the key role in courts administration performed in England by the Lord Chancellor.

As many of the members of the Legislature will know, the office of the Lord Chancellor is indeed a constitutional anomaly. The very existence of his office is an affront to many traditional constitutional theories about separation of the powers between the government and the judiciary. For example, the Lord Chancellor is a member of cabinet, a member of the House of Lords and a judge at the same time. He is not only a judge but is, in fact, at the top of the entire judicial hierarchy; and in terms of precedent, he actually ranks ahead of the Prime Minister.

Although he exercises a wide range of really very staggering responsibilities, perhaps the most important of all—at least from the point of view of my examination of his office—is his responsibility for the court system. His department is responsible for ensuring the proper functioning of the courts from an administrative point of view, including the flow of cases through the courts, the staffing of courts, the providing of suitable accommodation and the hundreds of other details which go into the operating of a complex court system.

The present Lord Chancellor had also been Attorney General under two previous Labour governments and therefore, of course, has had a great deal of experience in parliamentary matters. His views with respect to parliamentary accountability, as well as the necessity of a centralized court structure, were therefore of great interest to me.

The Lord Chancellor and his office have been at the centre of one of the most significant efforts towards court reform which has taken place anywhere in recent years. For years the English court system had suffered from a fragmentation of jurisdiction and a labyrinthine network of courts which had grown up since the Middle Ages. Courts administration was divided among a number of separate institutions and local authorities, and there was no unified system of courts administration, either for court personnel or courthouses and court accommodation, with the exception of the country courts, which had been administered by the Lord Chancellor's office since the 1920s.

The Lord Chancellor in 1966, Lord Gardiner, was faced with a number of problems, including the constant postponing of civil work because of the heavy demands of criminal cases, the conflict of dates for hearings, which of course not only led to great inconvenience to the parties but in many cases led to the parties themselves be-

ing deprived of counsel of their choice, and a number of other problems which have a familiar ring in virtually every developed country with a legal system based on common-law principles.

The British government set up a royal commission under the chairmanship of Lord Beeching, who had demonstrated great energy and imagination in a radical shake-up and rationalization of the British Railways system. The members of the Beeching commission took a very strong statistical approach to their terms of reference, and addressed themselves to questions such as delays before trial, why cases were postponed, to what extent the trial time was related to the type of case, and a host of other concerns which are now generally referred to under the rubric of case-flow management.

The Beeching commission recommended a general reorganization and simplification of the structure of the courts. But one of the central recommendations—and I think perhaps the most important recommendation of all—was a unified administration of all of the courts. And if I may quote briefly: "We regard control by a single minister, coupled with the creation and maintenance of an efficient administrative service responsible for all aspects of court administration, as essential for our proposed reorganization."

The Beeching report led to the passage of The Courts Act of 1971, which provided for a unified managerial control under the administrative aspects of the courts under the Lord Chancellor, whose office is responsible for the operation of the courts through the development of sound managerial policies and the development of professional court administrators throughout the system. I think it is rather important to emphasize the reliance placed on the concept of unified administrative control by the Beeching commission, as reflected in the new court system.

Now the English system is, of course, as many of the members will appreciate, a good deal different from the American approach. The American Constitution is based on the doctrine of the separation of powers, and the courts, the Legislature, and the executive are there for separate and equal branches of government. For this reason, the administrative office of the United States courts has been able to function as an almost purely judicial control of the administration of federal courts.

In England the rather delicate tension between the judicial and executive functions as contained in the office of the Lord Chancellor is as stated a constitutional anomaly, but one which appears to have worked very well, largely, I suppose, because of its very long historical tradition.

Those members who are familiar with the background of courts administration in Ontario will be familiar with the evolution, over the last 10 years, of a new approach in this province to the delicate balance in courts administration between the functions of the government—more particularly the Ministry of the Attorney General—and the functions of the judiciary. From 1968, when responsibility for courts administration was transferred from local governments to the provincial government through the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission on courts administration, through the development of our courts administration projects in the central west area under the authority of The Administration of Courts Project Act, 1975, and culminating in the issue of our white paper on courts administration, we have been gradually working out the appropriate balance of accountability and authority that will be necessary to achieve effective and efficient operation of the courts while preserving the fundamental principles of judicial independence.

Because of the obvious importance of courts administration, I have sent a copy of the white paper, which includes a discussion of proposed legislation, to every member of the legal profession in Ontario. A number of comments have been received from various sources. From the handful of formal comments, together with a large number of personal discussions with members of the legal profession, I do discern general support for our approach, subject of course to a few reservations on matters of organization.

I think at this point it might be helpful to discuss briefly the background and approach taken by the white paper, an approach which in my view has largely been validated and confirmed by our recent examination of the workings of the English system.

As I indicated earlier, the basis of the new approach arose from our experience in the development of a model court administrative structure in the central west region, a group of 10 counties and judicial districts clustering around Hamilton. Authority for the project, as I have already stated, flowed from the administration of The Courts Project Act, 1975. As stated in section 2 of that Act the purpose was to enable the establishment of a development project in the region for the central co-ordination of the administrative facilities and services of the courts for a more effective operation of the courts, sub-

ject of course to the traditional independence of the judges. In short, the project was designed to determine whether effective court reform could be achieved with the traditional division of authority—the Ministry of the Attorney General on the one hand to have control over strictly administrative matters, and the judiciary to control matters bearing on adjudication.

The results of the project have been carefully evaluated and the project has, I think, effectively demonstrated that we do need a new approach for courts administration in this province if we are to clear the backlogs in various parts of the court system. We certainly require a new approach to the flow of cases through the courts.

I have stated on a number of occasions that the case-load crisis facing the courts of this province does have the potential to seriously undermine the quality of justice in Ontario. At the same time I want to emphasize that there is a broad consensus that this crisis can only be effectively met by significant court reforms which must continue to include the application of new management techniques to the ever increasing workloads of the courts. While, of course, we must emphasize that justice can never be sacrificed for administrative efficiency, we nevertheless recognize that we can still do a great deal to improve the quality of justice by applying modern management techniques to the business of the courts.

However, as stated, the central west project has demonstrated that the present artificial division of the business of the courts simply cannot provide the basis for significant court reform. The courts are presently divided between purely administrative matters on the one hand and quasi-administrative, quasi-judicial matters on the other hand. Theoretically the purely administrative matters are managed by civil servants, and the quasi-administrative, quasi-judicial matters such as the times that a court sits, or the way the cases are adjourned, or the way that trial dates are set, are decided by judges.

While perhaps laudable in theory these distinctions have proven unsatisfactory in practice. Obviously therefore neither effective case load management nor true court reform can be dependent or based on such artificial distinctions. In our view the only way to achieve an effective unified approach is to consolidate the administrative management of the courts including the quasi-administrative, quasi-judicial matters into a single structure.

[4:45]

You will note, of course, the similarity of these conclusions with the conclusions reached by the Beeching commission and by the British government. I think it is very significant that two different jurisdictions sharing a common heritage and many of the same problems have chosen a basically similar approach. It should be obvious that the unified management of all these matters cannot be consolidated in the hands of the Attorney General, or indeed in any other minister of the Crown, for our entire court system is premised on the principle of the independence of the judiciary. That principle includes the proposition that judges cannot take direction from the government with respect to any judicial matter that arises in relation to the trial of a case. While judges cannot take direction or guidance from the government in these matters, they can and must take direction and guidance from senior members of the judiciary. For that matter, in my view, the only logical place to consolidate the management of the courts is in a body comprised of the senior members of the judiciary, but a body that would have to be backed up with the necessary resources from a standpoint of administrative and management techniques.

I want to make it very clear at this juncture that I recognize, as do members opposite, particularly the justice critics of the opposition parties, that judges being lawyers originally are not trained in administrative and management techniques. I want to make it very clear that our proposals are not dependent upon any necessary degree of management training or administrative training. But the truth of the matter is that judges throughout the system do exercise administrative techniques in many different ways and almost quite autonomously, often on a very ad hoc basis.

We recognize that senior judges and the judicial council can perform these important responsibilities only if they are backed up by the necessary resources from an administrative standpoint. If we had a Lord Chancellor our choice would be perhaps as easy and as obvious as the choice of the British government in consolidating authority in the person and in the office of the Lord Chancellor.

Mr. Lawlor: Why don't you appoint yourself Lord Chancellor?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: If you would be prepared to support it—

Mr. Lawlor: No, I am not.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —we could consider that option.

Mr. Cunningham: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Because we are not blessed with the constitutional anomaly of the Lord Chancellor's function, our only choice in order to preserve the fundamental heritage of judicial independence is to consolidate authority in the senior judges of this province which, quite frankly, will also involve a great degree more of accountability on the part of the individual judge throughout the system.

At the same time, we must preserve the fundamental constitutional accountability to the Legislative Assembly for the administration of public institutions and public funds under our system of government. That accountability must continue to flow, and must always flow, through a minister of the Crown who is also a member of the Legislative Assembly, someone who must answer in the Legislative Assembly for the administration of public institutions and public funds.

Mr. Singer: When he is asked questions.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: For that reason, we must maintain a strong element of ministerial accountability. I regard that as a crucial matter for the courts, through the office of the Attorney General, after this legislation, hopefully, becomes a law of this province. I want to make it clear that I for one, as the Attorney General for this province, would be most loath to support any legislation which in any way sought to diminish that very crucial responsibility and accountability. Therefore, under the proposed system the public accountability which the British achieve through the office of the Lord Chancellor would continue to rest with the Attorney General.

But again, as I've already stated, because we lack the unique office of a Lord Chancellor we must propose and consider a structure which would maintain, institutionally and hopefully in a harmony of working parts, the delicate and the essential balance between judicial independence and political accountability. I shall return to this essential point after outlining the basic proposals contained in the white paper, basic principles that will be contained in the legislation which I intend to introduce in a very short period of time as stated by Her Honour in the Throne Speech.

The white paper, explains the need for reorganization, sets out the details of the government's proposals for reorganization and concludes with a draft of legislation a design to implement these proposals. The basic proposals, which will be slightly modified by the bill which I intend to introduce, are as follows:

First, that the day-to-day administrative, financial and operational aspects of courts administration would be transferred from the Ministry of the Attorney General to an office of courts administration, headed by a judicial council.

Second, the judicial council, as set out in the white paper, would consist of the Chief Justice of Ontario as chairman, the Chief Justice of the High Court, the chief judge of the county court, a county court judge appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council—if the legislation is passed I think you could well speculate who that might be, if this proposal becomes law—the chief judge of the provincial court, criminal division, and the chief judge of the provincial court, family division.

Third, the judicial council will be given authority and responsibility for establishing and applying policy directives on all administrative matters, whether the actions required are those of court personnel or those of individual judges.

Fourth, the office of courts administration would carry out the day-to-day administrative, financial and operational aspects of courts administration under a director of courts administration responsible to the judicial council. The director of courts administration would be a public servant with the status of a deputy minister, appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Attorney General and removed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the judicial council.

Mr. Singer: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the Attorney General a question?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have no objection.

Mr. Acting Speaker: It is highly unusual to place questions during this type of debate. It would be up to the Attorney General if he wishes to accept one.

Mr. Roy: Of course, it is unusual to hear the Attorney General in the Throne Speech debate.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the Attorney General would consider the inclusion of lay representation on the council in addition to the representation he's outlined?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the proposal does not contain that. I anticipate that

that will be a subject for debate when the legislation is introduced to the House.

But I would like to say at this time, because I think it's certainly something that's going to be very germane in the debate, that the difficulty with the proposal, while it appears to have enormous attraction from the standpoint of public participation, is that we are faced with the dilemma of non-judicial persons directing the judiciary. The judiciary has adopted the attitude—and I must state quite frankly that I'm very sympathetic to that attitude—that the direction of judges by non-judges does strike, in their view, at the independence of the judiciary. Certainly, all the discussions and the briefs I have had from the judiciary of this province make that point very clear: that a judicial council made up of lay representation will be dealing not only with day to-day policy decisions, but with some very sensitive matters involving the conduct of judges and, of course, disciplinary matters.

I might say, for those who have taken the interest—and I hope that includes many members of the Legislature—that the whole area of discipline, or the provisions for discipline, in the draft legislation, which is part of the white paper, is being reworked, because I think that it has to be improved, quite frankly, compared to how it presently stands. It's my hope that the advisory council, which I'm going to refer to next, will involve that public input, which is so essential.

I want to stress the need for the involvement of the members of this Legislature in the administration and in reminding the Attorney General—as most of you do so effectively on a day-to-day basis—of my accountability in relation to expenditure of public funds in the administration of justice. I think the crucial element of lay participation can be accomplished on a continuing basis through the advisory committee and through the participation of this Legislature in an institution which is of such fundamental importance to the community as a whole.

The advisory committee, which would report to the Attorney General, would be established to review the work of the office of courts administration and to initiate studies in relation to various aspects of courts administration and procedure. The Lieutenant Governor in Council would retain the power to appoint judicial officers and those court officials who are presently appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Finally, the government would retain overall authority and responsibility in relation to the administration of justice. I think this is essential. Government must retain overall authority and responsibility in relation to the administration of justice through its fiscal, legislative and other controls, such as the standards of the Civil Service Commission.

This white paper is a major and essential step before legislation is introduced to implement a reorganization of courts administration. The legislation is going to be introduced, and I hope that within the next two or three weeks all members of the Legislature will avail themselves of the opportunity of looking at, and carefully considering, the white paper.

The discussion to date, as I've already indicated, has raised concerns around the issues of judicial independence and ministerial accountability. I hope that these principles will be given greater effect—greater emphasis—in the bill which I will be introducing.

These principles are not, of course, ends in themselves; they simply exist to safeguard the public interest in the administration of justice. And following up the learned member for Wilson Heights' question, I want to stress that, obviously, it should never be forgotten or overlooked that our courts belong to the public, that they exist solely to serve the public. It is essential, therefore, that all of us who serve the public should examine with care these proposals for the future development of their courts, because the issues raised are so central to our fundamental liberties.

[5:00]

A moment ago I referred to the essential and delicate balance between ministerial responsibility and judicial independence. This is not the only area where the new system must achieve a fair and effective working balance. I think that one of the commentators on the new English system put it very well when he said:

"What does seem clear is that programming problems can never be solved entirely by the imposition of authority, but that they involve a mixture of authority, calculation, hunch and persuasion.

"The Beeching commission did a good job in recommending a rational framework within which all this could operate. The Lord Chancellor's department has done a good job in setting it up. Its operation, however, seems to involve more subtle and various considerations than are described in the Beeching report—in fact"— and I think, Mr. Speaker, this is very important—"not only a system of authority but a system of relationships. There is the responsibility of the Lord Chancellor to

Parliament; there is the independence of the judiciary and of both branches of the legal profession and the rights of the various parties who come before the courts.

"What is required is the maintenance of a delicate balance between all these, whether in the programming of individual cases locally or in planning and controlling the whole system nationally."

I've stated at the outset that I believe this government is committed to the developmen of a new system of courts administration which can best serve the public by providing the machinery for achieving these essential balances. As members of this assembly, we all obviously have a very deep responsibility to the public to create a structure which will continue to promote the achievement of these balances.

Because of its newness, and because of its fundamental importance to all aspects of the administration of justice, I have focused my remarks on the courts administration proposals. In doing so I hope that I have not in any way minimized the importance of our other initiatives.

I am thinking, first, of our initiatives in family law reform. As you know, Mr. Speaker, they have been reintroduced in this assembly after a great deal of discussion, debate and public comment during the last session. I say nothing further about them now except that they are before you and, I repeat, that they do represent a very real advancement in the principles of fairness and equality in family law. I welcome the opportunity of carrying these reforms into law this session.

I should point out that not all of our recent and ongoing initiatives and advances have been legislative in nature. While, for example, the unified family court proposals did involve legislation in the last session, our encouragement of the family law division of the Supreme Court of Ontario has been accomplished without the need for legislation. Measures such as the reorganization and restructuring of the Crown attorney system into a more cohesive and responsive structure; the development of plans for a decentralizing of the Crown attorney system in Metropolitan Toronto, which hears about half of the criminal cases in Ontario; the development of a system of pre-trial discovery in criminal matters through various pilot projects; and, more important, our recent instructions to the Crown attorneys with respect to pre-trial disclosures, also have been accomplished without the necessity of introducing legislation.

One of the most important domains of the emerging public interest involves, of course, the complex issues of freedom of information and rights to privacy. You have our background paper on these issues prepared by members of the Ministry of the Attorney General, and I commend it to you, Mr. Speaker, as an example of the kind of hard, innovative thinking that must be done as the essential background of any major law reform in this area. I truly hope again that all members, most particularly the distinguished member for Lakeshore, will carefully peruse that background paper on not only the freedom of information but the equally important consideration of citizens' right to privacy.

Although I don't want to get into a debate now on the proposed bill from the member for Lakeshore—

Mr. Lawlor: You sure ask an awful lot of questions. You are a questioner; there are whole pages of questions.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I hope he will see the wisdom of combining in one Act these essential principles of freedom of information on the one hand and the citizens' right to privacy on the other hand. I hope he will not urge upon the members of the Legislature that we pursue the mistaken course—a course that is now acknowledged by most knowledgeable commentators in the United States to be the wrong course. I hope, therefore, that he will recognize this and that indeed he will want to withdraw his bill during the time that this very important commission—

Mr. Laughren: You are being provocative.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —not only dealing with freedom of information but also with privacy, does have the opportunity—

Mr. Lawlor: You have been in office too long—33 years.

Mr. Roy: I've got a feeling you are not going to win this case.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —of perusing and considering this very complex area before, as I say, we blunder into the same mistakes that have been made in other jurisdictions. We can learn from the mistakes of others—

Mr. Lawlor: This is a temporizing thing.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —and I hope that the member for Lakeshore does not persist in

clinging to the same mistakes that have been made south of the border.

Mr. Roy: Do you think you are going to win that one?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Other initiatives which I intend to bring forward this session include proposals for a new Limitations Act to simplify and clarify the time within which legal actions must be brought, proposals regarding occupiers' liability to simplify and clarify the rights and obligations of those who occupy land and the rights and obligations of those who go upon the land of others—

Mr. Makarchuk: When are you introducing the legislation?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —and an Act to protect employees from the administration of lie detector tests by employers.

Mr. Makarchuk: When is the legislation coming in?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: This legislation will be introduced in the next few weeks and—

Mr. Warner: Right after the headlines.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I certainly—I'm sorry; does the—

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will ignore the comments and continue.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Does the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere have a helpful suggestion?

Mr. Warner: I have many.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will ignore the interjections and continue.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: These are just some of the initiatives which I will bring forward this session to continue the momentum and advance of the pace of law reform in the province of Ontario. Law reform is of course essential if we are to build in this province, and continue to build in this province, a community which continues to satisfy the ends of justice.

In conclusion, I cannot put it better than it was put almost a century and a half ago in the British Parliament by one of the great pioneers of law reform, Lord Brougham. I quote:

"It was the boast of Augustus that he found Rome a brick and left it a marble, a praise not unworthy of a great prince and to which the present reign also has its claims; but how much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have to say that he found law dear and left it cheap; found it a sealed book and left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich and left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression and left it the staff of honesty as a shield of innocence."

Mr. Makarchuk: Marvellous.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Samis: Now the language of the people.

Mr. Roy: If the Attorney General gets carried away, he might build a court house in Ottawa. That would be something.

Mr. Sargent: The first thing he can do is shoot all the lawyers.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Laughren: It was appropriate that I was here to hear the Attorney General's closing remarks. Strangely enough, in my opening remarks I want to deal with freedom of information. I want to talk about three specific problems, not all related as directly to the Throne Speech as freedom of information. I will close off with a quote too at the end of my brief remarks on freedom of information.

The Throne Speech referred to a review that would be undertaken, which has already begun, I understand. The machinery is being put into motion. We feel that is a needless delay on the part of the government, and that it could have been implemented without that review. I'd like to use a specific example that occurred in the Sudbury area in which information was withheld from the public needlessly, and I suspect that most members of the government would agree it was needless when they hear the details.

Back in 1973 there was a train wreck in the town of Dowling near Sudbury. There was a spill of something. It had to do with diesel oil and a transformer. The transformer contained something called PCBs or polychlorinated biphenyls, which are a very dangerous carcinogen. After the spill, the transformers lay on the ground for a few days. Then the Minister of the Environment

proceeded to do testing into the spill. This is a chronological order of how the Ministry of the Environment conducted their monitoring and why I think they have been—I hesitate to use the word but I really do feel I must—irresponsible in withholding information from the public. When they see how needlessly the information was withheld I think that the government members too would agree with me.

The spill occurred on November 9, 1973. The initial clean-up—and these are notes from the Ministry of the Environment—including removal of debris, diesel oil and transformer fluid, was completed by the spring of 1974.

A follow-up inspection survey was initiated in the spring of 1975, which indicated that further investigation was warranted. By November, 1975, monitoring logs were located at the site and detailed investigations were sufficiently complete to indicate that further clean-up was required.

So there we had an indication in the spring of 1975 that further investigation was warranted and that in the fall of 1975 that further clean-up was required. Then in 1976 there was a further investigation to indicate that yet, a further clean-up was required. Then during 1976 it was indicated the clean-up would have to be even more extensive than that envisaged in the previous year.

During all this time the Ministry of the Environment did not tell the public that PCBs had been spilled into the environment and were draining through the ground. One has to wonder why the Ministry of the Environment withheld that information. Certainly it wasn't because there was any political liability attached to the Ministry of the Environment. They were not the cause of the train wreck. They were on the job doing their checking early after the wreck. It would not have caused the public to panic if they had announced that PCBs had been spilled into the environment and were draining down through the ground. Rather, the reason they withheld the information—and I can only surmise this from discussions with ministry officials and in letters from the Minister of the Environment—was that they assumed they had the kind of expertise to make the decision as to what should be released to the public and what should be withheld from the public. In this case, they decided deliberately to withhold information from the public that there were PCBs in the environment.

[5:15]

It was a needless refusal. I must say that if they had disclosed the nature of the spill there are people in the Sudbury area, from the public, some in the immediate area of the spill, others in the community at large, who understood very clearly the problems of PCBs.

I have a chemist friend who understood it before 1973 even and who would have done some work on it. I believe we could have convinced the Ministry of the Environment that at that point they should have commenced a massive soil removal programme, rather than a monitoring programme. That, of course, did not happen. In other words, the results could not have been worse if they had given the information to the public.

I believe that the principle of the right to know here was terribly important. That principle was violated, and so needlessly. If the information had been forthcoming, the pressure in the community would have, I believe forced the Minister of the Environment to act a lot faster than he did and to have the soil removed at the expense of the Canadian Pacific Railway. As it turns out now, they have had to issue an order under The Environmental Protection Act. They've got 25 days, I believe it is, to respond to the order, and the soil is still sitting there.

We know now, as a result of tests this spring, 1977, that PCBs are in the water table. There's no such thing as removing PCBs from the water table. There is no communal water supply in the community and as yet no individual wells have PCBs in them, I wouldn't be alarmist in that respect; but the fact remains that there are PCB's in the water table, and once it gets in the water table it is not possible to contain it in any way.

It's going to get into the local supply chain. A river goes by there, there's a lake into which the river flows; it's a matter of time until it gets into the larger water supply and into the food chain through fish. It concentrates in fish as it goes through the food chain, and that makes it terribly dangerous.

The problem is I don't think the ministry has learned anything. Despite the announcement in the Throne Speech that they were going to have freedom of information, when I phoned up the officials after the public meeting on March 3 in which they admitted all this, the ministry officials in Sudbury said: "Oh yes, we can send you that information" —I had asked for all the data on the spill— "but first of all it has to go through the minister's office in Toronto." Why information to the public—not just because I'm the

member representing that area but any member of the public—why shouldn't the local office be able to provide that information? It was all ready; they had already said what it was at the public meeting.

So then I wrote to the Minister of the Environment, and in part of his reply to me he said: "In this particular incident, there was no contaminated material in the ground water system until 1977 and it was not felt necessary to make special reference to this spill until such time as the situation developed to the point where there could be some concern in terms of a health hazard."

Mr. Martel: It certainly does.

Mr. Laughren: There are people in that community who could have told the Minister of the Environment back in 1973 that there should have been some concern for a health hazard, and here is the minister saying there was no health hazard until it reached the water table. That's a ludicrous statement for the Minister of the Environment to make. I know you would agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that if we are serious about providing freedom of information to the public with no threat to the privacy of anyone—

Mr. Mancini: Don't lead the Speaker on. The Speaker can make up his own mind. The Speaker has to be impartial.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, keep your irrelevancies to yourself. Put them in your pocket.

Mr. Speaker, there was no question of any breach of the privilege of privacy in this incident, and yet the Minister of the Environment persisted in keeping the information from the public. That is something that really must change, and the Ministry of the Environment truly does stand condemned in this case.

I promised that I would end with a quote, the way the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) did. It's not as learned a quote, but it certainly is appropriate in this case. Because the officials of the Ministry of the Environment all expressed grave concern: yes, perhaps they should have released the information; but after all they were only acting in what they thought were the best interests of the public. I don't think that they were acting in a partisan political way when they withheld the information; they were acting in a highly arbitrary way, an elitist kind of way, assuming that they had expertise the public couldn't cope with, that they had expertise the public didn't have and therefore they didn't want to trust the public with that kind of information. That was the view of Ministry of the Environment officials.

There was a fellow named John Kersell, who was writing on delegated legislation in the UK, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. He said about freedom of information: "A government official, like a good many other people in this imperfect world, is to be watched most carefully when he is acting with the best intentions."

I did want to use that as an example of freedom of information and how it is at present withheld from the public in Ontario. I wish the government would proceed as quickly as possible with this freedom of information legislation.

Mr. Martel: But not with Carleton Williams.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, that could be a problem.

Mr. Martel: That's a disaster.

Mr. Laughren: One of the other things I wanted to talk about was some problems referred to peripherally in the Throne Speech, as northern problems are always referred to in Throne Speeches from this government. It has to do with the unorganized communities in northern Ontario.

Those of us from this side have spoken long and spoken often about problems in the unorganized communities. Those are communities with no form of municipal organization whatsoever. Historically there has been a lack of services for those communities. I see the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) in his seat and I'm sure he understands the problem.

There are classic examples in my own riding, of communities like Gogama with a polluted water supply and other communities with no recreational facilities, no health care and no fire protection whatsoever. But hope does spring eternal. In those communities the people have been led to believe on a number of occasions that help was on the way.

A couple of years ago we had the northern communities bill, referred to affectionately as Bill 102. Bill 102 became a household word in the unorganized communities across northern Ontario. But when the government held public meetings across the north, it realized the enormity of the problem and withdrew the bill. They simply refused to deal with the problems in the unorganized communities and withdrew the bill entirely; and so much for the hope that there was in that bill.

Mr. Martel: That was in 1974.

Mr. Laughren: Then last year the government announced an isolated communities assistance fund. I believe it was $500,000 a year—$250,000 for part of last year and $500,000 for this year. I can tell members that a communal water supply in Gogama alone would cost $240,000 or $250,000; so that certainly wasn't going to go very far Then the government announced that we were going to have a Ministry of Northern Affairs, and once again the people got their hopes up that perhaps something could happen in the unorganized communities in northern Ontario; but it would appear the problems are not yet solved.

Mr. Mancini: Give the government a chance.

Mr. Laughren: I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think it was possible for the government to take away anything from the unorganized communities because I wasn't aware that they were giving them anything. But they found a way.

In my darkest moments I could not have conceived a way to take something away from the people in a little town called Sultan—and this is happening in other communities in northern Ontario as well. The people in Sultan for years have had their snow cleared and have had roads maintained by the Ministry of Natural Resources because it's a relatively isolated community. But they've found a way to take that away from them now. They've decided that the Ministry of Transportation and Communications will look after all road maintenance in those communities and they've refused to plough the roads or maintain them unless that community forms a local roads board and there is local assessment against the homes in that community.

Now we suddenly have local assessment for road maintenance. It doesn't seem to matter that they pay the same sales tax, OHIP premiums and gasoline tax as other people who get other services such as sewer and water, fire protection, health care and recreational facilities. That doesn't seem to matter. They've found a way to take something away from the small, unorganized communities in northern Ontario.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that took ingenuity. It is really strange that this government, after so many years, still does not understand northern Ontario. They still have trouble coping with small communities in northern Ontario.

A good example is fire protection. The government announced—it wasn't the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) who announced it, he didn't have the courage to announce it; it was announced by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), speaking on behalf of the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth).

Mr. Mancini: Margaret had courage.

Mr. Laughren: The provincial secretary spoke on behalf of the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Solicitor General. She announced there was going to be a programme to help the small communities by smoke detectors. Not fire protection to prevent the fires or to put them out when they occur, but smoke detectors so that when a fire occurs they can all run like hell. Mr. Speaker, that is some kind of programme for northern Ontario. I want to tell you why it is so serious.

Mr. Martel: Read it for Frank Drea, he doesn't believe it.

Mr. Laughren: According to the Solicitor General—

Mr. Drea: I don't believe this.

Mr. Laughren: When we break down the number of fire deaths by district in this province this is what you get—I'll give it on a per 100,000 population so that it is constant throughout the province. The Algoma district, 2.73 deaths per 100,000 people; in southern Ontario 2.38 fire deaths per 100,000 population. In Algoma it is 2.73, in Cochrane it is 8.1, in Kenora it is 25.07, in Manitoulin it is 29.38—for the member for Algoma-Manitoulin —for Nipissing it is 21.86, for Parry Sound it is 32.7—

Mr. Martel: That is you, Maeck.

Mr. Laughren: For Sudbury district it is 5.38, for Thunder Bay it is 8.78, for Timiskaming it is 17.33, and for northern Ontario as a whole the fire deaths per 100,000 population are 13.25 compared to 2.38 for southern Ontario.

Surely the answer to the number of fire deaths in the north compared to the south is not to arm the population of northern Ontario with smoke detectors. Surely, if we are going to deal with the problem in a serious way we get into the whole area of fire protection. We get into the area of training people in the small communities, of providing the people with proper fire fighting equipment.

I don't have the technical expertise to talk about the smoke detectors and the environ-

mental impact of those detectors when they are triggered, because I believe there is a form of radiation at that point as well. It is highly questionable that they should be used in the first place, but to think that the government would announce that as a programme for the northern communities that have no fire protection truly reveals a bankruptcy of understanding of the problems of northern Ontario.

Mr. Maeck: What about the grants to isolated communities then?

Mr. Martel: They couldn't buy a sweat pad for a louse.

Mr. Laughren: I can only assume that the government has no more of a commitment today with the Ministry of Northern Affairs than they had before the ministry was created.

Mr. Mancini: Why don't you give the government a chance? That's right, give them another 33 years.

Mr. Laughren: If that is the kind of programme that the Ministry of Northern Affairs is going to come up with, then we are in for some hard times in northern Ontario. People in the north will not be taken in by those kinds of programmes—smoke detectors as a camouflage for fire protection, for firefighting equipment. That truly is not fair to those communities in the north.

Because I know that we are operating under rather severe time restrictions, the last issue I wanted to talk about is one that has become somewhat of a passion with me. It has to do with the Workmen's Compensation Board, with the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson), with the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board and their failure to recognize laryngeal cancer as a compensable disease. The government has not heard the last of this issue; the government is wrong on this issue; the government will be proved wrong and the government will have to change its mind.

[5:30]

But what bothers me more than anything else? What bothers me more than the delay is the fact that the government has dug itself in on this issue. Not for the right reasons, but because they refuse to be proven wrong again. People like Dr. McCracken at the board, Michael Starr at the board and the Minister of Labour are saying we are not going to be pushed around by the opposition and the unions on this particular issue. I have a couple of quotes that will add substance to my remarks.

Mr. Nixon: We pushed them right out of the Legislature; they're the only two live ones left.

Mr. Martel: McCracken within a year will be gone.

An hon. member: She should resign.

Mr. Martel: McCracken, he's got to go; along with Starr.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the member for Sudbury East stop heckling his colleague from the Sudbury basin?

Mr. Martel: I'm not, I'm just supporting him; I'm supplementing his points.

Mr. Laughren: I am inclined to agree with the Speaker.

Mr. Martel: It's my friends I have to worry about.

Mr. Laughren: I find that whenever any of us speak on northern Ontario, the average turnout is two Tory members on the opposite side.

Mr. Nixon: And Frank is too embarrassed to leave.

Mr. Laughren: The issue is whether or not, in the province of Ontario, laryngeal cancer should be recognized as a compensable disease. I believe it should be. One of the foremost experts in the world on the relationship between asbestos and cancer believes that it should be. But the Minister of Labour and Dr. McCracken think it should not be, and for those reasons it is not recognized in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Aime Bertrand worked for almost 30 years as a maintenance mechanic at the Inco operation in the Sudbury area. In doing that job of cutting through asbestos lining in furnaces and so forth, he was exposed to literally clouds of dust over many, many years; and not just asbestos, but other agents such as nickel, copper, iron, zinc, leads, selenium, cadmium, cobalt, arsenic, asbestos and sulphur dioxide.

Now, we have medical evidence which indicates that it should be recognized. We are not espousing this cause just on gut instinct. We do have medical evidence, if only the minister would convince the Workmen's Compensation Board that it must be recognized.

I would like to put some of this evidence on the record. No. 1, a letter from Dr. Victor Cecilioni of Hamilton who stated, when he reviewed the problem of Mr. Bertrand: "Since the major ingredient or component of asbestos is silicate, I believe you have sufficient grounds to repeal the WCB's decision."

He was referring to the decision not to recognize it. "In conclusion," he said, "I would say that the Workmen's Compensation Board and the appeals board should review and reconsider the decision in accepting the claim of Mr. Aime Bertrand, especially in the light of our present knowledge about the effects of prolonged exposure to not only one but many carcinogenic agents, both gaseous and particulate, that are present in the work place. Some of these have an additive or synergistic effect when combined with cigarette smoking." That was Dr. Cecilioni again.

Then Dr. Selikoff sent to the Workmen's Compensation Board, and released, his statistics on what happened to asbestos workers when they were exposed to the material over a large number of years—between 1967 and 1975. He found that, along with many other cancers that were caused, cancer of the larynx had a prevalence which was statistically significant, to 95 per cent confidence levels as they say in the world of statistics. There were 4.45 expected deaths and the observed deaths were nine. So there were twice as many observed deaths because of laryngeal cancer as could be expected in the general population. Those are statistics from Dr. Selikoff of New York.

Well, all that information from Dr. Selikoff was the reason the board was stalling on making a decision, they told us. Then, when they get the information, they say it's not good enough. That issue was raised during last December's debates when the Workmen's Compensation Board appeared before the standing resources development committee. That issue was raised by both the leader of this party and myself. Dr. McCracken testified at that hearing and made no mention that there was a study going on. As a matter of fact, when he was asked about this very recently, he said: "The board had launched a $20,000 epidemiology study in conjunction with the University of Toronto. The decision was made in November to proceed on a study in the Toronto area." That's a quote from the Globe and Mail.

If that was true in November, why did Dr. McCracken not mention it during the debates in the month of December? Dr. McCracken's reason was: "The reason I haven't gone around announcing it is because I didn't want to jeopardize the study in any way." I don't know how announcing that a study is under way to determine the relationship between asbestos workers and laryngeal cancer can jeopardize the study. Perhaps Dr. McCracken could explain that to me.

After this became an issue in the province of Ontario, the Minister of Labour spoke to the Industrial Accident Prevention Association on April 4, about a week ago, here in Toronto. This is what she said:

"I have not and will not use occupational health and safety for political posturing. Some will and do. I suppose that is one of the sad realities of politics at the moment. But it shouldn't be. The reality of occupational health and a safe work place should be non-partisan. It should stand far apart from the adversary relationship between business and labour, employer and employee, the divisiveness of which some in Ontario like to foster."

When I read that kind of statement by the Minister of Labour and try to put it together with some of the comments that she and the chairman of her Workmen's Compensation Board make, it doesn't really fit. In an interview at Thunder Bay a couple of weeks ago—actually Mr. Starr was here in Toronto, and the CBC outlet in Thunder Bay phoned him—he was defending the Workmen's Compensation Board. I'd like to quote what Mr. Starr said.

"Let me say this: I've been on the job since the fall of 1973 and I've had very little complaint from the Northwest Territories or from the Thunder Bay area."

I don't know why he would get complaints from the Northwest Territories.

"As a matter of fact, last November I spent the whole week up in Kenora and the Fort Frances area and I didn't have a single complaint about the function of our staff in Thunder Bay."

The interviewer said: "Mr. Starr, 200 people have signed their names to a union called the Injured Workers' Union in Thunder Bay. There's a problem."

Mr. Starr replied—keep in mind what the Minister of Labour had just finished saying about it being non-partisan and not being political about it—Mr. Starr replied: "Don't forget the injured workers are of the NDP political party."

Mr. Martel: They're in those crowds.

Mr. Laughren: Maybe the Minister of Labour should tell the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board what she's saying, so that he's saying something in concert. The

way it is now, she is saying we must not be partisan about it and he's saying that a group of injured workers who have been discriminated against by the board are doing so for partisan political reasons because they are affiliated with the New Democratic Party. That's total nonsense, to start with. The Union of Injured Workers—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: You shouldn't blame them for their poor judgement either.

Mr. Laughren: Because they didn't affiliate with the party?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, because they won't.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, I see. The Union of Injured Workers have formed, not just in Thunder Bay but all across Ontario, because of their desperate situation in coping with the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board. This kind of knee-jerk reaction on the part of the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board is indefensible, and it is really time that the minister had a talk with Mr. Starr.

My colleague from Port Arthur says the Minister of Labour said the same thing in Thunder Bay last week. I didn't know that, but if that's true, that truly is a sad commentary on where her head is.

Mr. Lupusella: She's playing cheap politics.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, that's exactly right. To go back to the interview in the Globe and Mail, Dr. McCracken, in talking about laryngeal cancer, then warned that "the more that is printed about this"—referring to throat cancer victims who had work exposure to asbestos and are being denied compensation —"the more it will jeopardize studies from being undertaken. The worst thing you can do is to keep splashing these cases in the newspapers."

Once again, how dare the doctor from the Compensation Board say that these kinds of cases should not be brought to public attention? They are gross injustices and the media have an obligation even to bring them to the attention of the public and they should not feel at all defensive because of the utterances of the likes of Dr. McCracken.

Mr. Martel: You should fire the hot dog.

Mr. Laughren: Then Dr. McCracken said "that he is prepared to live with the criticism he may receive from politicians and unions, particularly New Democratic Party MPPs and United Steelworkers of America representatives, who have been pressing the WCB to recognize Mr. Bertrand's claim for about three years."

Mr. Martel: There's a neutral civil servant if I ever saw one.

Mr. Laughren: Surely it's time the Minister of Labour and the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board realized we do speak for those people who are having problems with the Workmen's Compensation Board. We do speak to a principle that goes beyond one individual such as Aime Bertrand. We speak for the problems of recognizing as compensable a disease for which there are epidemiological studies to indicate it should indeed be compensable. The minister simply refuses to do that. It's simply irresponsible on her part and or the part of the Compensation Board to refuse to do that.

The last thing I wanted to say about this is that when the minister refuses to direct the board to change its policy, she uses as a reason a letter from a Dr. A. B. Miller writing to Dr. McCracken at the Workmen's Compensation Board. This letter leaves me almost speechless, but not quite speechless enough that I can't finish my remarks. I do want to read this letter because there's a paragraph in this letter that simply astounds me.

"Dear Bill:

"Thank you for your letter of March 11. I have carefully considered the table from Dr. Selikoff and have compared this with the previous data that I also obtained from him.

"In practice, the number of deaths from cancer of the larynx observed have not changed with the additional year of observation. The data I had before went up to December 31, 1974. The new data goes up to December 31, 1975. What has, however, happened is an increase in the expected numbers of deaths which, in fact, makes the comparison between observed and expected for the total population, irrespective of duration from onset of exposure or smoking habits, slightly less significant than it was before.

"As Dr. Selikoff indicates, the difference between observed and expected for the total population is statistically significant. We estimate the P value as 0.03 using a one-sided test, but the two component parts of this, i.e., that depend on duration from onset of exposure are neither statistically significant. As you indicate, there is an apparent anomaly in the fact that the ratio of observed to expected is approximately in the same order for those cases with a duration from onset of

exposure less than 20 years compared to those of a duration from onset of 20 years or more.

"But perhaps if larynx cancer is behaving the same way as lung cancer, the appropriate division is, in fact, 15 or maybe even 10 years, so that maybe we should not take too much notice of that. Furthermore, when you look at the smoking-habit information, the major difference between observed and expected is for those individuals whose smoking habits were unknown.

"The difference here is, in fact, statistically significant, though the difference for the larger sample of individuals with more personal years of observation who are known to have smoked cigarettes is, in fact, not significant at all."

And now we come to the interesting paragraph.

[5:45]

"This particular discrepancy is, I feel one of the major difficulties in accepting Dr. Selikoff's data at its face value as an indication of a causal association between cancer of the larynx and asbestos exposure. Even if Dr. Selikoff is right that most of those for whom smoking was unknown are cigarette smokers, that still does not explain the discrepancy, though I agree we are now talking about very small numbers. It does, however, suggest that maybe some other factor accounts for the discrepancy which has nothing to do with asbestos, exposure or cigarette smoking. This could be alcohol or it could be something else, including socio-economic status or race (the comparison group are white workers and maybe there are a number of black workers in the population under observation) and therefore I feel that we should regard this data as an indication that the question needs to be studied further but that the association has not been established as the cause of one. I therefore feel that we are no further on than we were before. The data we now have from Dr. Selikoff if anything, makes us less certain of the relationship than we were with the earlier data and we have no fresh data, apparently, on the horizon other than data which we are planning to collect ourselves."

I'm sorry I read the whole letter, but I did not want to be accused of taking a paragraph out of context.

What bothers me a great deal about that is the comment that perhaps there is something to do with socio-economic status or race in the data provided by Dr. Selikoff. In the data on stomach cancer, cancer of the colon and the rectum or lung cancer, there is no mention of race or socio-economic status as far as I know. Besides, I don't think there is any validity whatsoever to that kind of invidious comparison. I would suggest that the Minister of Labour—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: What does Dr. Selikoff say about fluoridation?

Mr. Laughren: He is not in that debate, and I'm happy to say he's not in the debate.

Mr. Cunningham: He says, "Don't drink the water."

Mr. Laughren: He says, "Don't drink the water if there's asbestos in it."

An hon. member: Drink wine.

Mr. Laughren: And that goes for the people in Thunder Bay as well.

What bothers me most about this, aside from that comment about race and socio-economic status, is that there's enough doubt in everyone's mind that if there's even the slightest benefit of doubt given to the worker with laryngeal cancer, then it must simply come down on the side of the worker and it must be recognized as a compensable disease in Ontario. That simply must come about.

What's bothering me, as I said earlier, is that the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Minister of Labour are digging in their heels and saying, "We're not giving in on this one." Well, there goes the whole concept of the benefit of the doubt for injured workers in the province of Ontario. I guess that's partly because I spent time with Aime Bertrand myself and came away really touched by that man as well as, I think, some kind of understanding of the kind of battle he's fighting and the conditions under which he's fighting that battle. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if more people can spend time with him, there would be a public furore in this province.

It's not right that the Aime Bertrands and the Gus Frobels of Elliot Lake have to fight the kind of battle they do when there is a Workmen's Compensation Board that has a responsibility, not just to the employers but to the workers in this province as well. That's why we in this party realize that the adversary system of providing compensation to injured workers simply must be abolished.

We understand there must be compensation for injured workers. We understand that the employers in this province must be the ones who fund compensation to injured workers. We believe it can be done along the lines of the New Zealand model, where you take away the adversary system so that the injured worker isn't at the mercy of the likes of

Michael Starr, Dr. McCracken and the Minister of Labour.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Just before the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk commences, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the presence in the Speaker's gallery of the Hon. Francis Tulloch, Minister of Public Utilities and Transportation of Jamaica, and Mrs. Tulloch, and His Excellency Anthony Hill, the High Commissioner for Jamaica in Canada.

Mr. Nixon: I'll bet they have a more interesting Legislature than this.

Mr. G. I. Miller: It's certainly a privilege for me, as the representative for Haldimand-Norfolk, to participate in this Throne Speech debate, Mr. Speaker. It certainly has to be a better day than it was last Thursday, the last day we sat in the House, and had the opportunity of going down to the ball game and almost freezing to death without a beer. But there were a lot of brown bags around and I don't know what they contained.

Mr. B. Newman: Lunches, lunches.

Mr. Ruston: Roy, you could have made lots of arrests that day.

An hon. member: Roy had one of the brown bags.

Mr. G. I. Miller: It's certainly a privilege for me to speak on behalf of the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk. It is perhaps one of the greatest ridings in Ontario. It produces tobacco, apples, milk. We have an industrial park, we have the Nanticoke generating station, which isn't producing too much power at the present time, and we have Texaco which is going to be in production in the near future. We also have two town sites which were purchased not so long ago by the former Treasurer of Ontario, John White. It is a very controversial issue.

But it gives me great pleasure to speak on behalf of my riding and the folks I represent. I would first of all like to delve into the problems as I see them, and some problems that we have to deal with in this sitting of the House. I think the first one is the unity of Canada. That has to be the most important issue. There are also jobs for our youth and our older folks; controlling inflation; and the fact that we have to be competitive in the world markets.

I think perhaps the last factor is the most difficult to get across to the public at large because no one wants to accept the fact that we shouldn't have a little more, but I think it is clearly indicated by the markets and by our production. Our tobacco industry is running at 45 per cent; our industry is not running at full tilt; our agricultural produce is being imported at the rate of 74 per cent over our exports; and I think that indicates that we are in very troubled times.

But I would like to commend our leader for the stand that he has taken on the leadership of this great province of Ontario and the fact that he ended up the last session of Parliament with a speech on the Quebec issue. I think he realizes the importance of it. He realizes the fact of what it means to Canada and to Ontario. Only time will tell but I think the indications are at the present time that he hit it pretty well on the head, and I think also the polls have reflected that too. It's not a popular decision to make or road to go.

I think the leader of the federal government of today has taken the easy way out. I think the leader of the official opposition has taken the easy way out. I give our leader a tremendous amount of credit for the courage that he showed. He went around this province speaking on behalf of the people of Ontario and, as a representative of the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk, and of Ontario, it means much to me that Canada remain united. I can understand too that—

Mr. **Samis:** Be a statesman.

Mr. G. I. Miller: —we have to give and take. I don't think it's necessary that we give all the way. But I don't think over the past number of years—and I think that the government has to take this responsibility because they have been the government for—is it 31 years?

Mr. Nixon: Thirty-four.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Thirty-four?

Mr. Mancini: Too long.

Mr. Nixon: Another few weeks.

Mr. G. I. Miller: I think it clearly indicates that they have to accept the responsibility for the deficiencies of our French counterparts in Ontario. As the largest province, representing perhaps the largest French population outside of Quebec, I think compared to the rights that the English have had in Quebec that the French in Ontario have been ill-treated. I think this has to be righted so that maybe they won't have equal rights but at least they'll have more rights than they have now and hopefully we will work

towards equal rights for both Quebec and Ontario.

I think too that when we are discussing the French issue, if French is made available, I don't think we want to forget that the elementary schools in the smaller centres will have the same opportunity as the larger urban areas. I think we all have to be treated fairly and over the years some of the smaller municipalities haven't had access to as good facilities in the education field as the larger metropolitan areas.

I think also when you look at the legislation proposed in the Speech from the Throne that we have had considerable influence. There are many Liberal policies that have been just turned around slightly—

Mr. Foulds: That's why it is so bad.

Mr. G. I. Miller: —to bring them before the people. I would like to think that our Liberal caucus can take much credit for the effectiveness that this minority government has had over the past year. Again, I think we want to be responsible in the future, in the year ahead—

Mr. Foulds: Going to keep propping them up, eh?

Mr. G. I. Miller: Certainly will. It's got to be part of the democratic system.

Mrs. Campbell: You should talk!

Mr. G. I. Miller: I think that our education policies, which we were about to annouce last October, when there was a quick turnabout by the Minister of Education, is a very clear indication that they were listening to the Liberals. They were watching and they ultimately made the quick turnaround.

Mr. Riddell: They are bankrupt for policies over there. They rely on the Liberals to make their policies.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Consequently, I think the real people who have gained are the students, the boys and girls of our province. I say again we could take some credit.

It was very interesting yesterday. I had the opportunity of having dinner with a young boy who is graduating from a male nurse class, and he has no future here in Ontario. There just doesn't look to be any jobs at all. He goes to college at the hospital at Woodstock.

The amazing thing is that there's a hospital in Florida that would take the class as a whole; there is a hospital in Kansas City that would take the class as a whole; and there was another which would take the whole class we have spent our money educating and yet we do not have a job here in Ontario for them to go to.

I think, again, the government is responsible. When we were criticizing the education policies we weren't criticizing the teachers, we weren't criticizing the students in particular; we were criticizing the fact that we weren't adjusting our education system to fit into the needs of today. I think this has to be a continual change because we don't know exactly what tomorrow is going to bring. We have to be flexible.

I think another area of real concern is in the environmental field—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we are close enough to 6 o'clock to recognize the hour before the hon. member launches into a new area.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 12, 1977

Rent review, statement by Mr. Handleman ... 311

Successor rights, statement by Mr. Auld ... 312

Federal grants for French-language instruction, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. S. Smith ... 312

Cancer and asbestos, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Laughren ... 314

Conditions at Don Jail, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Lewis ... 315

Water supply at Beeton, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. S. Smith ... 315

Occupational health, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Martel ... 316

Townsend townsite, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Nixon ... 317

Rent review, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Deans ... 318

Gasoline tax, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Roy ... 319

OPP native constables, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Angus ... 320

Violence in the home, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mrs. Campbell ... 320

Wood imports, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Foulds ... 320

Home warranty plan, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. O'Neil ... 321

Supply of memorial wreaths, questions of Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Johnson ... 322

Mayo report, questions of Mr. Wells: Ms. Gigantes ... 322

Tourism, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Eakins ... 322

Operating rules for private railways, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Martel ... 323

Aluminum wiring, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Moffatt ... 323

Language education, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Grande ... 323

Water and sewage projects, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. McKessock ... 324

Alleged link between fluoride and cancer, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Deans, Mr. Nixon ... 324

Highway 402, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Bullbrook ... 325

Land speculation tax exemption, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Nixon 326

Point of order re ministerial statements, Mr. Deans, Mr. Lewis ... 326

Point of order re answers to written questions, Mr. Breithaupt ... 327

Point of order re conservation of energy, Mr. Reed ... 327

Motion re standing committee member substitutions, Mr. Welch, agreed to ... 327

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading ... 327

Borough of York Act, Mr. MacDonald, first reading ... 327

Lombardo Furniture and Appliances Limited Act, Mr. Burr, first reading 327

Toronto General Burying Grounds Act, Mr. Drea, first reading 327

Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited Act, Mr. Morrow, first reading 327

Successor Rights (Crown Transfers) Act, Mr. Auld, first reading 327

Municipal Elections Amendment Act, Mr. S. Smith, first reading 328

Borough of East York Act, Mr. Leluk, first reading 328

Canada Trustco Mortgage Company Act, Mr. Peterson, first reading 328

Brockville General Hospital Act, Mr. McCague, first reading 328

Village of Erie Beach Act, Mr. Spence, first reading 328

Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation (Diocese of Alexandria) Act, Mr. Villeneuve, first reading 328

Frank Postl Enterprises Limited Act, Mr. Johnston, first reading 328

Webwood Investments Limited Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 328

Kevalaine Corporation Limited Act, Mr. Grossman, first reading 328

Legislative schedule, Mr. Welch, Mr. Deans, Mr. Breithaupt 328

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. di Santo, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. Laughren, Mr. G. I. Miller 330

Recess 353

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Auld, Hon. J. A. C., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Brunelle, Hon. R., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Maeck, L. (Parry Sound PC)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K.; Minister of Correctional Services (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)

Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Government Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)

Ontario

No. 10

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 12, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Speaker: When we rose at 6 o'clock, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk had the floor. He may continue his dissertation.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly a pleasure to see the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) in the Legislature tonight, because I do now want to deal with housing, and the townsites, as it has and will affect my riding of Haldimand-Norfolk. First of all, I see we have some Girl Guides in the balcony, and I would like to welcome them to the Legislature.

When 6 o'clock rolled around, I was about to discuss environmental atmosphere and how it affects my riding also. In the past summer of 1976, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) came to my area and the deep well disposal site was discussed. They were anticipating using this deep well disposal system in the Canborough area, and the farm organization banded together and was fortunate enough to force the withdrawal of the application.

The fact that we are trying to dispose of our industrial wastes by this method was pointed out during the investigation. It was shown that it was the wrong way to approach it. I think that it will have a considerable effect on how we deal with our industrial waste. It will perhaps be recycled; there will perhaps be other ways found to dispose of it; and I think this is a step in the right direction. Again, we can't afford to jeopardize our fresh water system, such as our Great Lakes and our streams, one of the finest fresh water systems anywhere in the world.

I would also like to point out that between the Nanticoke generating station and the Stelco industrial park in my riding, there is a water intake with a capacity of something like 412 million gallons a day, a source of water supply that perhaps could eventually supply Brantford and Kitchener, as well as the developing region in the immediate area.

I'd like to point out, too, that we are now perhaps in one of the most difficult areas to get a good supply of water. We have plenty of water but it is of sulphur quality. In 1975 I believe there were 5,000 loads trucked by transport out of Port Dover alone, which has to be the most expensive way of putting water into a cistern-type holding tank. I think it is the natural right of everyone in Ontario to have a good source of drinking water.

I think one thing that should be considered when they're expanding the water intake is the supplying of rural areas with plastic pipe that is available now. Smaller municipalities should be able to have that right of having a good water supply.

I would like to point out, too, that Texaco has already hooked into the water line at Nanticoke. They have a 17-inch line which runs two miles from the lake, which brings the water line within four miles of Jarvis and nine miles of Hagersville. I think Stelco's industrial development is already hooked into the line with a 42-inch line. I think it's been brought to the Minister of the Environment's attention that Hagersville and Jarvis do need water, and it is within their reach now with some assistance from the ministry. I think the main trunk lines certainly should be put in by the Ministry of the Environment.

Also, there is a government property utilizing the line. The White Oaks Training School and the Sprucedale Training School are hooked on to the existing line, which has been in since World War I when Jarvis Bomb and Gunnery School was located where the Stelco property is at the present time.

So I think there has to be a priority on supplying good water for this particular area. There is a need there. As I pointed out before, transporting it at $15 per 1,000 or 1,800 gallons, depending on the size of the truckload, has to be the most expensive way of transporting water in this day and age.

I would like to point out, too, dealing with the Townsend townsite, which has been a very controversial issue, and the South Cayuga townsite—giving a little history on the background how the townsite came about—back before regional government came in,

in 1973, a study group was formed of the former counties of Haldimand and Norfolk, and I think its recommendation at that time was that under the population predictions that were presented to it by various studies, there could be a possibility of a growth of 900,000. I think the study group was well aware that perhaps one townsite was needed and I think the Townsend townsite was the particular site that it chose as being necessary.

However, I think it was also pointed out at the time that the existing municipalities should be allowed to grow until there was enough pressure to warrant the need for a new city site. I think we have 10 municipalities in the region of Haldimand-Norfolk. I think the largest one is Simcoe, with a population of 10,000. There are Port Rowan, Delhi, Waterford—which is in Bob Nixon's riding; and Delhi is also in Bob Nixon's riding, but it's still within the regional boundaries—Port Dover, Hagersville, Caledonia, Jarvis, Dunnville and Cayuga. I think, again, Simcoe is the largest municipality, with 10,000, and they went all the way down to 1,000 population.

Of course, to have a good business section and to have a viable community you need at least 10,000 people, perhaps. I think all these municipalities are capable of going up that high. The region at the present time is committed to $12 million to expand these water facilities and sewage facilities. I think again in the basic core—the city of Nanticoke and the town of Haldimand—in that basic area there is something like 5,700 lots now available to provide the housing needs. The municipality of Jarvis had a plan for 1967-1968 whereby they could expand to 20,000 people. I think these have been bypassed. We have to take a serious look at the situation and work along with the region, on their recommendation, to decide when the new townsite should be brought on stream.

The area has been basically a farming community. We are geared to deal with farming communities. We have the Norfolk Co-op in Jarvis, Simcoe and Waterford. The Haldimand Co-op is in Hagersville, Cayuga and Dunnville; plus some private enterprises like Masterfeed which are geared to deal with agricultural products in our area. It is very important to the economy of the existing people that the farming community is encouraged and promoted to continue. If there is a need for a city at any particular time in the future I think this should be utilized, but in the meantime the land should be utilized for agricultural purposes since the economy of the area depends on it so heavily.

Now when it comes to the South Cayuga site, the government may have to admit that it made a mistake. I really don't know what the intentions are for that particular piece of property. There are 12,000 acres. There are many good woodlots on it. Perhaps, with the energy costs going the way they are, these woodlots should be developed and a product taken out and utilized for heating purposes. I think there is now a swing in that direction. Certainly, if we want renewable resources, these woodlots should be worked on now for future generations.

It is certainly a pleasure for me to participate in the Throne debate. There is perhaps one area that I have missed—natural resources. The fishing industry in Lake Erie was a very controversial issue in 1976. Hopefully, they can look forward to a better year in 1977. But bringing down of the limit on fish size to eight inches created real hardship for the fishermen.

Many are well aware that Lake Erie produced 50 per cent of the freshwater fish in Canada—a tremendous resource which has to be worked to the full. I know the fishermen want to protect it. On the other hand, when it was implemented—the regulation had been on the books since 1960-something but it was enforced in 1976. It was a very difficult year for fishermen; the perch fishermen in particular.

There was a harvest of smelt obtained from Lake Erie but, unfortunately, there is only one processor of any magnitude—that is Omsteads Food Limited at Wheatley. Consequently, Port Dover fishermen had to truck their smelt to Wheatley, a distance of something like 170 miles. This seems to put too much dependence on one particular industry.

Omsteads are providing a good service, but when they get into the frozen fruit situation, with frozen food packing in the fall, the smelt fishermen are neglected. With a little prodding, perhaps we were successful. I noticed an article in this week's Simcoe Reformer—dated Thursday, April 7—an article written by Mr. G. G. Bramhill, an old farm reporter, who is, I think, in his 80s. He writes an article every week, and it's very interesting. I would like to quote from his article:

"It looks like Port Dover fishermen may have discovered a bonanza in the demand for smelt from Japan. The Henry H. Misner Company has sent a large shipment of smelt to Japan. The amount was 17 metric tons. A special staff has been trained and new equip-

ment installed to handle this new market outlet.

"According to the Port Dover Maple Leaf, each carton is labelled as Long Point brand and bears the Canadian flag. The shipment travels to Toronto, then via railway to Saint John, New Brunswick. The refrigerated container is then loaded on a freighter with the compass and charts set for Japan. It is expected to reach Japan on April 28. If this experiment works, a long-term contract is expected with Japan, a great boon to Lake Erie fishermen."

[8:15]

So I think perhaps there is a little daylight now with the coming of an alternative market for smelt caught by the smelt fishermen of Port Dover. I certainly hope they have a better summer in 1977, and a better fishing season.

Again, there is one other area as far as the natural resources are concerned and that is the fact that we do have a Grand River which has been fairly well developed at the upper end of the Grand. It is under the direction of the Grand River Conservation Authority. The lower Grand River has potential. I think back in the 1800s they used it as a highway. They had a dam system set up and could travel all the way to Brantford.

I believe that potential still exists. With our technology now it would be a great boon for the area if it was developed as a transportation system and if it encouraged tourists. I think the potential there is great and I certainly hope the minister will look at it in this light. As we need jobs this could be one priority.

Another area which is a real concern to me is lake shore protection. Again, at Port Dover there are cottages on the verge of tipping into the lake from the fact of erosion. Some say it is impossible to cope with it but I think they have found in some specific areas that they can protect the lake shore, especially the built-up areas. Where we are going to lose valuable property is another area where we could have make-work programmes.

As far as energy is concerned, we do have the Nanticoke generating station in my particular riding. It is one of the largest fossil-fired stations in the world, if not the largest. It hasn't been producing that much energy up to this point in time but I will admit that it is a new design. I would hope the company that is putting in the generators and the furnaces will support it because it has certainly cost a tremendous amount of money with very little return up to now.

It was pointed out in 1975 that we had gas being taken out of the ground in southern Ontario which was selling at 40 cents per 1,000. I don't know if anyone can imagine that at this particular date and time and place or not, but that is what they were paying those producers; and they had opposition, they wanted more money because they couldn't continue to search for new fields. With some finds they now have got the price up where it is feasible. I think we have some potential in gas of our own in southern Ontario. Given the opportunity and the financial security this could be developed. In a time of tremendously increasing energy prices, I think it is a must to have some competition.

I would just like to say it has been a pleasure for myself to participate in this debate at this time. As I pointed out in the very beginning, we want to be constructive. As a member of the Liberal caucus it is a pleasure for me to have participated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Housing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: First of all, I want to acknowledge the standing ovation I have received from the opposite side.

Mr. Breithaupt: You wouldn't get it from your side: there aren't enough there.

Mr. Nixon: There are just 14 Tories listening.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I realize that you are only recognizing talent.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If I can get you calmed down enough to listen to the words of wisdom, I will proceed with my remarks.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Housing has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I would assume that all of the hon. members opposite will have no more problems with their teeth. Obviously, they were talking to their various dentists prior to returning.

Mr. Nixon: It is your buddies who have flushed faces. Only two of them have made it. Wait until the rest of them get here.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's the Tories who are opening their mouths and saying "Ah."

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm pleased to have the opportunity to take part in the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I've listened with a great deal of interest to much that has been said by members opposite. Much of it is very interesting.

Mr. Sweeney: You haven't even been here.

Mr. Breithaupt: You have read carefully.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That which I was not able to hear, in order to avoid some of the acting that might have gone on, I read with a great deal of interest in Hansard, of course.

Mr. Riddell: That's not one of your better stories.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'd like to begin my remarks with reference to some of the remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) when he spoke here on April 4.

Mr. Sargent: Do you have to read that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Quite frankly, it was not one of his better days and I think even his colleagues recognize that. I suggest he was having difficulty because, as he has basically admitted, the Speech from the Throne was an excellent speech. It was perhaps the best speech to be given in this Legislature in many days.

Mr. Haggerty: What a flip-flop.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It was one that outlined a very progressive programme that the opposition parties have found they certainly can and will support.

Mr. Sweeney: That was said on Tuesday, not on Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Since the member for Scarborough West likes to think of himself as a great orator many of us gathered here to hear his comments. I think it's true that we found a certain amount of rigidity in many of his remarks, and certainly in his attitude.

Mr. Renwick: Who is rigid?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He is basically unwilling, I suggest, to see all sides of the question or to face some of the facts that are not to one's liking.

Mr. Nixon: He is not as flexible as you are. You have been on all sides of every question.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There is no question that his prejudices come through. He is a socialist politician. Sooner or later they develop a certain rigidity that does not limit itself strictly to their own beliefs about their political opposition.

Mr. Sargent: You didn't write that speech.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As I look across the floor I see the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. I'm so pleased to see him in the House tonight. I trust someone sent him a notice that I was speaking and he came just to hear. I really appreciate that.

Mr. Breithaupt: No, he actually came in spite of the fact you were speaking.

Mr. Sargent: I hear all your speeches over here.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The Leader of the Opposition has always had a problem. He is basically captivated by his own socialist rhetoric and he makes these speeches in the House criticizing a great deal of what we are trying to do—

Mr. Sargent: I am not.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and criticizing the programmes even before they've had an opportunity to be put into place. I might remind him that he perhaps might have taken more time to check some of the statistics he used in his speech prior to coming into the House. I admit I was disappointed in some of his remarks, because I can recall the first day I sat in the House he spoke and I thought, well now, here is a man we should listen to with interest. But he really wasn't up to his usual par.

Mr. Haggerty: Do you mean his research is wrong?

Mr. Sweeney: His researchers can't be wrong.

Mr. Godfrey: Which side are you on then?

Mr. Reed: It is the brown envelope.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Of course, the Leader of the Opposition is unlike the leader of the Liberal Party in that at least he's not a newcomer to this province. He has a pretty good idea of what's going on here and one would expect he would have some feeling for reality.

Mr. Nixon: Talk about a speech that doesn't come up to the mark, this is it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's quite apparent that both parties have one thing in common; they have very poor research talent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think it would be a better evening in the eyes of the beholders who are in the galleries if we had fewer interruptions.

Mr. Nixon: Do you mean we should just sit back and listen to this baloney?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We would ask that the hon. minister be allowed to complete his remarks without so many interjections.

Mrs. Campbell: He hasn't said anything about the Throne Speech.

Mr. Sweeney: Start now; start over again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That remark is meant for everyone.

Mr. Godfrey: He is being petulant.

Mr. Sargent: That is the best speech we have heard. He hasn't said anything.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, both the parties opposite have found that their weakness perhaps is in their poor research. Some of the details that have been brought to our attention as supposedly well researched facts have proven to be less than that.

The situation first came out in a big way when the Leader of the Opposition got into the discussion about Confederation, and dropped a few numbers around. That was back on March 6. As I recall, one of the columnists in the Toronto Sun dealt rather clearly with the inaccuracies in that speech.

Mr. Nixon: It was just before he dealt with beer at the baseball games.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But more recently, of course, the Leader of the Opposition, in his attempt to—I suppose I could say "mislead," but that would cause some problems, so I won't say "mislead."

Mr. Breithaupt: It certainly would.

Mr. Nixon: That's right; withdraw.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'll just say his inaccuracies in regard to the amount of socially-assisted housing in this province—but I'd like to deal with that a little later.

Mrs. Campbell: Sure.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But the misuse of facts, deliberately or otherwise, quite frankly is not new. In some of the statements that have been made in this House by the Leader of the Opposition and some of his colleagues, there are several examples of this that come forth.

Mr. Godfrey: Did you say "deliberately mislead"?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I didn't say "deliberate." No, I would not say "deliberate." I would not do that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. minister just continue and ignore the interjections. Thank you.

Mr. Eakins: He's not in the House just now.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In his reply to the Throne Speech, the Leader of the Opposition talked about freedom of information. That has been one of his topics for the last while back.

In an exchange with the Premier (Mr. Davis) on that day, he said, and I'd like to quote: "I don't know if there is a freedom of information Act in Manitoba and Saskatchewan." Now surely, since we hear day in and day out all about the so-called great things being done by those socialist governments in those two provinces, it's a little too much to expect that he's not aware that Mr. Schreyer is personally against any such legislation in Manitoba and has fought strenuously against such legislation for eight years.

Mr. Nixon: Premiers always are.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Notwithstanding this, the same Manitoba NDP thought it was a good idea before they formed the government.

And what about good old Tommy Douglas, now the champion of freedom of information? He wasn't very receptive to that idea when he was the Premier of Saskatchewan for all those years.

Mr. Eakins: Joe Clark does that now, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I suggest that since the hon. member for Scarborough West seems to know all about those governments' compulsory insurance programmes, mining taxes in the potash industry and so on out in the western provinces, I think it's reasonable for us to expect that he did have some general idea of the position of the party in those provinces as it relates to freedom of information. But then I suppose he would also deny knowledge about Flyer Industries and Saunders Aircraft and so on, all of which have been disastrous government-run enterprises.

Mr. Moffatt: Oh, come on.

Mr. Makarchuk: Tell us about Bricklin; tell us about Bricklin.

An hon. member: Where did you come from?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Still, the same kind of economic theories and policies he and his party would put into effect in this province and put them then on to the backs of the Ontario taxpayers.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We ask that there be fewer interjections and we request that you honour that.

Mr. Sargent: Why does he get special treatment? He needs all the help he can get.

An hon. member: "Before I was so rudely interrupted by the Speaker . . ."

Mr. Sargent: It's the first time I heard him make a speech.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: All we know, really, from what the Leader of the Opposition said to us in his speech the other day, is that he is against stimulating job opportunities and increasing economic expansion through the assistance of the private sector. He's opposed to that.

Mr. Moffatt: No, he's not.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We believe that is probably the most meaningful way to guarantee higher economic activity and increased opportunities for jobs for the people of this province.

Mr. Moffatt: That's why the crisis.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But his alternative, and it's basically a pretty simple one, is for governments to spend more and more money.

An hon. member: Yeah.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That also means higher and higher taxes, and somewhere along the line the members of his party are going to learn about that.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's what you're doing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The interesting part of it is that there are certain members in that caucus over there who really know what free enterprise is all about and they know what effect it can have on the community. Yet they'll stand in this House and make some of the strangest statements about more government intervention into the lives of the general public. Surely we're going to find out—

Mr. Mancini: Like regional government.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Surly we should try to find out that they tried all of that—

Mr. Moffatt: Who wrote this? You don't believe this.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They tried all this in Great Britain.

Mr. Renwick: This is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They've tried it all in Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Renwick: You've been here for seven or eight years and you haven't heard a thing we've said.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Warner: You never listen.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Many of these theories that I hear put forth by the hon. members opposite have been tried in Great Britain, and we all know what's happened there. They've just been colossal failures.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Again, in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan—and you've got to live with these things, my friend—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You're going to have to live with them.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would suggest if the hon. members wish to remain in the chamber that they cease the interjections.

Mr. Shore: Clear the House.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: No; order, please. Will the hon. minister be allowed to continue? Would you continue, please?

Mr. Renwick: Why don't you go and build some houses?

Mr. Sargent: The minister is inciting them.

Mr. Moffatt: He pre-dates the Neanderthals.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The NDP has been living in sort of a strange world where its members really believe they can dip into the pockets of the taxpayers of the province for everything—

Mr. Warner: Why don't you run in Oriole?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —that they can enlarge the civil service beyond all means.

Mr. Nixon: You're the one with the $2-billion deficit.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Take both Manitoba and Saskatchewan—

Mr. Nixon: You're paying $1 billion a year in interest.

Mr. Breithaupt: Sixty thousand in the civil service and another 18,000 on contract.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[8:30]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Anyway, I think it's safe to say that I don't believe the people of the province are ready to accept the sort of philosophy that's being put forth by the New Democratic Party in this province. They're not prepared to do it. They may try—

Mr. Swart: Try it.

Mr. Nixon: Right, they are trying for liberalism.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: While we're on the subject of taxes, I don't think we should forget that the Leader of the Opposition has just made some changes in some of his critics, one of which concerned the former critic of the finance portfolio; because quite frankly, that hon. member was doing a lot of talking about increasing taxes and more government spending. I think the Leader of the Opposition got just a little jittery with all that and he decided that perhaps he should really set that off to one side.

Mr. Moffatt: Just like John Smith getting into trouble too.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the NDP in this House, while being a rather fascinating lot, are really not too different from those who have sat in this House for many, many years. Their public image is a little strange, just a little strange.

Mr. Sargent: They have always stayed NDP anyway.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Look, let me ask them this: In the agricultural portfolio—

Mr. Makarchuk: It's better to be rather strange than senile.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In agriculture, their spokesman is from Toronto.

Mr. Swart: Where do you fit in?

Mr. Germa: Should be from Middlesex South.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In northern affairs, the spokesman is from Toronto; and then, as if to deny all the logic, the spokesman for beer at Toronto's Exhibition Stadium is the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis). I think that's delightful; it's really delightful.

Mr. Moffatt: The member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is the critic for northern affairs.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In land preservation, they all stand up in public supporting a no-growth policy, but I think I can show in writing the number of letters that I've received from some of their caucus wanting me to lift minister's zoning orders, to amend minister's zoning orders, to do this and to do that to provide for growth in the same areas that they're telling me they want a firm hand placed upon the developers in these areas.

Mr. Warner: We would like to see more housing.

Mr. Nixon: Surely you don't think minister's orders replace planning?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No.

Mr. Nixon: That is what you like. You like to control the planning in all those areas.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk and all other areas in the community has made the comment that I'm in favour of minister's orders.

Mr. Nixon: You've got plenty of them.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: After listening to the very sage advice of the hon. member, I took those zoning orders off of his area, as a result of his pleading to hear his case.

Mr. Nixon: They're not off yet.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They're there to be taken off as a result of what you said.

Mr. Nixon: They are there to be taken off? You're the one who put them on.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, I'm not.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Housing did. Aren't you the Minister of Housing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I still find it a little strange that, as the member for Cornwall stands up and makes his public pronouncements on the position that he has taken as it relates to the provision of beer in Exhibition Stadium here in Toronto, what is the position of that party? I haven't heard any of the other members standing up and very loudly expounding that; not very loudly at all.

Mr. Nixon: Tell us about your position? Are you against beer?

Mr. Warner: Not one of them answered the question.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that the hon. members can set a little better example for the young people in the galleries tonight, as well as showing some respect for whoever has the floor. The hon. minister has the floor.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister will continue.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What I would like to find out next in the course of this sitting is what the real position is of the New Democratic Party on northern development. We had a policy put forth by one of their Toronto members and he said: "No further development until the mess in the south is cleaned up." Yet I sat in the House here today and I listened to one of the members from the Thunder Bay area criticizing the Minister of Natural Resources because, he said, we're importing logs and wood from the United States and we're not cutting enough up in his area. Those two fellows want to sit down and get together on what their policy really is for northern development.

Mr. Moffatt: We are together.

Mr. Warner: It is easy on your side—you don't do anything.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The other interesting point was that the Leader of the Opposition, in his rather lengthy speech in the Throne debate, did not once make reference to that northern development policy expounded by one member in this Legislature.

Mr. Warner: Oh, yes he did.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Warner: Re-read it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I've often asked myself, as I think most people in northern Ontario have, why is it that they have a southern member from Toronto, who probably hasn't been much farther north than Highway 401 and Steeles, setting out the policy for northern development? I really believe that we want to know why it is that this sort of policy is being put forth, and yet no position has been firmly taken by the party to support that position which he has expounded.

Mr. Sargent: How many members have you got?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I haven't heard the northern members standing up and saying that this is the policy they support. I would invite them to do so. They have made a mistake and they are going to have to live with it.

Mr. Moffatt: No, we didn't.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Someone mentioned the other day that what I should do, or someone should do, is send out one of these questionnaires that they are all so familiar with and they are all so in love with filling out; we should send them all one and ask them to fill it out as to just exactly what their positions are on these various things.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) sent one out asking if his people wanted to have cans or bottles.

Mr. Breithaupt: After he had done it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: This government believes in making sure that the people who understand the various regions and interests are appointed to look after the needs of the people in the respective areas. That's why you will find a northerner in charge of northern affairs, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and you will find a rural person responsible for agricultural policy.

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: I notice you didn't say a farmer, just a rural person.

Mr. Hodgson: He was a farmer too.

Mr. Angus: Talk to George about pollution in the north.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: All that comes down right now is that the government is prepared to supply good government.

Mr. Nixon: The member for York North (Mr. Hodgson) is the only bona fide farmer you have got.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —some of the figures that were used in this Legislature as they relate to the development of housing in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Deans: Some of them.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Now we all know that you fellows can throw statistics around pretty good and you can throw out numbers too.

An hon. member: What housing?

Mr. Moffatt: List the housing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In both his statements and Speech from the Throne remarks, and as well in a prepared statement he released, the Leader of the Opposition went on to quote certain numbers and figures as to assisted housing starts in the province of Ontario. Well, even his own candidates refused to believe the figures, so they have used different figures in the course of discussing the question of development of assisted housing in Ontario.

Mr. Moffatt: Spend more time building houses than reading press releases.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He will be familiar with the words of his own candidate who stood at a meeting not too long ago and quoted a number of figures which were certainly far different—and much more accurate, I might add—than those put forth by the Leader of the Opposition here in this House.

The Leader of the Opposition said that in 1974 the Ministry of Housing created 497 assisted housing units in the province, 474 in 1975 and 202 in 1976. That—and he knows it—is absolutely incorrect.

In 1974 the ministry started 4,192 assisted housing units—

Mr. Warner: Baloney.

Mr. Moffatt: Whose press release is that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —which is surely a far cry from the 497 that he credited us with. Let's look at the real figures for 1975 and 1976.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member for Scarborough West states, absolutely incorrectly, 474 and 202 respectively. The simple fact of the matter is that in 1975 the Ministry of Housing was involved in 8,461 units—

Some hon. members: "Involved in."

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —of assisted housing; and in 1976, 10,130 units.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Now, let me repeat—let me put it to you this way. I am fully aware of your policy in that caucus, that housing in Ontario should be built by the government. That's your position. You don't believe that the private sector should build it.

Mr. Renwick: We want to build houses.

An hon. member: Rather than do nothing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You don't believe that there should be integrated communities. You don't believe that we should have a variety of housing in areas. What you want and your critic—your former critic was the one who talked this way continually—is large blocks of low rental housing—

Mr. Moffatt: That sounds sensible.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —no real social interchange between people. That's what you want. You want it to be built by the government. You don't recognize that the pri-

vate sector can build assisted housing; and through our rent-supplement programmes, through co-operative housing, through community-integrated housing, we are supplying units here in this province for people to live in assisted rental housing, but you people insist that it has to be done by—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I wish the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie the Minister of Housing, would speak to me.

Mr. Angus: He won't believe you either.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I would be more than pleased and delighted to speak to you, because I suggest that among your colleagues you are the only one who really has an ability to understand and listen, so I would be glad to speak to you, sir.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we ignore the other members opposite and we speak to you, I point out to you again that the figures used by the Leader of the Opposition as they relate to assisted housing in this province are totally wrong and they are not accurate at all.

Mr. Nixon: Who wrote that stuff, John?

Mr. Moffatt: Author.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We had over 3,964 assisted housing units in 1975.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We signed agreements for—

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) try to restrain himself? He will have an opportunity later on in this debate.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, these units were under rent-geared-to-income accomodation, under the rent-supplement programme; and, as I said, the community-integrated programme and the limited-dividend and accelerated-rental programmes. Now if you see something wrong with those programmes, would you tell us? If they are providing units at lower rents for people to live in, what is wrong with them? Just because it isn't being done the way you would like to see it done—

Mr. Moffatt: They are too slow.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, right now we have over 76,000 units in this province in the portfolio of the ministry. Allowing for normal rental turnover that will make available more than 7,000 units a year which can be re-rented.

The Leader of the Opposition's statistics also ignore the fact that there are 4,625 senior citizen and family units now under construction—

Mr. Angus: How many on the waiting list?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —over the years the ministry has produced more than 12,200 units of housing for students, brought to market more than 25,100 fully-serviced lots and provided millions of dollars of mortgage financing to nearly 22,000 other units.

Mr. Sargent: It is all federal money that you are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: So you're telling us that we're not doing anything in housing?

Mr. Angus: How big is the waiting list?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Fort William is becoming repetitive.

Mr. Angus: He is not answering the question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This is not the question period.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is also trying to suggest that the province is getting out of programmes to build houses. This again, of course, is completely untrue; it is incorrect. As anyone who is familiar with our new programmes will recognize, we'll be working even more closely with the municipalities in the future to meet their needs for assisted housing. All I ask of you is that if you want to be critical, which of course is your responsibility, please do so with some degree of accuracy, because up till now you've been missing the target by plenty; just get down to getting your research underway.

Mr. Makarchuk: Where is the housing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The housing is all over this province, and the hon. member knows it full well. That same hon. member, the member for Brantford, has in his own community the proof of the number of units that have been started in assisted housing; and he knows full well that that's true.

He knows full well that when his community has asked for assisted housing those

programmes have been delivered. He can't stand in this House and say anything else and at the same time be honest to himself and the rest of his colleagues here.

Mr. Makarchuk: It was only because I did it myself, not because of you.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I might read into the record the comments that were in the Realty Communication Newsletter of April 1977, and I quote as follows: "The best news for home builders these days is the increasing traffic around new subdivisions and a market increase in sales during the first quarter of this year as against last year."

That was Murray Webber, the president of the Toronto Homebuilders Association, who called the increase "dramatic." He also indicated that one of the reasons for this was the piggy-back arrangement between the federal and Ontario governments that we've put together, putting AHOP and Home Developments together. I know you're going to say that comes from the Toronto Homebuilders' Association, and it does; but after all they are the people who are doing the building.

But while we we're being critical of the programmes of providing housing in the province of Ontario let me read something else to you. It says here: "While Ontario built 77,601 units of public housing between 1964 and 1975 under the programme, Quebec built only 20,265. Ontario built 46,633 units of senior citizens' housing under the programme, while Quebec built only 8,352.

Mr. Sargent: How many apartments have you built?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It doesn't say anything? Do you know who was saying it?

Mr. Moffatt: Where did it start?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Do you know who was saying it? I'll tell you who was saying it, and maybe you're right, maybe it doesn't say anything. It was said by Ed Broadbent, MP, leader of the New Democratic Party, in a discussion with Levesque in Quebec. Maybe you're right, perhaps it doesn't say anything—

Mr. Moffatt: Where did you start?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —come to think of it.

Mr. Moffatt: It is about time you thought of it.

Mr. Riddell: Who is Ed Broadbent?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, in my own riding of Sault Ste. Marie a $34,000 semi-detached unit, with estimated municipal taxes of $45-a-month, would generally require an annual income of $13,200 to make the monthly mortgage and tax payments; with the AHOP interest-reduction loan the minimum requirement is reduced to $10,880; and with maximum assistance, the loan and a $750 subsidy, the income is $8,380.

Mr. Makarchuk: Those are federal programmes you are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If we go to a maximum programme involving the Ontario government in the programme that we've put together—

Mr. Makarchuk: You didn't put anything together, you took advantage—

Mr. Ruston: The feds put up the wherewithal; you turned the key.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. John Rhodes comes to town.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As long as they put it up, we'll run the programme. We add on to that our $750 grant, and a person with an income of just about $6,000 a year can afford to buy the home.

[8:45]

I don't think that sounds like we're getting out of housing in Ontario. I recognize and I give full credit to the programmes that we have been able to work together on with the federal government. I'm not for one minute attempting to suggest that the federal government has not played its role in housing.

Mr. Haggerty: That's a switch.

Mr. Nixon: They don't need you at all at this stage.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I have always said that. But I will say this as well: The federal government has been willing to work with us in the development of their programmes and ours so that we can make maximum use of the dollars, with a limited amount of administration—

Mrs. Campbell: They have always co-operated.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —which is something the hon. members on that side don't know anything about; they're all busy trying to enlarge the bureaucracy to run government

programmes sponsored only by them. But I have no hesitation in recommending that.

Mr. Nixon: What does your superminister say about that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The Throne Speech also indicates that we have an intention to increase the amount of rental housing for senior citizen families with low income. We will do that. Again, that obviously does not make any kind of possible suggestion that we are getting out of the housing field. If the Leader of the Opposition continues to use his faulty figures, then I can only conclude one of two things: He's either deliberately trying to avoid giving the exact figures or his research needs an awful lot of work to be done on it.

Mr. Moffatt: You know better than that.

Mr. Warner: You might try—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the members for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) and Durham East (Mr. Moffatt) keep quiet?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I have mentioned the public position that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues like to take on land policy. But what of the private requests that more often than not greatly conflict with what they say in public? There's a lack of consistency there.

I want to talk specifically about the area regarding land preservation policy; and this has to do, of course, with the antics of the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart). He has been very vocal about the government's green paper on food land policy and Niagara regional boundaries. But when all is said and done, when one gets through all the press releases he has let out, I can only conclude that he is a member of the Legislature who really thinks the solution to this problem is to put it in the hands of the Ontario Municipal Board and let that become a political forum.

I don't think that's what the board is for, but he apparently sees that as a way of making some sort of political hay out of a very complex problem in that region. In suggesting that the OMB should decide the boundaries for the development of that area on agricultural land in the region, if that's what he recommends, I might add that would diminish considerably the local autonomy. But then he has always said in this House and during consideration of my estimates, as I recall, he really felt the provincial government should come down hard on municipalities and make the decisions for them.

Maybe we can crystallize the member's thinking of this. I'll quote from a story in the Niagara Falls Review of March 11, 1977:

" 'I am sick and tired of hearing Swart on the subject he, an urban dweller, knows nothing about,' Councillor Russell High of Lincoln said. 'I am sure he has never been closer to the land in Lincoln than looking at an aerial map. He's never walked over an inch of it. When agricultural land is mentioned, he immediately starts to talk and he doesn't know what he is talking about.' "

Mr. Nixon: The member for Lincoln (Mr. Hall) is the man who knows all about those lands.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I suggest that that should suffice; it parallels my own feelings as far as his knowledge of that particular problem is concerned.

Mr. Riddell: The member for Welland-Thorold will have lots of time to walk over the land after the next election.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I suggest that one should at least make some mention regarding the contribution that has been made to this debate by the Leader of the Opposition; and that is to say that, in fact, the Speech from the Throne was a good speech and one in which he found a great deal that he could support. But, of course, in a dying effort he had to come up with some sort of an amendment, knowing full well that amendment would never carry in this House.

I suggest that the Speech from the Throne deserves the support of the entire House—

Mr. Warner: You have got to be kidding. You are not really serious.

Mr. Cassidy: No wonder you backed away from half of it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and then the members of the opposition take a notion to look at what that amendment really is, they too will stand in support of the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Burr: Inasmuch as the previous speaker's political identification was called into question, Mr. Speaker, and at the time there were more former Liberals present on the Tory benches than there were genuine Tories, perhaps I should identify myself. I am a member of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Maeck: Glad you told us.

Mr. Burr: But I must confess I have not always been a member of the New Democratic Party. For 22 years before I became a New Democrat I was a member of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation; that is, a dues-paying member.

Mr. Mancini: That's when he ran in Essex North.

Mr. Nixon: That's when he had a real party to support.

An hon. member: He's just a born loser.

Mr. Burr: I should like to congratulate the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) for speaking so well on the subject of nuclear and solar energy, thereby saving me the trouble of doing so. I should also like to thank the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) for speaking on PCBs, which subject I was going to cover.

Mr. Nixon: Well, that's that.

Mr. Burr: Oh, I have had a request from the member for Brantford-Norfolk-Oxford and Woodstock—no, not Woodstock—

An hon. member: He would if he could.

Mr. Burr: —to throw in a reference to—is it beer?

Mr. Nixon: Any of those drinks. You know about them all.

Mr. Burr: Any of those drinks. I'll try to work that in just to please this member, who's a very nice fellow.

I should like to make some comments first of all on the subject of unemployment, a disease that bedevils most non-totalitarian countries. There are some differences between the depression of the 1930s and the present-day depression. For the benefit of those members who didn't experience the last depression, I should like to give a very brief description.

In the 1930s there were no old-age pensions of any significance and they were not paid until the age of 70. There was no unemployment insurance, and there was very little help available in the form of welfare. Thousands of people lost their homes simply because they couldn't pay their property taxes. The unemployed—at least those who travelled from town to town looking for work—were subject to frequent arrests and frequent warnings to get out of town to avoid arrest. These were the major obvious differences.

There were some similarities. In the United States there were nine million persons unemployed and in Canada almost a million, as I recall. Today's statistics are not unlike those of the 1930s. The prospects for high school and university graduates were no better then than they are today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Excuse me for a moment. Will the hon. members keep their voices down? I can hear three different conversations while I'm trying to listen to the hon. member for Windsor-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Married women had virtually no chance of being hired as teachers, and single women teachers who married had little chance of remaining on staff.

I mention this simply because last week I received from a former constituent the first angry letter that I have received on the subject of unemployment. The theme of the letter was that married women whose husbands hold good jobs should not be employed until the present depression ends. Actually I'm surprised that I have not received such a letter before now, and I shall be even more surprised if I don't receive many more in the weeks ahead.

Adolf Hitler destroyed and shortened the lives of millions of people. On the other hand, ironically, millions of North Americans were saved from lives of poverty, deprivation, misery and indignity because of Hitler. The war that he started gave meaning and dignity, and even brought happiness to millions of North America's unemployed.

How will the present depression end? The depression of the 1930s lasted almost a decade and had not World War II put everyone to work, there is no certainty that it would not still be continuing today. Roosevelt's public works programme merely alleviated the problem in the United States; it did not by any means solve it.

Inasmuch as totalitarian methods are anathema to most Canadians, we can safely ignore them as a solution.

We have seen what a national anti-inflation programme has caused: the widespread staff cutting and increased unemployment. I want to propose, and this is simply my own proposal, that we change our approach and start a full employment programme. To make it palatable to government we will even use the acronym FEP.

Let us assume that for every 100 persons now working full-time in Canada there are seven who can find no work at all. Let us assume, also, that inflation is continuing at

an annual rate of seven per cent. Let us assume, also, that for most jobs and for most people the only justification for an annual increase in pay is the increase in the cost of living.

Based on those assumptions, in order to make our thinking specific let us consider a hospital that has 100 employees—nurses, clerical, housekeeping, maintenance staff and so on. The total wage and salary budget for this hospital would be increased seven per cent this year to take care of inflation. But because of FEP, our full employment plan, the 100 employees would get no increase in pay, partly because their work hours would be reduced by approximately seven per cent and partly because there would be seven additional persons hired to maintain the quality of service the public needs.

How would this affect the public? How would it affect the employer, the 100 employees, the seven previously unemployed and the state? Since the number of work hours would be the same, the quality of service offered to the public should remain the same. The employer—in this case the hospital board—would be increasing its budget no more than the anticipated inflationary seven per cent. The 100 employees would receive no increase in total pay, but would be receiving an hourly rate increase of about seven per cent because their hours of work were being decreased about seven per cent. The seven jobless persons would of course be the main beneficiaries of FEP, for reasons that surely need not be elaborated; the restoration of dignity, restoration of income, and possibly salvation of a family life are among the most obvious benefits.

Imagine the FEP, the full employment programme, applied to 10 million jobs or positions in Canada and you can see that 700,000 unemployed persons could be restored to full citizenship. If the FEP were put into operation in every possible category of employment, governments would receive much more revenue from income tax, unemployent insurance payments would become minimal, welfare payments would be confined to the unemployable.

Consequently, there could be tax reductions at all three levels of government, sufficient perhaps to make up for the lack of a seven per cent cost-of-living wage increase that all employees would forgo in the first year of the FEP. It is possible that the tax reductions will offset the cost-of-living increase in its entirety.

The success of FEP would depend upon the compassion of governments—in particular the federal government—to initiate the programme in the first place, and the goodwill of all those now employed to make sure that it was implemented in the second place.

From answers to questionnaires that I have circulated in the riding of Windsor-Riverside, which I have the honour to represent, I know there would be great support and enthusiasm for a full employment plan. I commend it to the Premier (Mr. Davis) for his serious consideration, endorsation and presentation to the federal government.

[9:00]

For the Minister of Transportation and Communication (Mr. Snow), the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and any other cabinet minister who is interested in the subject, I have a report from my constituents on the legal driving age they prefer in Ontario. The age of 16 is satisfactory to, or favoured by, 24.5 per cent; the age of 17 by 10 per cent, and the age of 18 as the legal driving age by 64 per cent. Only one per cent had no opinion on this subject.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I can hear the Minister of Transportation and Communications better than I can hear the person who has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Fred, speak up. Speak up, Fred. Turn on his microphone.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You only hear the important things, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Burr: I wonder if the minister heard my remarks or should I repeat them, Mr. Speaker?

An hon. member: Repeat them. Repeat them.

Mr. Nixon: He is not interested in full employment.

Mr. Burr: I'll send them to him by mail—by courier. The comments on the legal driving age included references to the obvious drinking and driving dangers, as well as to the energy conservation aspect. The emotional immaturity of the average 16-year-old, compared with that of the average 18-year-old, was mentioned in some comments, especially in the case of a fatal accident. A youngster of 16 may be traumatically scarred for life, whereas two years later he might handle such a situation more successfully. I would like to tell the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk—inasmuch as he is very interested in this subject—and in particular give to

you, Mr. Speaker, the results of the survey in my riding concerning the best legal age for the drinking of alcohol. I gave my constituents five choices; 18, 19, 20, 21, and over 21. The percentage of constituents favouring each was as follows; age of 18, 15.5 per cent; 19, 4.5 per cent; the age of 20, 18 per cent; the age of 21, 52 per cent; a higher age, nine per cent. One per cent offered no opinion.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Drinking or driving?

Mr. Burr: This was the drinking age. In other words, raising the age to only 19 does not satisfy 79 per cent of the constituents who answered the questions. At least 61 per cent favoured restoring the drinking age to 21.

I wish to register my dissatisfaction with some of the operations of the Workmen's Compensation Board. We must have a better system of compensating injured persons, whether they are injured workmen or any other kind of injured citizen. The physical effects of an injury are the same whether it happens at work, at home or anywhere else. But the financial effects can be extremely different.

If an injury occurs at work, the injured workman or workperson has a fairly good chance of being compensated, especially if he has several witnesses and, preferably, a moving-picture-camera operator covering the accident. In those cases, he is fairly well off. But if he has the accident at home, he is financially out of luck, unless he is fortunate enough to be covered by a sickness and accident insurance policy of some kind. A better system must evolve, wherein there is no necessity to prove the injury is related to the work place. It is on this reef that the fates of thousands of injured workmen have foundered.

I have one current case history that I should like to share with the House, never having done so before. As I relate it, I ask members to keep in mind the number of persons whose time and talents are taken up with handling this one particular case, persons whose involvement would not be required at all if we had an all-embracing universal accident insurance plan.

At the end of October 1976 a constituent came to me for help. Normally his union would have looked after his case, but he was aware that his president was spending about 35 per cent of his time on Workmen's Compensation Board problems and hoped I could speed up the resolution of his problem.

Mr. Ferrier: You can say all you want now, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk is in the chair.

Mr. Burr: On November 1, I wrote to the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board telling him the following story.

Mr. Davidson: Are you sure that's King Robbie?

Mr. Burr: In the letter I mentioned names, but here in the House I shall not do so. I shall call my constituent "Ray," although that is not his name.

"Dear Mr. Starr:

"At [a certain plant] on October 26, 1975, while Ray was pushing a 300-pound stock truck, the latter's wheels caught in a crack in the floor causing Ray a piercing pain in his right shoulder. When this pain gradually extended to his neck, his family physician sent him to a doctor to be x-rayed. As a result of the x-ray findings he was sent to a physiotherapist. The diagnosis accompanying him was cervical and right shoulder suspensory pain.

"Between November 21, 1975, and May 13, 1976, Ray went on 97 separate days for therapy sessions, with good results for the shoulder. On May 17, he was called to the Downsview rehabilitation centre. The therapy there was strictly for the neck. On June 8, no further progress seemed likely and he was told that he was discharged. The rehabilitation officer said, 'You can go back to work tomorrow, Ray.'

"When Ray told him that the doctor had said only for light work, the rehabilitation officer called the doctor and confirmed this. He then called the industrial relations manager at Ray's plant, who informed him that with over 200 of the 300 employees on layoff there was no light duty work available, despite Ray's 27 years of seniority.

"The rehabilitation officer then said to Ray, 'I have bad news for you, Ray. You will be on WCB payments for some time yet. Your company has no light work.' Ray returned to Windsor in June and his Workmen's Compensation cheques continued until September 15, 1976, when suddenly he was cut off.

"Six weeks later a letter, dated October 25, arrived stating that 'a routine review [of his claim] had revealed that the Workmen's Compensation Board has evidently been paying benefits since June 8, 1976, for a non-work-related upper back injury. The letter ended by saying that he would be notified shortly of the exact amount of this overpayment.

"Since being cut off in mid-September Ray has exhausted his savings and has now $56 left in the bank. He has no wish to go on welfare. The suggestion that he has been overpaid and should return a couple of thousand dollars simply floors him. He's had to borrow from his credit union in order to have enough money to make his November mortgage payment.

"From what he can gather, the Workmen's Compensation Board is suggesting that his present cervical pains stem from a 1950 auto accident in which some ligaments torn in his right shoulder were repaired by transfer of ligaments from his right leg. In this accident, there was no injury whatsoever to his neck. In fact, he served in the army from May 1951 to January 1954 with the 48th Toronto Highlanders. He was A1 when he enlisted and he was A1 when he was discharged. As a leading infantryman, he carried heavy packs without any difficulty or discomfort throughout 32 months of service, most of that time in Germany.

"The doctor's letter of February 20 refers quite clearly to the C5, C6 and C7 trouble as the cause of his taking the physiotherapy treatment. His family's physician is so annoyed by WCB's actions that he simply throws its registered letters into his waste-paper basket. The physiotherapist's instructions were clear. He was to treat Ray for 'cervical and right shoulder suspensory sprain.' At Downsview, the treatment by the therapists was for the neck only, the shoulder trouble having virtually ended.

"Why suddenly does a 'routine review of the claim' turn a blind eye to the neck and assume that the compensable injury was restricted to the shoulder? I should appreciate your earliest possible consideration of this case, as Ray's personal savings have been exhausted."

Mr. Starr replied promptly on November 3 and set the wheels in motion, but it took until December 8, a good five weeks later and a very long time for a man harassed financially as well as physically, for Ray to receive word that he would not have to pay back the $2,000. However, the letter said the board's medical advisers "said that the neck injury was a degenerative disc disease and that, although it could be aggravated by accident, it could not be aggravated by this type of accident."

Mr. B. Newman: The old story.

Mr. Burr: You've heard that one?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes.

Mr. Burr: Of course, we appealed this decision and eventually on February 17 of this year had a hearing in Windsor — a sympathetic hearing, I might add. Nevertheless, it took until March 11, almost four weeks, before Ray received a letter saying he must go to London to be examined by still another doctor on May 11 — one long interval after another. After his examination on May 11, how much longer will he have to wait to hear the results of his February 17 appeal? Even the mailing of a letter takes the board such a long time.

Take these dates, for example: On March 2, Dr. Hopper of the WCB wrote the letter notifying Ray of his medical appointment in London. On March 3, a transportation warrant was issued, but it took until March 8 for the envelope to get postmarked and it took until March 11 for Ray to receive it in Windsor.

Since mid-September of 1976, Ray has received no compensation payments, although his local doctors have been visited by investigators, although he has had a myelogram, although he continues to wear the cervical collar provided by WCB, although he endures continuous pain, and although he has had a hearing on February 17. Still he has no prospect of hearing a decision before some time after this examination on May 11.

Mr. B. Newman: Shame.

Mr. Burr: It is this kind of delay that turns injured workmen into depressed, discouraged individuals and perhaps eventually into unemployables with functional overlays. When one adds to these delays the fact that Ray's company is having economic troubles and may fold, leaving him at the age of 46 or so in the unenviable position of having to seek a new job with his recent WCB record, one can realize what his frustration and discouragement have been during these last several months.

[9:15]

We need a universal accident insurance scheme in which it is necessary only to prove that an injury has been suffered without any concern as to where, how or why. Ontario needs a better plan and hundreds of injured workmen need it now. In fact, if we had a universal sickness and accident insurance plan, the kind of speech given by the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) concerning Aime Bertrand and the quibbling over the cause of his illness would be quite unnecessary. If a person is dying or disabled by cancer, society should have an insurance scheme to take care of his financial worries.

Despite the welcome change in rules restoring the question period to an hour, there are still often occasions on which it takes the member a long time to ask a question of the minister.

Mr. Samis: Especially the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams).

Mr. Burr: There is no certainty that he or she can be present during estimates during the particular vote under which certain concerns may be raised. For this reason I am raising the following environmental matter publicly and will follow it up personally with the minister—although he is here now, almost the only minister who is, and he may be able to take note of it.

The Environmental Protection Agency in the United States has found that the practice of salting streets and highways during winter is not an unmixed blessing. In addition to the $200 million spent on the cost of salt itself and the cost of applying it to road surfaces in the American snow-belt states, there are environmental costs which are probably equal in dollar terms, although putting a precise dollar-and-cent value on damage to the environment is not possible.

Damage to highway surfaces, and especially to bridges, has been estimated at $500 million annually in the United States. Salt damage to vehicles has been estimated at 10 times the cost of the whole salting operation, namely, $2 billion. Even more serious than these property damages, however, is the damage to water supplies. In Massachusetts alone, 90 communities had sodium content greater than that allowed to persons on low-salt diets. Increased levels of sodium in water supplies increase the risk of hypertension, according to health authorities. In fact, the EPA reports that in some communities salt levels in drinking water now "exceed public health service safety standards set by leading researchers, heart specialists and the American Heart Association." It is probably anti-climactic to add that damage to vegetation is estimated at $50 million annually.

My questions to the Minister of the Environment and to the Minister of Health are these:

1. What studies are being made of the environmental and health costs of the practice of salting roads in Ontario?

2. Is the situation any less serious in Ontario where use of salt is even higher than in the United States?

3. What measures are they planning to safeguard against further damage and risk, both to Ontario's environment and to the health of Ontario citizens?

I have a brief comment to the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell): Dr. H. A. Heggtveit, professor of pathology at the University of Ottawa, has shown magnesium deficiency in the diet of rats rapidly damages heart muscle. He has found that human victims of fatal heart attacks have significantly less magnesium in heart muscle than is the case in individuals dying of other causes.

Dr. T. W. Anderson of the University of Toronto's department of preventive medicine has found the protective factor in hard water, as far as the incidence of fatal heart attacks is concerned, is magnesium. He also points out that modern processes used in refining food reduce the level of magnesium left in our food. Depletion of magnesium in certain intensively-mined crop land has been observed in areas in which fatal heart attacks, certain types of cancer and leukemia and other diseases are increasing. Consequently, supplementary amounts of magnesium are recommended by some physicians for those diets may be deficient in magnesium.

It seems to me that disseminating information of this kind is a proper function of the Ministry of Health. At present, most of the ministry's activities are such that the title of Ministry of Ill Health would be more understandable, if not more appropriate.

I now refer to one other topic. I should like to appeal to the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Parrott) to modify, if he will not rescind, his policy on a fee increase for foreign students. Iona College's board of directors has recently approved a resolution to this effect. After pointing out that Canada has profited greatly by having generations of its students enjoying the benefits of education in various foreign countries, the directors point out we have an obligation to reciprocate. The directors suggest the very least the provincial government may do is to offer offsetting scholarships or bursaries to "students of proven need from the less-developed countries." I commend this resolution to the Minister of Colleges and Universities for his serious consideration.

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to participate in the Throne Speech debate here tonight and congratulate the government in the odd place, criticize it in a few areas and make a few recommendations.

It was encouraging to see in the Throne Speech a new nine per cent loan being made available to small business. I have been asking for something like this since I came in here. It came out in the paper, saying it was

eight and a quarter; I had been saying we should have one at eight per cent. I thought it was getting close to what I wanted but when calling the ministry the next morning, I was told it was nine per cent and not eight.

I asked for the definition of "small business" and they said any employer with under 100 employees. I said: "Well, then, that's fine. The farmer will come under that category." The fellow on the other end of the line immediately started to laugh and assured me that this loan wasn't going to be made available to farmers. I cannot see how farmers can be discriminated against in this way. It seems obvious to me that farmers need this nine per cent loan; they come under the category of small business.

There's an Industry and Tourism office in Owen Sound and the ODC loans are not administered through this office. I think they should be; in the case of the small business loan they, especially, should be administered through the local offices to cut down the government and civil service red tape to a minimum. They should have the power to authorize these loans from local offices. They would be able to be administered within, say, a two- or three-week period whereas now it can take two or three months to get a loan approved.

What is the Ontario government doing for agriculture anyway? How can the young farmer, especially, get established in farming today? The only way I see it, unless he is born into a family that can set him up, he is going to have to start part-time, as a lot of the rest of us did. And in order to start part-time he has to have made available to him some small loan, such as this loan here that's going to be made available. He may need $10,000 to $15,000 to $20,000. If he's going to start full-time he's going to need a loan for $150,000, which he can get through the Farm Credit Corporation. But the Farm Credit Corporation will not look at a person who wants a $10,000 loan.

A fellow came to me just last weekend, and I've had a lot of them come to me in this category wanting to obtain a loan from $5,000 to $25,000 to start into farming part-time so that he can build up to be a full-time farmer at a future date. This doesn't only just enable them to get into farming, but starting in a smaller way also takes a lot of the risk out of it for them.

I would like to see the government reconsider this small business loan and try to make it available to the farmers as well. Do they really want to keep the family farm or not? If they do, they're going to have to do something more than what they have suggested—that is paying their taxes for them in the new assessment deal that is coming through. I haven't talked to one farmer yet who wants his taxes paid for him. He wants to be able to pay his taxes the same as everybody else and he wants to run a viable business like everybody else, and he's not looking for any charity.

We seem to be in a worse mess now than ever in starting the market value assessment and the commission on assessment. If we are not going to scrap the whole deal and keep putting it off, we're going to have to do something to help counties such as Grey which are half on market value and half on the old assessment. It's very unfair. The residential people are paying a lot more taxes than they were before the switch, because the whole programme hasn't been worked out yet. It's just questionable whether it ever is going to be worked out to anybody's satisfaction.

Right now in Grey county industrial taxes have been cut away down and the residential taxes have been raised considerably. To show the unfairness here, the government is recommending that residences be taxed at 50 per cent of the market value assessment. Right now they are taxed at approximately 85 per cent of the assessment.

I'd like also to mention the Niagara Escarpment Commission. As far as I'm concerned, it should be scrapped. It never really should have come into existence in the first place. What would have made more sense would have been an agricultural land commission. This would have protected our farm land, would have made provision for hydro corridors going on land that isn't viable farm land or at least keeping them to lot lines where it wouldn't interfere with farming operations. It could have protected against the rampant building that's going on now on farm land. What we are doing is protecting food land for the groundhogs and not considering anything about the people themselves.

How many people really know what is happening on the Niagara Escarpment that stretches from Niagara Falls to the tip of the Bruce Peninsula, with a width of 12 miles in some places? I would suggest if we are going to have to put up with this Niagara Escarpment ruling, the width of it is going to have to be cut down to somewhere around 300 feet on either side of the escarpment ridge instead of the 12 miles that it is right now. This land is poor land and it should be made available for building on, instead of

the good farm land that we are building on today. Here it is, this land we can't get permits to build on.

[9:30]

There are a lot of things that come up in the Niagara Escarpment rulings that are hard to understand. In the regulations you have to abide by certain colours on your buildings, and some people say this isn't right. This is rumour, but it is right. There are a couple of cases that I know of for sure. One guy had to take the siding off his building because it wasn't the right colour. Another guy had the siding bought and he had to return it and get the proper colour, because the Niagara Escarpment Commission had turned it down.

Another case concerned a doctor who came up from Toronto and built a home on a 15-acre parcel of land. The farmer next to him had a 15-acre parcel of land. He was born there and he was over 70 years old at this time, and he applied for a building permit for these 15 acres. The doctor next to him objected, and his application for a development permit was turned down. Here is a farmer who lived there all his life applying for a building permit. The doctor came from Toronto and he got a building permit, and what he was objecting to was exactly the same thing that he had done himself—building a house on 15 acres of rough land. Yet when the farmer asked for this he objected and the farmer didn't get it. It was turned down by the Ministry of Housing hearing.

The farmer came to me and asked what he should do, and I said to go back and start over again and do the same thing, because this is definitely unfair and somewhere along the line it has to be corrected. The trouble is, it cost him $50 to try again, but that's what he did. The next time, with changing the house a few feet on the rough land and making a few minor adjustments, it went through. Of course, the hearing board can only be embarrassed so many times, and maybe it finally came to realize what is fair.

The Niagara Escarpment Commission also says it is passing 85 per cent of the applications that come to it. I wonder if they realize how many people are being turned off by the regulations and aren't going through the procedure of applying. All the red tape, rules and regulations have just turned so many of these people off that they don't even bother applying. Of course, this also goes for a lot of building today. You have to go through so many procedures before you get your house built it begins to make you wonder whether it's worthwhile or not. Only those who are very persistent and stay with it for a long period of time and have a lot of money to spend are the ones who eventually get through to building a house.

I'd like to point out that having controls on this land also puts the price of building lots up. The government owns enough land right now that it doesn't have to put restrictions on the Niagara Escarpment land. In Grey county alone, the government owns 1,106,000 acres of land. That's 1,106,000 acres of land owned by the government through different ministries and the conservation authorities. In Bruce county, they own almost as much—773,000 acres. There is enough land, right here, for the people from the urban centres to come out and walk over and look at without tying our land up so that we can't develop it or look after it the way we have for the past several generations.

Not only should these controls be removed, but we should also have legislation that would allow for no trespassers without written permission from the owner, and this should be enforceable by the game wardens. We who own the land, bought it and paid for it, shouldn't have trespassers any more than the people down here in Toronto should have people coming in and using their swimming pool in their backyard. Neither should any more of our land in this day and age be used continually for landfill sites.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What's worse, development on the escarpment or filling in old gravel pits?

Mr. Gaunt: It's nice of the minister to stick around.

Mr. McKessock: The money that has been spent in Toronto on the experimental recycling, et cetera, is questionable. There are companies right now which have incinerators of various sizes on the market—

Mr. Mancini: Why doesn't the minister look them up?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They won't buy them up there.

Mr. McKessock: We would buy them, and I believe the government should provide 50 per cent grants to help these municipalities buy them. They would then need only 20 per cent of the land that they are using now for landfill sites.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: How about operating expenses? Fifty per cent of them too?

Mr. McKessock: The incinerators on the market today don't even pollute the air. I don't think a lot of people realize that they

are new, modern incinerators. There is no smoke. They're just like your self-cleaning ovens; you heat them up to a certain temperature, then you open the door and clean out the ash.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: And let out the smoke.

Mr. McKessock: I think we certainly should be moving ahead in that area and protecting our farm land in this way as well.

While I'm on the environment, I'd also like to mention again the five sewage projects in Grey riding that are held up for lack of funds —Meaford, Thornbury, Neustadt, Flesherton and Hanover.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What about the ones that are going ahead?

Mr. Sargent: It's funny how things never change.

Mr. McKessock: They are going ahead too slowly for this day and age. There is sewage running down the streets. Six years ago, the Ontario Water Resources Commission told Neustadt if they didn't clean up their act, they'd fine them $500 a day until they did. That was six years ago. Environment has now taken it over but, six years later, there are still no sewers. The local health authorities say it is a health hazard and they have sent letters to the town telling them that they must proceed with the sewer project. The Minister of the Environment told me today in question period that they don't pay any attention to the local health authorities.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I didn't say that.

Mr. McKessock: They send their own men down to reassure the village that everything's okay. Would this be allowed to go on in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. McKessock: Sewage running down the street?

Mr. Hall: Or Burlington?

Mr. McKessock: The local health authorities are concerned because they are the people who are there. The ministry people only have to look at it once a year when they come up—

Mr. Sargent: Or a Tory riding.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, no. You live right in the riding.

Mr. Ferrier: Would you let it go on in Burlington?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Once in a while.

Mr. Sargent: The minister swims in the stuff, doesn't he?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grey has the floor. Will he continue?

Mr. McKessock: Money is made available for many other things that I don't believe have the priority. There is $67 million set aside in the Throne Speech for learning our second language and $5,000 for every municipality that would like to celebrate the Queen's Jubilee. It wouldn't surprise me a bit if the government would make money available for the restoration of the John Diefenbaker house in Neustadt before Neustadt gets sewers. It might be that Neustadt would be able to get enough money for this restoration programme of the John Diefenbaker house to put in their sewers as well.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think John can service his own home. Let John put sewers in his own home. Why should the province do that? He is an author; he made a lot of money from royalties.

Mr. McKessock: Good idea. I would appreciate if you would write him a letter to that effect.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grey is the only person who has the floor.

Mr. Riddell: He's doing a good job, too.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would he continue please?

Mr. McKessock: While I am still on environment, I would like to say that we should be putting more research money into solar and wind energy, and methane gas.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Cut down on gas too.

Mr. McKessock: We could cut down on hydro a little and promote these other areas which involve continual natural, renewable resources.

Mr. Roy: What about hot air, George?

Mr. McKessock: And also hydro rates should be changed so that the user pays. It only encourages the misuse of hydro now when the more you use, the less you pay.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Are you going to circulate this speech all over your riding?

Mr. McKessock: Would you like a copy, George?

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. Minister of the Environment kindly let the hon. member for Grey continue his speech uninterrupted?

Mr. McKessock: Also, the ones who are using the most hydro are the ones who are contributing to the capital cost. If we didn't use so much we wouldn't have to build so many nuclear plants and we wouldn't need so much capital money spent. So it is only fair that the people who are using it are the ones that should have to pay the most money.

I would like now to switch a little to the welfare programme of the province. I think they should come forth with a programme where the people who are on welfare, those who are able to work, would be let out to any employer who would accept them, free of charge.

Mr. Angus: Sounds like slave labour to me.

Mr. Warner: It's called slavery.

Mr. McKessock: I am quite in favour of welfare for those who are unable to work, but I do not believe in people being paid money if they are able to work.

Mr. McClellan: What about the workhouse? That should fit in the Liberal programme well.

Mr. McKessock: This programme could be very well implemented by local municipalities. They could be let out to the people to shovel their snow or to sweep the streets, or whatever.

Mr. McClellan: With a whip?

Mr. McKessock: Even if it cost a little more money it would be worthwhile because we are deteriorating our society—

Mr. Cassidy: You want all the deserted mothers out shovelling snow?

Mr. McKessock: —by allowing people to accept money for no work.

An hon. member: Easy, kid, easy!

Mr. Cassidy: Do the kids have to shovel snow too? The six-year-olds?

Mr. Ferrier: Why don't you create the jobs?

Mr. McKessock: And to make sure that this programme wasn't misused, any employer who accepted one of these people on welfare could maybe only have him for three months and then he would have to go back to somebody else. So there are ways that it could be controlled.

Mr. Angus: Recycle them.

Mr. Cassidy: What about the people on compensation who can't find light work?

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you sell their children? Give the money to the welfare recipients.

Mr. McKessock: I can see when I start talking about welfare that the NDP pipes up, because if they had their way they would have everybody on welfare.

Some hon. members: Oh!

Mr. Warner: We'd have everybody working.

Mr. Ferrier: They would be working.

Interjections.

Mr. McKessock: Finally, I would like to congratulate the government on the decentralization of some of the ministries. It is good to see that some of these ministries are going to be moved out of Toronto. I wonder if maybe in the move they will lose a lot of the surplus civil servants in the shift. It may be a government plan to ditch a lot of them when they do move out.

Mr. Angus: Just reclassify them.

Mr. McKessock: Someone asked me the other day how the civil service got so large. I said, "It is impossible to fire them. If one doesn't do his job, the government hires another one to see that he does."

I would like to make the suggestion that if they would like to move the Ministry of Agriculture and Food out, maybe they would move it into the Dundalk, Harriston or Palmerston area. All these areas are good farming areas, and I think they would make an ideal spot for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to present some of my views and comments and I thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Reed: There is nobody on that side so we will give you a hand, John.

Mr. Lane: Thank you very much.

Mr. Reed: Your friends are over here.

An hon. member: John for minister.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the Throne Speech debate of the fourth session of the 30th Parliament of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Roy: Make it good.

Mr. Lane: I think the Throne Speech was the best ever—certainly the best in my years as a member of this government.

Mr. Mancini: That is what you said the last time.

[9:45]

Mr. Lane: Well, it is better this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity this session to express my appreciation to you and your assistants for the very fair and efficient way in which you run the business of this House on a day-to-day basis. Although your task is often very difficult, I have always known you to be very fair. I thank you for a job well done.

Many items in the Throne Speech are very important, especially in the troubled times we find ourselves living in today. Perhaps the most important item in the long term is the steps being taken to strengthen Confederation. I think the Forum on Canadian Destiny to be sponsored by this government in June of this year could indeed be the mechanism to weld this country together and do much to shape its future.

Each and every one of us must make a very strong commitment to our communities and to our country. We must be prepared to take a little and give a lot to build a strong nation. If we in Ontario, the greatest province within Confederation, set an example of fairness and stability, we can show other provinces within Confederation that in our province personal success is attainable for all those who are willing to make a fair contribution. We must be sure each citizen has an opportunity to participate fully in all the aspects of life in this province.

I believe that if our people attend the Forum on Canadian Destiny showing this type of an example and determination to have one nation, a strong and democratic society, this attitude and this type of leadership from this province can go a long way in solving the problem of separation and other major crises that face this country today.

Mr. Angus: You really don't believe that, do you?

Mr. Lane: Unemployment is at a very high level today and we must do everything we can to get as many of our people off the unemployment lists as possible. However, we must remember there is a very fine line or a very fine balance between inflation and unemployment. If we are to help the unemployed without an increase in inflation, we must balance our economy on that very fine line.

The concern expressed in the Throne Speech about occupational health and safety of the working men and women of this province is a concern we all feel very deeply for. I am glad to see the mechanisms that are being developed to improve this situation.

I also think the provisionary period for new drivers of automobiles will save many lives and prevent much painful injury. I am sure when we see the final report from the select committee on highway safety there will be other recommendations to improve safety on the highways, because we all know there have been many needless deaths and much injury. I hope that in the future measures will be taken to prevent these tragedies and keep them to a minimum.

The concern expressed about the need for assistance to small business is very timely. Small business is having a very difficult time today competing with the giants in industry. The small businessman and the farmer have been the backbone of this country over the years. I am pleased to see special mention was made in the Throne Speech of both these very important groups of people.

I was glad to see the multicultural character of our province highlighted. Of course, my interest has increased, and it has always been a very special interest to me, by the reference to helping children with special needs and to benefits to improve the lot of our senior citizens. I think that the Throne Speech put special emphasis on these matters.

I could go on at great length about many interests to me and the people I represent. But I will be a bit selfish and discuss the one item which made this Throne Speech more important to me than any other Throne Speech since I've been a member of this government, and that is the portion dealing with the setting up of a new ministry for northern affairs.

Mr. Angus: Why don't you leave that one alone?

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and many others in this assembly will recall I spoke on several occasions in the past two years about the great need for a ministry to serve the sparsely populated areas of the north. During the past summer I conducted a survey and sent out over 300 letters to municipalities, Indian reserves and many other organizations in northern Ontario. The return from this effort was excellent. Over 75 per cent of the replies were in favour of a northern ministry. In addition to the survey, I spoke on several radio programmes, met and spoke with a large number of organizations across the north and wrote many columns for newspapers on the matter. The fact of the cabinet shuffle last February brought about the appointment of the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) as the first Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Swart: That ought to kill it.

Mr. Lane: The Throne Speech sets out the reason why this new ministry is required and also confirms legislation for this ministry. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction, to say the least. I think this is an historic event for the people of the north and will at long last allow the people of the north an opportunity to really become involved in the political process and, hopefully, provide them with the same economic advantages as have been available to those living in other parts of this great province.

Mr. Makarchuk: Did you vote for Leo?

Mr. Lane: The Premier pointed out in a statement in the House on April 7, 1977, that the north comprised almost 90 per cent of the land area of this province and made a comparison that one could set France and Germany down in northern Ontario and still have room to spare.

Mr. Davidson: Page 4.

Mr. Lane: Many people in this province never have seriously thought about the great expanse of the country that northern Ontario includes and few realize that people living in Halifax are closer to Queen's Park than many people living in parts of northern Ontario.

Mr. Angus: In more ways than one.

Mr. Lane: It gives me a great deal of pleasure to have been the member to have brought the need to the attention of the government, and I'm sure that as we watch the result of this Ministry of Northern Affairs unfold, we will see the great benefits it can and will provide. I'm sure in the years to come we will look back and ask why we waited so long to provide this much needed facility.

Mr. Angus: How many years, John, how many years?

Mr. Lane: I was very surprised recently to hear the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Conway), he's not here tonight, say while participating in the Throne Speech debate that although a portion of his riding includes a part of Nipissing he did not want to receive any benefits from this new ministry. I find this statement very hard to understand, because I personally like this young man and I have a great deal of respect for him. I'm sure it can't be a matter of party politics, because on May 11, 1976, which is just pretty near a year ago, the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid), while I was making a speech in the House and talking about the ministry, got into a conversation with me, and I'll just read a little portion here:

"Mr. Lane: For this reason I projected the idea of a ministry of northern Ontario; something for those people in the north to relate to."

"Mr. Reid: That's a Liberal programme. You are stealing our programmes now."

"Mr. Lane: The member can support me. I'll be glad of his support. I think it's a good idea."

"Mr. Reid: We have been saying that for five or six years."

"Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue without interruption."

Mr. Samis: That is the best one.

Mr. Angus: That must be Jack Stokes.

Mr. Roy: Leave the Speaker out of this.

Mr. Lane: "Mr. Reid: I just want him to know someone is listening." Well, I thought I had the support of the people in the third party.

Mr. Davidson: Why don't you read the rest of it?

Mr. Angus: Not the Thunder Bay Chamber of Commerce, you didn't.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What would you know about Thunder Bay Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. Angus: They write me letters.

Mr. Lane: But listening to the member for Renfrew North the other morning I was really concerned to think that he didn't really

want his constituents who actually live in northern Ontario to receive any benefits from this ministry, and it's difficult to understand this, very difficult.

Mr. Roy: Are you happy with Leo Bernier as minister?

Mr. Lane: Sure, let's see how he performs.

Mr. Roy: That is what you think of the north.

Mr. Lane: I did expect this type of response from some of the members of the opposition.

Mr. Angus: Send him up new pages, John.

Mr. Lane: In fact, the records have shown that on several occasions while speaking on this very important matter in the chamber the leader of the official opposition and other members of that caucus have taken issue with me on this matter in a very negative way.

I would add that if each and every member of this House representing a northern riding is truly honest with himself he will admit that the people of the north need and deserve a ministry to deal with the many problems that are peculiar to the north. Any member expressing otherwise would be indicating a greater interest in being re-elected than providing positive facilities for the benefit of the people he represents.

I think it is very unfortunate, and I was very unhappy tonight to hear the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) condemning this new ministry without ever having had a chance for the ministry to try its wings and see what it can do for our people.

Mr. Germa: You know it is all politics.

Mr. Ferrier: Leo Bernier is in charge; that is enough.

Mr. Lane: I think it is unfortunate that the leader of the official opposition boast about having nine ridings in northern Ontario, and yet there wasn't any support at all, in any measure at all, to provide a very much needed facility for the people in the north to get involved in the political process and really have something to say about the future of this country. I think it's most unfortunate.

Mr. Angus: How about appropriate government, John?

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at some length about the very positive way matters of great importance have been dealt with in the Speech from the Throne. I will admit, however, that one item I hoped would be included, and a matter which I've promoted since I was first elected in 1971, was missing.

Mr. Angus: Nobody's listening to you, John.

Mr. Lane: That's an effort to equalize the price of gasoline and oil in the province of Ontario. Since it's not included in the Throne Speech, I'm introducing in a few days a private member's bill, which I hope will receive the support of all members of this assembly.

Mr. Davidson: Sinking lower and lower, John.

Mr. Lane: We in this province are all Ontarians and we should all receive equal treatment and opportunity. Yet in many cases towns and villages in the north, as well as elsewhere in this province, are paying 15 cents more per gallon of gasoline and 10 cents more for fuel oil than other people in the large urban areas.

Mr. Davidson: That was told to you last fall.

Mr. Lane: A car is a necessity in the north because many of the smaller areas do not have a good public transportation system and one must travel greater distances to get from point A to point B. Therefore we must burn more fuel accordingly. To have to pay more per gallon than our friends in large urban areas is an insult and a matter that I feel must be corrected.

Mr. Makarchuk: Throw the rascals out.

Mr. Warner: You had 34 years to do it.

Mr. Lane: I'm told by those who should know, that the oil companies are no longer making large profits.

Mr. Makarchuk: What? The Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) says they are.

Mr. Lane: Well, I'm told that they're not.

Mr. Angus: Who told you? The oil companies?

Mr. Lane: Well, my heart doesn't exactly bleed for those people—

Mr. Davidson: You said they should know.

Mr. Reed: Don't pay attention to them, John.

Mr. Lane: —but I have no quarrel with them making a reasonable profit.

Mr. Reed: They're biased, John.

Mr. Davidson: Reasonable!

Mr. Lane: However, I do believe they should average out distribution and other costs and be required to provide the same product to all the retail outlets in this province at the same price.

Mr. Davidson: What do you consider reasonable?

Mr. Lane: This does not prevent one company from charging a different price than another, because we all know that efficiency and other factors can have an overall effect on cost. It does not take away from the private enterprise system because it still leaves competition between distributors and retailers. I may choose to pay a few cents more because I like a certain brand of fuel or I like the service I get at a certain—

Mr. Makarchuk: It all comes out of the same spout.

Mr. Lane: —service station, but to pay 15 cents or more per gallon in some of these areas of the province over other areas is ridiculous. It's not only that Ontarians are not being treated equally—

Mr. Davidson: Great.

Mr. Lane: —but the tourist industry also suffers real damage. This industry could and should grow rapidly in the north. However, a would-be visitor to the north—

Mr. Davidson: Why do you support a two-price system then?

Mr. Lane: —looks at the distance that he or she must travel and takes into account the tremendous increase in the cost of fuel over the other areas and the planned holiday is likely to be spent elsewhere. This we cannot afford.

Mr. Davidson: You support a two-price system.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, while I have been dealing with the price of gasoline, I want to point out that the same applies to the cost of oil to heat homes and to supply heat to industries in the north.

Mr. Davidson: You still support a two-price system.

Mr. Lane: Not only is the weather colder in the north and the heating season longer, but in many cases the cost of fuel oil is much higher than in the large urban areas. This means that the cost of living is much higher for some in this province than for others. I again want to point out that we are all Ontarians and we should all receive the same consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for this opportunity provided for taking part in this debate. Thank you.

Mr. Davidson: Say that to your own party.

Mr. Samis: Talk to Taylor, John.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, let me say how pleased I am that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before you start, I hope that your colleagues in your own party will give you a better hearing than they gave the last speaker.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I guarantee you we won't.

Mr. McClellan: I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, how pleased I was that you were in the chair and how utterly and ruthlessly impartial you are and how much all of us on all sides of this House appreciate it.

Mr. Breithaupt: However.

Interjections.

Mr. McClellan: I want to speak in support of the amendment to the motion and I want, first of all, to spend a minute or two describing the riding that I represent, the riding of Bellwoods in the centre west end of downtown Toronto.

Bellwoods is the traditional reception area of Toronto. It's the area where new Canadians have always come—

Mr. Reed: It's the hot springs.

Mr. McClellan: —to make their first home in this country. I think Bellwoods has been the traditional first home for new Canadians in Toronto for probably 70 or 80 years, and it remains the same today.

If there's one thing that my constituents would want me to say and to argue for as vigorously as I can, it's for government policies which create jobs and give work to people. Because the people who live in my riding came to this country to work. They came to this country from Europe and Asia to escape economies that were unable to provide them with jobs that would give them a decent standard of living for themselves and for their children more particularly. That's why they came to this country; that's why they work in the toughest jobs, the most dangerous jobs in construction; and in factories

that, by and large, aren't unionized, are rather dangerous places to work and don't pay very well. But they came here to work and work is what they want. They don't like being pawns to ideologues on the government benches testing out their new-found enthusiasm for obsolete economic theories.

[10:00]

Darcy McKeough's newfound zeal for Milton Freedman's economic theories are leading us headlong into a depression and my constituents don't like being used as pawns in those kinds of foolish exercises. They expect government to stimulate the economy to provide jobs for people. They expect government to invest. They expect government, if necessary, to be an employer of first resort. They do not expect that a government will allow employment to reach the astronomical levels that it is approaching today. They don't expect a fraudulent anti-inflation programme like the one we have been saddled with; like the one the government has so enthusiastically adopted despite the fact that in the last few months inflation is back up at the level of 10 per cent—10 per cent, Mr. Speaker—and unemployment seems likely to match that hideous rate of inflation.

We are not prepared, in this caucus and in this party, to support a government that is willing to say to a budget as irrelevant as the federal budget of a few weeks ago—willing to say, in the face of such massive unemployment and such real suffering in ridings such as mine where the unemployment rate among construction workers is approaching 30 per cent—that this is "heavy medicine." I believe that was the Treasurer's phrase.

In the body of my speech, I wanted to address myself to a particular concern of mine and many of my colleagues. In December, 1976, I believe, on the last day of the last session, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) tabled the report of the interministerial committee on residential services. That report contained a condemnation of Ontario's social service system more savage than anything one could imagine. Over the years we have not spared the resources of vituperation in describing the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Yet, I doubt that any of us, in our most truculent moments, have ever approached the kind of condemnation of Ontario's social service system that was delivered up by the ministry's own staff, by the deputy minister and by senior civil servants from a number of ministries.

The kind of chaos in Ontario's social service system that the interministerial report revealed is almost unimaginable. In the field of child care, we are told that in any of a dozen residential programmes spread among three different ministries, where a kid goes is purely a matter of chance. Whether a kid goes into the child welfare system; whether a kid goes into the health system; whether the kid goes into the correctional system—is purely a matter of chance. The family court in this province has, in the last year and a half, completely by-passed the existing social service system and has been placing children without reference to the existing social service system because of the degree of dislocation and dysfunction within the social service system.

The combined bureaucracy is simply grotesque: Some six ministries administering some 26 pieces of legislation over some 50 different bureaucracies producing almost, at random, 24 residential service programmes. The ministries combined spend some $600 million without the slightest idea of what it is they are purchasing or what benefit those dollar expenditures give to the people of this province, and the real harm is obviously spelled out in the report in terms of what happens to the recipients of service. I believe my colleague from Peterborough (Ms. Sandeman) will be addressing herself to the needs of senior citizens. I want to talk just for a few minutes about child care services in Ontario, because that was what was addressed in the Speech from the Throne.

We were offered in the Throne Speech what was purported to be a major reform in response to the revelations of the interministry report. We were offered three components to that report—the transfer of all child welfare services into one mini-ministry within Community and Social Services; something called local children's services committees; and, somewhere in the dim distant future, a reform of legislation described as the omnibus children's bill.

First, I want to express the most profound apprehensions about the prospect of transferring all services to children to the Ministry of Community and Social Services. There is virtually nothing in the rather wretched history of that ministry that gives us the slightest bit of confidence in its capacity to absorb so many vital child care services.

They have, in fact, done a rather disastrous job with what they have already. The mental retardation programme has not been a success. The attempts at normal community living for the retarded have not been a success, and there is no reason to believe that they have the slightest capacity as a ministry to deal with the introduction of all child welfare

services. We are pleased with the appointment of Judge Thomson. We think he is a good choice, but we maintain those reservations and apprehensions about the capacity of the ministry to absorb so many services.

Aside from the question of the organizational transfer, the rest of the promises in the Throne Speech are remarkably vague. Not a shred of detail has been provided with respect to the omnibus children's legislation, so we have absolutely no idea what it is that the government is proposing to do by way of rationalizing the 10 or 12 pieces of legislation that now govern the provision of services to children. And we don't have a clue—not a single, solitary clue—as to what they are talking about when they use the phrase "local children's services committees." There is not a shred of description, not a glimmering of a clue what it is that they are talking about.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that they don't know. They are flying by the seat of their pants. They are engaged in what is, I am sure, for them a very pleasant exercise in public relations. They have appointed, as a government, a new and rather plausible minister who has in turn appointed a young and rather plausible assistant deputy minister, and on the strength of that they have issued their April policy statement, as promised in the Throne Speech, saying that they are going to solve the chaos in child welfare services through the device of the omnibus children's bill and the local children's services committee without having the slightest clue what it is that they are talking about.

I am afraid that nothing short of a radical restructuring of Ontario's social service system is going to address itself to the kinds of problems that the residential services report reveals. It is not going to be sufficient to tinker with bits and pieces. The organizational transfer itself simply offers the promise of warehousing all of the chaos in child welfare in one great, rather Kafka-esque, central bureaucracy. It does nothing about addressing itself to the real problem.

We should keep in mind what the object of the exercise is.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The member for Kitchener is hired.

Mr. Foulds: What's that, the odd couple over there?

Mr. Warner: Which one is Felix?

Mr. Reed: There is nothing like being here to listen to an orator.

Mr. McClellan: The object of the exercise is to make it possible to provide preventive social services at the community level. It's not sufficient to deal as Ontario has been doing for as long as the ministry has existed. It's not sufficient to deal with family breakdown once it's occurred. We need to put in place a social service system that addresses itself to providing services to families and individuals before they break down, before their children come into care, and before senior citizens are forced to suffer the indignity of unnecessary institutional incarceration.

There are a number of options, a number of possibilities, a number of models, which have already been developed and tested in other jurisdictions, and even here in our own country. I wanted to spend a minute or two outlining to you, Mr. Speaker, what might have made sense by way of an alternative in the policy statement entitled, Special Services for Children.

In 1969, the Commission on Emotional and Learning Disorders in Children issued its report—that is, some eight years ago. They presented to us a clear and detailed model of how a government might go about restructuring the social service system so that it was capable of providing preventive social services and so that it was capable of providing services to individuals and families before breakdown occurred. I want to remind the House of what was suggested eight long years ago.

The CELDIC report called for an absolutely fundamental reorganization of social service by locating the responsibility for planning and delivering social services at the local community level. They proposed that this would be done through the establishment of a community services board at the local level, which would promote, plan and develop in co-ordination the establishment of a comprehensive network of services at the local community level, which would establish priorities for the development of services and which would have the jurisdiction and authority over the distribution of public funds. Services under the CELDIC model would be delivered through community service centres. Such centres would be established in areas of between 25,000 and 50,000 population.

The community service centres would combine at the point of delivery at the local community level all of the essential services which are required in a modern society. These are services which must be provided not as philanthropic gestures but as matters of social rights and on the basis of being social util-

ities as essential to survival as roads or electricity or running water. Those services would include counselling for individuals, family counselling, addictions counselling, child protection, unmarried parent counselling, public health nursing, public health social action programmes, foster and adoption home-finding programmes, group home care, homemaker services, home nursing services and social services to the courts and to the schools and to hospitals and to the correctional system.

[10:15]

Through these community centres, they would provide personnel to maintain necessary social services to schools, hospitals, mental health facilities and family physicians. They would operate and supervise group homes, in-patient facilities for children and the aged, foster homes, boarding homes and day care. Instead of warehousing everything together at the centre in the way this government is seeming to do, the CELDIC report suggested that what makes sense is to integrate services at the local community level, where people live; and bring them under the control of local communities and allow the local communities to participate in the planning of what's needed in their own neighbourhood in the delivery of services.

Mrs. Campbell: But not the financing.

Mr. McClellan: I know the member for St. George agrees that makes a lot more sense than to lump everything together in one great chaotic mess. That's a sensible alternative we had thought would be in the policy statement that was forthcoming. I can't tell you, Mr. Speaker, how surprised and disappointed we were that after two years of work since the interministry report was produced in April 1975, we were given only some indescribable, indefinable and completely ephemeral entity called the local children's service committee.

We conclude that the major thrust of the Throne Speech with respect to child care services is simple bunk. This government has no more idea of how to deal with the mess in children's services today, in April 1977, than it did in April 1975 when it first received the interministry report. And as the minister said, most surprisingly of all, they are now entering a period of consultation with municipal governments, with social agencies and, I suppose, with whoever will tell them how they are to get out of the mess they are now in.

I have talked to people in the court, in the children's aid societies and in municial government, and not one of them has the slightest idea what it is that the government wants them to consult about. How can you consult about something which is not defined, which is not described, which is simply called a local children's services committee and which somehow is going to be bounced out into the air like a basketball, without even the shape of a basketball?

It's absolutely absurd, and yet the minister is saying that he is going to enter into a period of intense consultation, beginning almost immediately—within the next week or two—and the social service community is going to respond to this major initiative from the government in the Speech from the Throne, with respect to children's services. It is such patent nonsense that it surprises me that there was an expectation that anybody at all would be deceived. Nobody is deceived. Nobody is fooled for a second that this government is any closer to a solution than it was two years ago.

We are disappointed that the government did not take a concrete option, such as that presented in the CELDIC report and put it forward as a sensible, coherent, workable, practical and plausible alternative to the mess that exists in social services today.

The CELDIC option is not the only option. The Seebohm committee in Britain in the late 1960s presented an alternative way of reorganizing social services so that they can be integrated at the local community level. The Seebohm option differs from the CELDIC option only in that the functions described as vested in the community services board, they vest in local government within a municipal social service department. That, too, is a valid option.

It makes sense to empower local government with the responsibility, and the resources, the capacity and the backup support and consultation, to provide a comprehensive system of social services. That, if I may say, is an option that I lean towards rather strongly myself. It makes a lot of sense to locate the responsibility for preventive and personal support services and family support services with municipal government.

Yet that option was not presented either, although there was some kind of a vague suggestion that the local children's services committee will somehow, in some strange and mysterious and ephemeral way, have something to do with regional government. But we have no idea how.

Are they talking about a board of health-like structure, or are they talking about a committee of the municipal council, or are

they talking about an advisory committee to regional government, or are they talking about a committee that is made up of municipal representatives and board of education representatives and social agency representatives, or are they talking about anything at all? We cannot tell. It's a great shame, because the disruption of social services in this province is virtually complete. As I said before, it will not suffice simply to tinker with what now exists. It has to be transformed in a fundamental kind of way, and I doubt very much if this government will ever have the capacity to do that.

Let me conclude firstly by saying that we intend in this caucus to pursue these items as vigorously as we can when we are not quite so constrained by the clock, in the estimates and in the debates on the bill, because we are convinced that this major initiative in the Speech from the Throne is in fact very little indeed. And we intend to talk a great deal about it in this session.

Secondly, I would like, if I may, to make a few comments about the Workmen's Compensation Board. No instrument or agency of government, Mr. Speaker, causes so much pain and so much distress to the constituents of the riding of Bellwoods as the Workmen's Compensation Board. I said at the beginning that my constituents by and large worked in construction and by and large are new Canadians. They suffer a toll of industrial accidents that I doubt is equal in very many other ridings except perhaps those in the Sudbury basin. And I think it is fair and accurate to say that within the constituency of Bellwoods there is barely a family which has not had a close member or a close friend injured in an industrial accident and had some dealings, therefore, with the Workmen's Compensation Board.

I don't know if I can convey to you, Mr. Speaker, the kind of scandal that the Workmen's Compensation Board represents, for example, in the Italian community in the west end of Metropolitan Toronto. It is a simple disgrace and there is no reason why anybody in the province of Ontario needs to tolerate that kind of arrogant and callous and brutal treatment from an agency of government.

I am not simply engaging in rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the basis now of almost two years' experience in my constituency office, day after day, week after week, with people coming in talking about being victimized by the Workmen's Compensation Board. And I have enough material in my own case load that I can validate that charge to the satisfaction, I think, of anybody in this House. This is not simply a matter of partisan rhetoric.

Mr. Warner: All the minister does is defend them.

Mr. McClellan: It is a matter that conjures up the deepest anger and personal feeling.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are a free-loader.

Mr. McClellan: I could go on, Mr. Speaker, to describe case after case after case of injured workers who have been treated in the most shabby and unbelievable way by the Workmen's Compensation Board. As with social services, I doubt that the tinkering is even worthwhile engaging in. As long as the adversary system of the Workmen's Compensation Board exists employers will be pitted against employees, the board will be playing one off against the other. It is now two years since the rates were raised? Perhaps the member from Riverside can recall how long it has been?

Mr. Bounsall: June, 1975.

Mr. McClellan: Since June, 1975, the workmen's compensation rates have not been raised. At the same time the board has an unfunded liability of some $400 million.

It is, in a sense, the other side of the same coin, because the board is unwilling to impose adequate rates on companies within this province; and that gets reflected in every single case that one takes to the board, that kind of mean and petty seeking to protect the rates for the corporations.

We are faced with a kind of administrative incompetence within the Workmen's Compensation Board that is absolutely staggering. I had one constituent who, through a fault of the Workmen's Compensation Board, received an overpayment, in January, 1976. In July, 1976, the Workmen's Compensation Board decided to recover the overpayment, with no warning and no notice. This man was on temporary total disability; his cheque was suddenly cut off. He was then left to fend for himself, with no explanation and no notice and no warning, for a month.

We intervened and had his cheque restored. Then from the period of July, 1976, until January, 1977, his cheque was fouled up on every single pay period—every single pay period. We intervened every single pay period, with officials from one end of the Workmen's Compensation Board to the other; finally to the chairman and finally to the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson).

From July to January, every single pay period was fouled up. Finally the minister intervened and he was paid for two consecutive pay periods on time; and then it started again and it remains so to this day.

They are seemingly incapable of dealing with routine administrative matters. I see the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle) sitting opposite, who was the Minister of Community and Social Services. He will know that you do not recover an overpayment by docking somebody the entire amount of their social assistance cheque. He would never do that in the Ministry of Community and Social Services when he was minister, and he never did. It defies logic, it defies common sense, it defies humanity.

He also knows that it it not conceivable, even in the Ministry of Community and Social Services, for a payment on an individual constituent or client to remain fouled up for six, seven, eight consecutive months. Yet this is not unusual at the Workmen's Compensation Board, this is not an untypical story. Every one of us in this House can give, probably dozens, dozens of examples of absolutely identical situations. It defies analysis, it defies understanding.

I see by the clock that I have run out of time. I just want to say that only a universal accident and illness insurance scheme, as has been advocated by this party, addresses itself to the problems of injured workers in this society and this community. We look for no hope of reforming the Workmen's Compensation Board, other than through the introduction of universal accident and illness insurance.

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Have you completed your remarks?

Mr. McClellan: I have completed my remarks.

On motion by Mr. Sargent, the debate was adjourned.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Kerr, the House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 12, 1977

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Burr, Mr. McKessock, Mr. Lane, Mr. McClellan 361

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Sargent, agreed to 390

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Kerr, agreed to 390

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Porth Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
Maeck, L. (Parry Sound PC)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)

Ontario

No. 11

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, April 14, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

LAND SPECULATION TAX EXEMPTION

Hon. Mr. Welch: A few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, following the decision of the public accounts committee to recommend to the House that the committee be relieved of its scrutiny of the exemption under the land speculation tax provided to Ronto Development and that a select committee be appointed to continue that work, there were some discussions among the usual channels of the parties in the House concerning the implications such an additional committee would have on the management of the assembly's work load.

The rather elaborate but very clear timetables agreed to by the parties earlier this week and now posted indicate the concerns we have had about making the new rules and structures work for members on all sides. Earlier, in fact, the House passed a motion supporting the enhancement of the role of standing committees by the avoidance of appointment of additional select committees wherever possible.

Since the House reconvened, and despite peripheral questioning of the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener), there has been no direct question or response dealing with the government's official reaction to the dormant report of the former public accounts committee.

Mr. Nixon: The questions were direct. The answers were peripheral.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Obviously our difficulty with that report stems from its failure either to acknowledge the all-party agreement on committee structures or to provide a means of examining the issue in a fair and balanced way, something which a judicial inquiry would indeed do.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) and I had been prepared to say in the House, had the matter been raised directly, that such a judicial inquiry would not be inappropriate. Today I am announcing that such a judicial inquiry will be held, to commence as soon as a justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario can be freed from other duties; and so the name of the judge should be known in a few days and announced to the House.

In addition, the terms of reference for the inquiry will specify that the justice complete the inquiry within 30 days of commencement, and will also specify that there be an inquiry into the granting of an exemption to Ronto Development under the provisions of The Land Speculation Tax Act, 1974, and particularly whether or not any undue or inappropriate influence was brought to bear from any source on the decision to grant that exemption.

Mr. Speaker, our position has been and remains that the government has nothing to fear or to hide in this matter, and that such an inquiry is the appropriate forum for a full, objective and non-partisan resolution of this particular matter.

Earlier today, the opposition House leader put to the new public accounts committee a motion calling for such an inquiry, and I understand the motion was supported by all committee members present.

Mr. Sargent: With qualification.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I gather that the concerns for management of House business have by now been appreciated by some members opposite who made and supported the proposal for a select committee earlier.

ESSEX COUNTY FRENCH SCHOOL

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will this afternoon be introducing legislation designed to ensure the construction of a French-language secondary school in Essex county.

The events leading to this legislation have unfolded over, of course, a long period of time. The high feelings and strong emotions that have been generating during the course of public discussion about this school are well

known, and I think there is no need for me to dwell at length upon them here today.

It is worth remembering, however, that it was as long ago as 1969 that the French language advisory committee of the Essex County Board of Education first recommended that a school be provided, and that this recommendation has been put forward consistently since that time. Further, the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario recommended in 1974 that the school be built.

Regrettably, however, we have come to a point where it is abundantly clear that the Essex County Board of Education has no intention of proceeding with the project of its own volition, now or in the foreseeable future.

This is why the legislation which we are introducing today has become necessary. We proceed with a sense of disappointment that legislation is required at all. It had been our earnest hope, indeed our expectation, that the board of education would itself have taken the initiative to build a secondary school for the French-speaking young people in its constituency, especially in view of the strong recommendations which have been made urging such a course of action.

However, Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of this legislation we recognize our responsibility, and we are proceeding with a firm sense of resolve and determination. As the Premier said in this Legislature last week, this province's commitment to our French-speaking citizens—to their educational language and social rights—is not to be diminished, regardless of events elsewhere in the nation.

This commitment is tied to our belief in an open, diverse and pluralistic society, strengthened by the vitality of our two founding peoples, and enriched by the presence of a multicultural milieu.

It perhaps could be viewed as ironic that this legislation affects an area of the province where there has been a French presence and tradition stretching back through most of our history.

This legislation that I am presenting today is simple and direct. It deems that the board of education has passed a resolution to construct a school to accommodate 750 French-speaking secondary school students and it directs the board to proceed, within 30 days, to select a site and to appoint an architect and other persons required for the purposes of constructing the school. The Act further directs that the board shall proceed forthwith to have the school built, following the normal procedures which affect all school construction projects in this province.

The Act further provides that if the board fails to proceed in the manner directed in the bill, the government itself can proceed to have the school built. However, it is our sincere wish and expectation that the school board will move ahead, expeditiously and in good faith, to follow the wish of this Legislature and demonstrate a positive sense of leadership, which can be the starting point for a return to harmonious relations throughout Essex county.

For the sake of all concerned, I am sure that all members of this Legislature will give rapid and unanimous approval to this legislation as evidence of our united commitment to the rights of our French-speaking citizens, not only in Essex county but throughout Ontario as well. Nothing short of this, in the view of this government, would be appropriate if we are earnest in our stated wish to improve educational opportunities for our francophone students, and further to strengthen harmonious relations between French and English-speaking citizens wherever they may live in the province of Ontario.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lewis: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Apart from expressing accord with the minister's statement, may I draw to your attention, sir—and to that of the minister and thank him for it—the first very full compendium we have received, as required under the new orders of the House, as background information from the minister. It is much appreciated; I hope it becomes practice.

Mr. Riddell: You guys are really getting into bed over there.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that's part of the new rules we are operating under; thank you very much.

Mr. S. Smith: They've had seven years to collect this information.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring the assembly up to date on the actions I have taken, as Minister of Health, to safeguard the psychiatric health care rights of Ontario residents.

First, I have now asked the Ontario Council of Health to make a complete review of all adult mental health services in the prov-

ince, to determine the range of services now offered, their distribution, accessibility and overall quality, and the relationship to children's mental health services; and, further, to make recommendations for the future development of adult mental health services.

This is a broad mandate, but I am hopeful that it will be possible to release a discussion paper containing the council's findings and recommendations for general public discussions by March 31, 1978.

This, I must make clear, is in addition to the review I asked the council, last month, to undertake of The Mental Health Act, with specific reference to the rights of involuntary paients, the right of a patient to receive or to refuse treatment, the confidentiality of patient information, special requirements applying to minors, responsibilities of non-medical staff, management of patients' or of former patients' estates, possible immunity of a psychiatric facility and its staff from liability in respect to injury or damage caused by a patient.

This is a major undertaking, as the assembly will realize. It would be unrealistic to expect the government to be in a position to submit legislative proposals for a complete revision of The Mental Health Act in less than two years. Nevertheless, two years is a long time. Accordingly, I intend to introduce, for the assembly's approval, proposals for interim changes on specific aspects of The Mental Health Act where and when these appear to be matters of urgency.

I think it will be clear from what I've said that I recognize room for improvement exists in our present mental health services. Nevertheless, I think it would be appropriate to remind members of the considerable progress made over the past 15 to 20 years.

Previously, mental health services were almost exclusively confined to a comparatively small number of psychiatric hospitals in Ontario. Over that period, however, we have been successful in having the services made more widely available in general hospitals across the province. By doing so we have moved these services much more fully into the main stream of health services generally. Having gone from psychiatric hospitals to general hospitals, we are now looking at community-based services involving workshops, living arrangements, counselling and rehabilitation services.

A considerable number of agencies and groups have parts to play in community-based mental health programmes. These include the Canadian Mental Health Association, social service agencies, public health departments at the municipal level and the police, as well as the psychiatric units of local general hospitals. I foresee, in fact, that an increasing proportion of our future effort in mental health care will be in the area of community-based services.

[2:15]

To speak specifically now of Metropolitan Toronto, an up-to-date assessment of the mental health services in Metro has been undertaken by a task force on psychiatric care in co-operation with the Canadian Mental Health Association. This report should be available early this summer.

An attempt will be made in this report to identify the total mental health care system in Metro Toronto, both in its formal and informal approaches, and also to identify whatever gaps appear to exist in these services and to make recommendations.

The task force preparing the report is made up of mental health professionals, representatives of social agencies, and representatives of citizens' groups and individuals who have been meeting to discuss their concerns and perceptions of mental health services.

Mr. Foulds: When are you going to do something in Thunder Bay?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The House will also be aware that criticism has been levelled at the physical facilities at Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital and Whitby Psychiatric Hospital. Having personally inspected the Whitby hospital shortly after becoming Minister of Health, I have to confirm that many of the older buildings at both hospitals are inadequate for modern types of treatment.

However, since the Queen Street Mental Health Centre is now in the final stages of complete rebuilding and renovation, 15 consulting firms have been invited by my ministry to submit proposals for a role study and master programme development applying to all three facilities—Lakeshore, Whitby and Queen Street.

This study is to cover clinical services, teaching and research requirements, and all the necessary support services. Further, this study will outline the relationship that should be established among these three hospitals, as well as their inter-relationship with the psychiatric units of general hospitals in their respective catchment areas.

The submissions we have received have already been reduced to a short list now being considered by an internal steering committee, and I expect to announce the successful proposal later this month.

I would ask the assembly to regard this statement as a progress report. I believe, however, that the actions I have outlined will leave no doubt that I share the view that mental health care represents an aspect of the province's total health care system needing careful attention at all times.

Mr. Foulds: When are you going to do northwestern Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

DISMISSAL OF MALE NURSE

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Health, if I may. Has he directed the administrator of the Etobicoke General Hospital that he would wish him to reinstate Mr. Honsberger, the nurse who commented on the waste and maladministration, in his mind, of the hospital, within the context that the minister does not wish people in the health sector to be punitively dealt with when they feel, in the public interest, they should bring such matters to public attention?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think I made it clear in response to questions put to me in recent days by various media and particular groups that certainly I want people involved in the health care system to feel free to state their concerns. I would hope that, in the first instance, the hospital boards and administrators would operate their institutions in such a way that they would be receptive to those concerns, and where agreement exists on the need for amendments to procedures or whatever, that action will be taken there.

As far as my own office is concerned, I've again tried to make it clear that my door is open—however you want to take that figurative expression—and we'll always see to it that we follow up on any complaints or concerns. I have no authority, as the member knows, under The Hospitals Act, to order a reinstatement. Mr. Honsberger is an employee—a former employee at this point—of the Etobicoke General Hospital. Staff in the ministry were in touch this morning with the administrator, who indicated he felt he had other reasons than the one indicated in the letter, but I am satisfied that Mr. Honsberger has available to him a grievance procedure to follow due to their collective agreement.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister not realize that if the administrator of the hospital is able to get away with this punitive firing in a letter he himself sets out, based on statements in violation of some hospital directive, press code, or whatever else it may be described as, then nurses all over the province who may legitimately want to bring to public attention concerns they have about hospital administration, such as the ONA has now done, will feel straitjacketed, will feel that there will be punitive actions taken against them?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, let me also again repeat something I have said a number of times since the ONA brief came out.

One of my concerns about that brief when it was initially published was that they were not specific. As you know—I am sure you have read it, Mr. Speaker, as most members have by now—they talked about a problem in northwestern Ontario, a problem in eastern Ontario, without being specific. And that was a criticism I had of it; I said I want to know where those problems are.

Mr. Deans: Now you know.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I don't want names of people—the informants, if you will—but I want to know, because I think really that it begs the validity of the whole report unless we know, unless they are prepared to tell us. There is no reason why, through the ONA, I need to have the names of nurses or nurses' aides or RNAs or whomever so long as they are prepared to work with us in a co-operative spirit. Now I repeat, Mr. Honsberger was not an employee and is not an employee of my ministry. I have no authority to order a reinstatement.

Mr. Lewis: You closed hospitals, I remind you, without authority. You can reinstate a man.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Well, I didn't realize the member had also become a Supreme Court justice.

Mr. Mackenzie: That doesn't help very much.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: But I am satisfied that the gentleman in question does have sufficient grievance procedures available to him.

Mr. Philip: I wonder if the minister would not agree that the grievance procedure could likely take as much as six months; that two other nurses are presently, at this very moment possibly, before their hospital boards or before their hospital administration on a

similar kind of problem; and is it not time that the minister took some specific action to ensure professionals in the health field, when they are speaking out as professionals—as members of professional organizations—that punitive action will not be taken against them?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: This is why I made the point that certainly through the associations on this specific concern the avenues are open. But they are employees of individual hospital corporations whose boards set the terms and conditions of employment, those which are not otherwise covered by collective agreements. I have no authority to intervene and to dictate terms and conditions of employment. If there is a term or condition of employment—

Mr. Cassidy: You are the Pontius Pilate of the health field.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Pardon me, if you would just listen for once.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have no authority to intervene in those terms and conditions of employment, but I am, as I say, satisfied that this procedure is there for grievance.

Now I do not know that it would take six months; I would be very concerned that it should not take six months. I would hope that it could be dealt with as soon as possible, and I will follow up on that.

Mr. Cunningham: Supplementary: Notwithstanding the fact that the minister may not have the legal authority to dictate to the boards of health or to hospitals that such pervasive activities not be considered, would he not consider it his moral obligation to write to the boards of health and to the hospitals and indicate, as the Minister of Health for the province of Ontario, that this kind of situation disturbs him greatly?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, let me inform the member that the boards of health do not run the hospitals. They are boards of those particular corporations.

Mr. S. Smith: He didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have already indicated that we have in fact this morning been in touch with that particular corporation to follow up on the press reports. So that, yes, our interest and our concern about it has already been conveyed.

METRO CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Treasurer, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Given the general state of unemployment, and given the Treasurer's previous intermittent interventions with the Ontario Municipal Board on other matters, would he be prepared to convene a meeting among the Ontario Municipal Board members and all of the mayors of the various municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto, to bring to bear the pressure of the provincial government, or the good offices of the provincial government, to free for immediate construction two projects: One, the series of housing projects which have been discussed before in this Legislature, part of Metroplan, and the other, the construction of the light rapid transit line through Scarborough; which two projects together would amount to something like 6,500 man-years of work immediately available?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would not. The Ontario Municipal Board reports to this Legislature through the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the question might properly be put to the Attorney General.

Mr. Lewis: He has answered it.

Mr. Nixon: That's what you said last week when we asked the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Attorney General has already indicated that he has been in touch with the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board on the former matter. It seems to me that the council of Metropolitan Toronto in its constituent parts will, in their own good time, make up their mind whether they want or don't want some form of rapid transit, and at that point the Ontario Municipal Board will become involved. I don't think they have any involvement in it at this moment.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister not feel, given the present economic circumstances, that either he—or perhaps I should have directed it right to the Premier—should perhaps intervene, when the project will eventually proceed anyway? The jobs could be available now; these roadblocks make very little sense in the context of the unemployment figures.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not aware of any roadblock in the construction of the rapid rail, other than that Metropolitan Toronto have not yet decided to do it. I don't see it as part of my job, frankly, to tell Metropolitan Toronto what they should or should not do.

The Leader of the Opposition may see it that way over there, we don't on this side.

Mr. Sargent: How about the Spadina Expressway?

Mr. Hodgson: Respect your leader, Eddie.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What was that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Have you told them about the Spadina Expressway, Bill?

BARRIE ANNEXATION PROPOSAL

Mr. S. Smith: Now that the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, has decided he will no longer tell Metro Toronto what to do, perhaps he could say something about the plan for the south of Barrie.

Is the Treasurer aware of the existence of a report, submitted by the major developer to the south of Barrie, in which there is illustrated a land-use plan very similar, almost identical, to the land-use plan submitted by the city of Barrie in their annexation report? And is the Treasurer aware that the report of the developer had as its engineering consultant the same firm that in fact produced the Barrie annexation report?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The answer to both questions is no, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bullbrook: And yet you intervened.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, now that the Treasurer has heard this, would he care to comment on the Barrie annexation study, on page 90, where they suggest that because the developers employed consultants to advise on the suitability of lands to be developed, that the Barrie annexation study recommends that that major land assembly in itself is excellent evidence as to why the annexation should take place, on precisely those lands? Does he have any comment at all on that particular aspect of the annexation report?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Are you going to continue to let the developers do the planning, just like they did in Norfolk—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: Let the developers do the planning.

Mr. S. Smith: I have another supplementary.

Mr. Good: You are really involved there, Darcy. Why are you promoting the annexation then?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: There wil be another royal commission there.

Mr. S. Smith: Since the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) has still not seen fit to let us have the letter that went from his food lands division to the Treasurer's department, even though he has that letter, would the Treasurer kindly table the letter in question, regarding the use of agricultural land south of Barrie?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith: Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary to the provincial Treasurer, since his letter to the OMB was based upon and included a projected population figure of 125,000 by the year 2011, and since that time the new study, Ontario's Changing Population, is projecting a figure of 50,600 by the year 2001—a discrepancy, now, of 75,000 in his own reports—why is he prepared to allow this kind of annexation to proceed, on false premises, chewing up at least 9,000 acres of prime agricultural land in the process?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I don't necessarily, nor have we accepted this policy. I presume the member is referring to—I think it is the Barnard report.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We haven't studied that, nor has it been accepted, on this side of the House at any rate, as some sort of manna from heaven.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the government commissioned it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But if in fact it is, we still would say—

Mr. Foulds: Manna from McKeough.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that whatever growth there is to be in this province—and we happen to think that there will be some growth in this province and we are going to do our best—

Mr. Lewis: You sure do, all in one place; not in the north, not in the east, but always here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, not always in Metropolitan Toronto; some of it will be in Barrie, whether the member likes it or not.

Mr. Lewis: Well by way of supplementary, to be specific—

Mr. Speaker: No, that was a final supplementary.

[2:30]

OHC OCCUPANCY POLICY

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Housing: Has it always been the policy of the OHC to evict people once their children grow up and they no longer, therefore, qualified as having dependants? Has this been a policy over the years or is it something new?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, that never has been the policy, and it is not the policy at this time to evict tenants once their children have grown up.

Mr. Lewis: It's to evict them before they grow up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some people never grow up.

Mr. Reid: Why are they all in one spot?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The policy is, that if a family is—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We'd probably evict the member for Grey-Bruce just on general principle.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. minister just ignore the interjections?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. The policy is that if a family is occupying a unit in a family housing project, if it is a single parent, and if the children of that single parent have grown up and left home, then we would look at the eligibility of that particular tenant in that facility. If they are under the age of 60 and in good health and are employable, then they may well be asked to find accommodation elsewhere so that that particular facility would be available for someone with children who would qualify to occupy the premises.

It is not the policy to evict when the children have reached a certain age or are no longer in school, as was suggested quite erroneously in the article in the Toronto Star today.

Mr. Bain: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell us then why the Timiskaming Ontario Housing authority evicts people who, when some of their children have left home, they say no longer qualify for the present unit they're in, and they are told to leave without any attempt to find another unit, even though the people still have other children at home?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment with any degree of authority on what may be happening in that particular area, but I can say in general that what we try to do is make sure that we are not over-housing the tenants in the facilities. If a family is in a project where it requires three bedrooms, and as a result of a change in the makeup of the family perhaps it requires only two bedrooms, then we would attempt to relocate the people, if possible within an Ontario Housing project, into a smaller facility that would meet their needs, and house someone in the larger facility who could use that accommodation. To say that they're simply evicted, I find a bit strange. I've never had that proposal suggested to me before. We try to relocate them in a smaller unit.

Mr. Bain: It happens.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister, therefore, clear up the matter that was raised in the Toronto Star with regard to Mrs. Pitney and her family, and the statement made by one Laura Plescia, according to this report an information officer with OHC, who said that the Pitneys were being evicted and the lease wasn't being renewed, and who pointed out that there are a great number of families with young children who need accommodation more than a single person who has no young children, or children attending school. That seems to contradict the point the minister just made.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, again I cannot be responsible for what has appeared in the article. I have not spoken to that particular officer to know whether or not those were the words that she, in fact, used. However, I just simply reiterate that it is not the intention nor the policy of Ontario Housing to simply evict people.

I can take the time, if it is desirable, to comment upon the situation that was reported in the paper. I won't go into too great detail, but in general the understand-

ing was that we were talking about a hypothetical situation that did, in fact, involve this particular tenant. In this particular case, the understanding that we had—when I say we, I mean OHC—was that the two sons were going to leave the project and that, in fact, the lady would be a single tenant in this particular unit, and she was advised, as I understand it, that she may not be eligible to be a tenant as a result of her particular circumstances, her age, her health and the possibility of her being able to work.

At the same time, it's my understanding that the tenant advised OHC officials that she was going to be leaving anyway, that she was getting married. The circumstances apparently changed, why, I don't know. But she is now not going to get married and, as a result, she will be remaining in that unit. She has not received an eviction notice. I understand as well that my officials will be contacting the individual who wrote the story in the Star to attempt to clear up this, I think, unfortunate misunderstanding.

LAND SPECULATION TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. Deans: I have a question for the Premier. With regard to the Ronto inquiry, is it the Premier's intention to place before the Legislature the terms of reference to be followed in the inquiry in order that they can receive perusal by and approval of the Legislature before the inquiry commences?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is the normal custom that a matter of this kind is determined by government. While I welcome the initiative of the standing committee and the very substantial change in approach, which I personally support, of moving from a select committee to what I think is a far more appropriate form, I would say with respect to the House leader of the New Democratic Party that I certainly have no objections at all to our House leader discussing with him, and with the House leader for the third party the proposed terms of reference. But I suggest with respect that we are talking here about something that is fundamental to the discharge of the responsibilities of government in this province—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and that the Lieutenant Governor in Council will pass an order in council which will establish the terms of reference. After this is done, if some members opposite have reservations and if they wish to express either disappointment or, I would expect, very frankly, rather total support to the wording of the terms of reference, they will have opportunities to do this. But I do point out to the House leader, and I'm not attempting to be controversial, that this surely—

An hon. member: Or provocative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no.

Mr. Makarchuk: Stop weaselling.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the hon. member for Brantford, if he is asking me, that the cabinet of this province will advise the Lieutenant Governor to sign an order in council which is part of our responsibility. It's as simple as that. So there's your answer. That's the way it should be done.

Mr. Lewis: Why do you say that?

Mr. Breithaupt: Without being provocative, as a supplementary, would it be possible to have those terms of reference made available before the order in council is passed so that if there are some reasonable changes that may come forward, they could be accommodated rather than have an order passed which might then not be fully satisfactory to all members?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'd be quite prepared to have our House leader discuss that in that we have had some suggested thoughts for a period of time.

Mr. Peterson: Give a few more supportive thoughts to the answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the hon. member is available—and I must discuss it with our House leader—tomorrow morning at, say, 9 o'clock, and if the House leader for the New Democratic Party is available, perhaps the three of them could have a look at this. I would like to get the order in council passed forthwith because we are more anxious perhaps than some members opposite, who want to go the select committee route and have this prolonged for weeks and weeks on end, to see this matter finally disposed of.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, just before the comments of the Premier go by, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you should be informed that the resolution to which he referred had a specific clause indicating that the select

committee should be established without delay and that it should have only six weeks to accommodate its purpose. I thought that that should be set clear before the point passed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order, just so that there is no misunderstanding of what I said, I said week after week, which could include six weeks. I would think a judicial inquiry—

Interjections.

Mr. Ruston: You're playing with words now.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —would take substantially less time. I would point out to the hon. member who, I understand, was responsible for the initial recommendations—

Mr. Mancini: That is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —in the select committee report that that recommendation was contrary to the general expressed intent of the new procedures we're to adopt in this House, that is, to avoid select committees if at all possible.

Mr. Good: You're sure avoiding them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I suggest that the route that has now been suggested, which we totally support, makes a great deal of sense and—it may come as a surprise to the Leader of the Opposition—we're ready.

Mr. Lewis: Ready for what?

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is getting into a debate. Is there a further point of order?

The hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: On a further point that the hon. Premier brought before us in his reference a moment ago, I'm sure he is aware that the agreement with reference to committees was that select committees should not be used except in matters of some importance. We happen to think this is a matter of importance whether he does or not.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Who is the leader over there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. former leader of the Liberal Party is opposed to having this form of inquiry, why doesn't he say so?

An hon. member: There's a better way.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He is the present leader, not the former leader.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, this is becoming a debate. It's out of order.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in response to the statement made by the Premier—I was going to say your leader, excuse me—by the Premier, who indicated that if I was opposed to this I should say so. Of course I think a royal commission is a good idea. I believe a select committee would be preferable, since this House referred it to the standing committee on public accounts. Surely that is the way that it should be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is strictly a difference of opinion.

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a supplementary question of the Premier. I may not have heard the statement correctly but the way that the statement was read in the House, as I understood it, no reference was made in the statement to where the justice will have the power to investigate the payment of $400,000 for undetermined services to one Mr. Ernest Goodman, as well as payments to consultants by the name of Hiram Walker, as well as payments to a fellow by the name of Reimer.

Mr. Speaker: Your question is?

Mr. Makarchuk: Are these matters going to be included in the terms of reference which will be investigated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think this can get into a prolonged debate.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes or no?

Mr. Nixon: You are aching for a debate on this. Let's have a debate on it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. Premier answer this question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's quite obvious you people have decided not to.

Mr. Nixon: Why have you ignored that resolution for two weeks?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I've been asked a question by the hon. member as to why we have ignored the resolution. As a matter of fact, that public accounts committee report really hasn't been before the House.

Mr. Nixon: It is printed in Order Paper No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on. You've changed your minds again. In answer to his question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: It is in Votes and Proceedings of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Flip-flop Nixon. You're a bigger flip-flop than your leader.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I would anticipate the terms of reference will be such that the public interests will be well served. I will not get into a word-by-word analysis of what may be in that order in council, but I can assure the members of this House, and my experience has been, that these terms of reference give the commissioner adequate power to do what needs to be done.

Mr. MacDonald: Not always.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: Recognizing, rightly or wrongly, that we're burdened with the Premier's government and that he has the right to govern—

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We are burdened with you.

Mr. Bullbrook: —in view of the fact that the traditional response isn't totally acceptable, and if I may say, in view of the fact that the terms of reference are totally deficient as far as one member is concerned—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a supplementary question?

Mr. Bullbrook: —is there any possibility of the Premier's broadening the traditional function of not taking it just to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but giving this whole House, in this minority situation, an opportunity to discuss openly the terms of reference, which are so important to us all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would only say to the hon. member for Sarnia, my experience here has been that he has never been reluctant to express his point of view on any significant issue;—

Mr. Bullbrook: Give us the opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —on sometimes insignificant issues he has not been reluctant to express his point of view. I'm just saying, and I'm not attempting to be difficult, that this is a responsibility the government must discharge. I have gone this far in suggesting that our House leader would be quite prepared to discuss with the House leader of the New Democratic Party, the eminent counsel—

Mr. Bullbrook: That's not good enough.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —learned in the law, House leader of the third party in this House, the proposed terms of reference.

Mr. Breithaupt: What a nasty thing to say.

Mr. Nixon: The first two engineered the thing in the committee. They should be able to deal with the terms of reference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have total confidence in his ability to express the point of view of the member for Sarnia, and I think, in terms of the traditional responsibilities of government, I have gone a fair piece.

FOREST FIRES

Mr. Reid: Maybe I can heat this debate up, Mr. Speaker, by asking the Minister of Natural Resources if he can give us a full report on what his ministry is doing in regard to the danger of extreme forest fires in northern Ontario this spring. Can he tell us specifically what steps he has taken, how many extra people will be involved in fire crews and what liaison he has had with the municipalities and their fire-fighting equipment in this regard?

[12:45]

Mr. Conway: He's got Leo flying the skies.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a statement tomorrow morning on that.

Mr. Reid: By way of supplementary, if I may, can I ask the minister if he is considering using high school students of perhaps grades 11, 12 and 13, particularly those who have indicated by their year's performance that they will be passing their year, as emergency firefighters in this situation?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I will make a statement tomorrow.

One thing I can assure the member is that we have $7 million more allocated to advance fire protection this year so that there will be more people trained, more equipment ready and more people in place than in previous years. The number of people used to fight fires depends upon the actual occurrence, as I am sure the member knows. At that time, I believe we have been quite willing to use people as we could get them to supplement the already trained staff. That certainly wouldn't exclude the young people the member mentioned.

Mr. Foulds: Do I take it that the statement tomorrow morning will include answers to the questions I raised about this matter last Thursday with the member's colleague, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle), and in the statement could the minister indicate what contingency plans he has for possible travel bans in the area?

Hon. F. S. Miller: There is no reference to that in the statement at the present moment. I think I adequately answered the question the member raised last week, which prompted me, in fact, to prepare a statement.

LINCOLN PLACE NURSING HOME

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, last week the member for Oakwood asked me if I was aware that since May 1976, staff of my ministry knew of complaints concerning charging practices to residents in Lincoln Place Nursing Home, yet had done nothing about it. Specifically, the member asked if I was aware the senior citizens in Lincoln Place Nursing Home were being charged for services they did not receive. Further, the member asked if I would investigate the situation and ensure the residents of the home were reimbursed.

I have investigated the situation and must thank the member for drawing it to my attention. It appears that through a misunderstanding the matter was not adequately addressed when first discovered by ministry staff in May, 1976. I can assure the member I will do everything possible to see this does not happen again.

A nursing inspector's report has confirmed a $10 a month charge for marking, mending and ironing of residents' clothes was being applied to all residents, not just those who used the service. The report also indicated a monthly telephone charge of $2.15 was also being applied to all residents, except for those who had their own phones and those who were bedridden.

I can advise the member that on March 31 a letter was sent to the home to say that effective immediately these general billings to residents must cease, and that all charges to residents must be accompanied by itemized statements. The letter also stated that care must be taken to bill only those residents using these services. Furthermore, the fiscal resources branch of my ministry is today sending people to the home to determine as best we can the extent of any overcharges that may have been made to residents.

I can assure the member that if there have been overcharges to residents, I will insist the residents be reimbursed by the home.

Mr. Grande: Would the minister investigate other private nursing homes to see whether that kind of thing that happened at Lincoln Place is happening also at those homes?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, all homes are regularly inspected by three types of inspectors: Those looking at nursing services, those looking at the physical care—we call them environmental inspectors, if you will—and fiscal. I can check and see if this is in fact the kind of thing that is covered in the inspection. It should be, because it is certainly covered in the regulations, as to what authority nursing homes have for additional charges.

PAN-AM GAMES

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. I am not sure if he is still in the chamber.

Mr. Conway: Send Segal out, it might be interesting.

Mr. Breithaupt: There's the possibility of an answer.

Mr. Mackenzie: To the Premier: The mayor of the city of Hamilton has indicated that the province of Ontario, as approved by the cabinet, has committed better than $17 million to the Pan-Am Games in Hamilton, based on a cost of some $50 million to $55 million. I want to know if this is a firm commitment; I want to know if the province will increase its commitment in the event that the costs for the 1983 project escalate; and I want to know to what extent the province would increase its commitment to the city of Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm going by memory; I think the mayor of the city in-

dicated, and the reports indicate, that the top capital cost would be in the neighbourhood of $50 million. It was requested that we share on a little different basis than that to which we have, by and large, agreed. The agreement is one-third from the province, one-third from the government of Canada and one-third from the municipality. I'm not sure in what form that one-third will be, that's not within our area of decision.

The mayor of Hamilton was very constructive on the suggestions we made, in terms of having some involvement on the part of this government, and perhaps the government of Canada, to assist in the planning and the development of the necessary physical plant. None of us want to see an escalation take place, but we're talking about a five-year period so one has to build in—and they have the $50 million figure—the potential for escalation. But I think we're all concerned that it be kept to approximately that amount of money and I am told that there is every likelihood it can be. I think with proper supervision this is possible. The mayor has indicated he would have on the committee representatives, perhaps from this government or people we might appoint; I'm not sure whether this understanding exists with the government of Canada or not.

I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that our limit is in that neighbourhood. I can't pin it down to, say $17 million or $17.5 million, I think it is still too early to determine that, but roughly within that amount of money, that that would be our limit; and I would be optimistic that it can be accomplished for that amount, including, then, the federal and the municipal share.

Mr. Mackenzie: Supplementary: I want to be sure, because this is a matter of some debate in the city of Hamilton right now. My understanding of what you've said is that if we're not able to meet that control requirement—and this is what's concerning the citizens of Hamilton—that this government's commitment is only to $17 million or $17.5 million.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had much experience in these matters, but if one establishes a pretty firm amount—and I'm sure the city will do the same thing; I would be surprised if the government of Canada doesn't do the same—if one has that outside figure, knowing a little bit about physical plant for sporting events, not necessarily as much about what is served at those events from time to time—

Mr. Conway: Ask the Attorney General.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it can be kept within that measure of control. For instance, on the Commonwealth Games in Edmonton, my best recollection, again, is that they are pretty well on target with respect to budget. I see no reason why this can't be accomplished for the Pan-Am Games in Hamilton. So for me to say yes, if it's up 10 per cent we will raise ours by 10 per cent, human nature being what it is that then encourages it; so I'm saying no. We're going to stand firm with our commitment, and if the other two participants do the same my guess is we can build a very adequate plant within that dollar amount.

LAKE ERIE CONTAMINATION

Mr. Mancini: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment: Is the minister aware of the spill that occurred in Lake Erie and was detected last Friday, stretching approximately six miles from Point Pelee to Leamington? Can the minister tell us what was the cause of that spill?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the spill. There is some difficulty in pinpointing exactly what the cause is. There are a number of assumptions. The main one seems to be that it is from some type of commercial vessel and that it may have been laying there for some months; since the ice has moved away from the area it is now obvious and is seen by the people in that area. There was some possibility that the Leamington sewage treatment plant may have been responsible. My officials assure me that is not the cause of the trouble.

Mr. Mancini: Supplementary: I would like to know from the minister if his ministry is involved in the clean-up operation; and is the ministry going to monitor for any environmental effects which might take place from this spill?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are involved with the federal Ministry of Transport. I believe there is also some US involvement here, as well, in the cleanup and retention of that spill; and of course we will be monitoring it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer has the answer to a question asked previously.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on April 5 I indicated with respect to a point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition that I would be tabling a compendium of background information regarding the move of OHIP to Kingston, and the head office of the Ministry of Revenue to Oshawa. I have today filed that with the clerk, together with a three-page covering memo.

ONTARIO MALLEABLE IRON

Mr. Moffatt: I have a question of the Minister of Labour: I would like to ask the minister, given the fact that the employees at Ontario Malleable Iron in Oshawa were locked out for well over a year and the company then ceased operation. Those employees have now been denied unemployment insurance benefits. Is there anything that the Labour ministry can do to aid those employees?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The Ministry of Labour has been involved with investigating the possible solutions to some of the problems which have been raised by this close-down of the plant. At this point of time I unfortunately don't have any very positive answers which I can provide for the member, because that investigation is going on at the present moment.

Mr. Moffatt: Would it be possible that the minister could use her good offices to request special assistance from the Unemployment Insurance Commission to those employees who have, through no fault of their own, been disqualified from receiving benefits because they have not worked, by nature of the lock-out, for the qualifying period?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I think that request has already been made, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, before my question, I know you would like to recognize that today is the birthday of the hon. member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham).

Mr. Conway: It is also the anniversary of the Titanic.

Mr. Speaker: Now the question.

PROVINCIAL CREDIT RATING

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Premier: I would like to ask the Premier—anticipating the answer—if an emergency situation would arise, does he have enough confidence in our credit rating to immediately go to the bond markets to raise some $300 million to $500 million?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not April 1, is it? Is he recognizing somebody else's birthday, or what? Do I have confidence in the credit of this province? Yes, I have great confidence in the credit of this province.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that I, along with about eight million other people in Ontario, feel that this government belongs to the people, not to the Conservative Party, and in view of the fact that hundreds of thousands of our people are desperately looking for jobs, I am asking the Premier to provide leadership, to tell us why he can't go to the bond market and get an issue of some $300 to $500 million and do a crash programme to provide jobs in this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This government is quite concerned about the employment situation in this province. One reason we have developed the credit rating we have—which the hon. member has come to recognize as being significant very recently—I can recall some of his observations about who cares whether we have a triple-A rating or not. Not too many months ago he made light of it—

Mr. Sargent: You haven't changed a bit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —well, the hon. member has, thank heavens. He has now changed his mind; that it is important. And one reason it is as important as it is is because we have handled the affairs of this province, due to some very excellent Treasurers, in a way that has given us this rating.

Mr. Ruston: A deficit for five years.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are anxious to deal with this problem, but I say with respect, going and borrowing $500 million at this moment doesn't really appear to be a logical answer to the present situation. And we might not have the credit rating.

Mr. Sweeney: You did it in 1975.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We didn't borrow in 1975.

Mr. Sweeney: Giveaway programmes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we didn't.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that we have hundreds of vacant plants in this province and there's a desperate need for hous-

ing, why can't the government do a crash programme on housing in this province to put people to work?

[3:00]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to have that question. We had a great programme to stimulate housing. We had a great programme to stimulate the automotive industry. Those people opposite poohpoohed it. Then voted against it. They went around this province—and today is once again like—

Mr. Breithaupt: No new cars were built.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —you know, the great conversion that's taking place. Today they would support that kind of thing. I think it's tremendous.

Mr. S. Smith: It stimulated some voters for you.

Mr. Nixon: You voted $600 million that election. Money for everybody.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

Mr. Dukszta: A question to the Minister of Health: In the context of the latest revelation of waste in hospitals, is the minister aware that one of the large unnecessary costs comes from the common practice in some hospitals in Ontario of routinely x-raying the opposite and unaffected limb where there has been trauma or injury to one limb in a child under the age of 16, whether or not there is a positive indication for the need for such an x-ray? If the minister is aware, what were the costs in 1976, or the current cost if it is known, of this practice to the taxpayer?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that that procedure is, in fact, carried out in every instance. I don't know if the member is in fact suggesting that it is carried out in every instance. I'll take it as notice and look into it, but it seems to me from what he said, it sounds like a judgemental thing again in a treatment situation.

Mr. Dukszta: Supplementary: How frequently does the minister review the standards of practice in technologically intensive medicine, in view of the minister's answer to my question during the last session regarding the cost of medical services, which indicates a growing trend toward channelling taxpayers' funds for technologically intensive medicine? How long has the minister been aware of this and similar practices, and is the minister prepared to reduce the abuse of the cost of technologically intensive medicine?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the member is well aware that there are a number of initiatives under way in the Ministry of Health—be it through local district health councils, be it through study or work under way, for instance, with my fiscal resources branch, with input from the Ontario Hospital Association, whatever it is—and we are constantly trying to find ways to pare unnecessary costs in the health care system.

I'm well aware, though, as a layman, not as a health professional, that in many instances what we're talking about is a judgement by the health professional as to what is necessary in the interests of his patient. Certainly nothing—nothing—that we are doing is intended to put a crimp on the judgement of the professional, but rather to try to, where possible, pinpoint unnecessary expenses and do away with them and to work with the professions.

Mr. Dukszta: Final supplementary: I was not speaking as a professional, I was speaking in many respects like a chartered accountant to point out certain costs. Let me ask whether the minister would be prepared to introduce what his sister government in Alberta, a Tory government, has introduced in terms of controlling these costs on a capital cost recovery basis, or does he know what that is?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It sounds like we're going to exchange "did you know whats."

An hon. member: Do you?

Mr. Dukszta: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen that specific action out of the province of Alberta. Perhaps I can send the member some information on what's been done in the state of New York.

MARKET VALUE ASSESSMENT

Mr. Peterson: To the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker: Since a complete data base was not compiled before the Blair commission proposals and before the Blair commission started looking at budget paper E, was there in fact a data base developed with a specific impact on various communities, and if there was, is the Treasurer prepared to table that and reveal those specific impact studies to the people of this province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The studies were prepared on the basis of budget paper E and, of course, all those are now undergoing revision by assessment on the basis of the Blair commission. Consideration will be given to the request made by the member.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary: Is the Treasurer prepared to reveal specifically the impact on each community of the proposals? Is he prepared to make that public, for public discussion, prior to implementing the new system, whenever that will be—and, as a little tiny supplementary, when will that be?

An hon. member: Too late.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the statement which we made at the time of the release of the Blair commission indicated that those figures would be made available, yes.

Mr. Good: Supplementary: Does the Treasurer expect anyone to properly study, or get a proper evaluation of, the impact of the market value assessment without a counter-proposal as to what changes there might be in government grant structures that would flow from the changes in taxation on assessments?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, those matters are being worked on at the moment.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That was a final supplementary.

Mr. Peterson: Could the Treasurer tell the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener) what is going on?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: It is called studied indifference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Study yes—indifference no.

UNITED ASBESTOS PLANT

Mr. Bain: In the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Could he inquire and find out when the Ministry of Natural Resources will be completing an economic and engineering study of the viability of the mine and mill at United Asbestos? This study was discussed at a meeting between the Premier, the leader of the official opposition, the Minister of Natural Resources and myself on March 15.

Could he find out when the report will be completed or, if it has been completed already, when it will be made public and tabled in this House? Could he also indicate to the Minister of Natural Resources that we are all in favour of a private company—everyone in this House is in favour of a private company taking over the mine and mill and reopening it? But what will the minister be prepared to do if this does not materialize?

Mr. S. Smith: Surely not free enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He is starting to squirm.

Mr. Reid: Jack Stokes—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Bain: Will the government be prepared to make a commitment to the people of Matachewan and to the people of all of the north that if a private company doesn't purchase the mine and mill within, say, two months, the government will form a joint venture company with the creditors, and reopen the mine?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And you are going to be general manager like Elie is at Inco?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Like the hon. member for Timiskaming, I know we are all very interested in seeing that the mine continues to operate. I understand that a meeting was held very recently with the Minister of Natural Resources. I did not attend that meeting, and I would be pleased to have the minister, or myself, report in the very near future on this important matter.

Mr. Bain: Supplementary: Could the minister also at that time make some indication that if a private company is not willing to open it up within the near future, a commitment will be made on the part of the government that either the government will work with a private company to get it reopened, or the government will form a joint venture company—something on the lines of Texasgulf—and reopen the mine?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think that was part of the original question.

BROWNDALE

Mr. Eakins: To the Minister of Health: Will the minister tell the House why it has apparently taken so long for his ministry to

approve the Browndale budget for this year? Does this delay have anything to do with the OPP investigation?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I spoke with the director of the children's mental health services branch on this about 10 days to two weeks ago. They are, in fact, proceeding very well in finalizing that budget. Certainly, the investigation by my colleague the Attorney General and by the OPP is still going on; you may have questions about that which you should direct to my colleague.

Mr. Eakins: Supplementary: I just want to ask the minister, is he aware that the lack of decision on his part has caused labour negotiations which have been going on since last year to bog down; and when will he approve the budget so that financial matters can be discussed in these negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on; your leader wants to close them all out.

Mr. S. Smith: The only people suffering now, Bill, are the employees who can't get a contract.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, Mr. Speaker, that suggestion has not been made to me but I will bring that up with the director of the branch.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why don't you people get together?

Mr. S. Smith: John Brown isn't suffering.

INDUSTRIAL WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of the Environment. If I may steal a leaf from the member for Sarnia, I ask this question on behalf of myself and the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. Bullbrook: Is this about Komoka?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, good.

Mr. Lewis: Why has he allowed levels of anxiety to reach such significant proportions in Lambton county among the Federation of Agriculture, the council members and many people in the community, over the possible reopening of an abandoned oil well for the purpose of disposing of millions of gallons of toxic industrial waste, which I gather is currently under negotiation between his ministry and the owner of that well, whose certificate of approval the minister terminated in 1974?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There is no plan at the present time to renew that certificate. There has been some discussion between a private company, Tricil, which is in the waste disposal business, and the operator of the disposal well in the Lambton area regarding pretreatment at the Tricil plant with a possibility of disposing of the residue in the Thompson well, for example. The minister, of course, has not indicated any approval to that.

I am not sure what rumours are spreading around the township of Enniskillen or in Lambton—

Mr. Lewis: Wild ones.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I have made it plain to the local member—

Mr. S. Smith: You gave him a good round figure.

Mr. Reid: He is stopping up the well himself.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —that there is no change in the status as far as our ministry is concerned. There has been no application to Mr. Thompson. So nothing is changed as far as we are concerned.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Is the minister prepared to guarantee that before any change is contemplated—and certainly the community, having seen the correspondence between the minister and the local member, is a little apprehensive; and the minister can understand why if he thinks back to the letter he wrote—is the minister prepared to guarantee that nothing will occur without (a) initial consultation with the community and (b) a hearing under section 33(a) of The Environmental Protection Act?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would answer yes to both of those questions—

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —but I want to say a little more—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I just happened to reread that letter, and there is no reason they could have any apprehension or to conclude from that letter that we are going to approve that particular application.

Mr. Lewis: You don't say you won't.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are quite emphatic that the township will be advised if there is

any change in the status of that well and that there would be a hearing.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: How can the minister even contemplate putting more toxic wastes into those wells when the figures of his own ministry indicate that some of the existing wells which have been used in this way have been losing pressure over the years, which means there has to have been seepage around the well into surrounding lands and waters? How can he even contemplate doing this again?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The hon. member, of course, is using the same type of scare tactic that he used last fall when this particular problem was a subject of discussion in this House.

Mr. S. Smith: I am scared.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We have no evidence within our ministry that those existing wells which he is talking about have contaminated ground water.

Mr. S. Smith: They have lost pressure; you know that.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The question is whether or not they have contaminated ground water.

Mr. S. Smith: Where has it gone if it has lost pressure?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If there is no ground water in the area—in fact, we have dug wells in that particular area to monitor that, so we are satisfied that there is no contamination of ground water.

Mr. S. Smith: Where is it going?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As far as considering the opening of another well is concerned—

Mr. Lewis: What about Buttermilk Creek?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —as the hon. member knows, there is a great deal of concern about the disposal of industrial liquid waste in this province and it is important to have safe disposal sites. We are concerned about certain clandestine dumping that is going on. Who knows? That may have caused the problem that the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Burr) asked a question about earlier. We are concerned that we have safe disposal sites. That is why we are looking at every possible disposal area that may be available in the province.

AID TO THE THIRD WORLD

Mr. Good: A question of the Premier regarding provincial aid for developing countries. Since it is now almost a year since his government indicated that no funds would be made available for international development, and since the 40 churches and secular agencies have now given the Premier a critique of the Hilliard report, would he now consider their alternative that a grant be made to the Ontario Council for International Co-operation so that they, in turn, could apportion this grant out to the agencies working in world relief and development?

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I had a very excellent meeting with representatives of the organizations and the churches some few days ago. The presentation was somewhat different from the one that was made a year ago. It did contain some of their thoughts about Mr. Hilliard's report, but it also came forward with, I think, six suggested ideas.

I told the group that made the presentation that the first suggestion it made and the second, I thought, would be acceptable to the government—that would be some great areas of co-operation and communication as between government, the various churches and other organizations. Then they had three alternatives as to how we might participate, if a matter of policy were involved. I did point out to them, and I restate it to the hon. member, that it's not just the money involved, and I made that very clear to them, but it is a matter of principle as to whether or not the provinces should be that directly involved in what is normally, for most countries, a matter for the national or the federal government.

I also indicated to them that we would support a greater involvement by CIDA, not only in terms of amount but in CIDA giving to the independent organizations a greater portion of that budget for allocation in those projects to which they have attached priority. I said to them we would re-evaluate their more recent proposals, and that it would take us, I think I told them two or three weeks—which I think is a fair length of time to see whether or not some policy decision might be entertained.

They did recite to us the policy of one or two provinces. I think Alberta has some involvement in the programme but it does have certain strings attached, I think I'm right in this, in that it relates to either surpluses or

products that are produced within the province of Alberta, and I won't be critical of that.

I did re-emphasize to them, because there is a principle involved here, that it's important, I think in terms of this country and in terms of the effectiveness of these organizations, that to the extent possible it be done on a national basis rather than having necessarily individual provinces involved. We have not closed our mind to it. I sensed they thought it was a constructive meeting—certainly we did—and I did indicate to them we would get back to them in two or three weeks.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

REPORTS

Mr. Germa from the standing public accounts committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows:

Your committee recommends to the Legislature that a commission be appointed, under The Public Inquiries Act, from the Court of Appeal of the province of Ontario to inquire into and make recommendations upon all matters related to the government's exemption of Ronto Development Corporation from land speculation tax, made by regulation on April 14, 1976.

Your committee further recommends that the terms of reference for this inquiry be placed before the Legislature for approval within 10 days.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I got the impression when the government House leader was announcing to the House that he would be setting up a judicial inquiry to look into the Ronto matter that he was aware this motion was going to be presented. Certainly the committee is not disturbed that the government saw fit to take action prior to the report being tabled. I would, however, point out to the government that there were two recommendations contained in the motion which was just presented, and one was that the terms of reference should be brought to this Legislature for consideration before the order in council was issued.

I am a little disturbed. The committee spent some considerable time analysing and determining whether the judicial inquiry route would be successful in accomplishing a resolution to this problem. The committee was of the impression that the quality of the inquiry, of course, will be determined by the terms of reference as presented to this Legislature. For that, I am a little disillusioned that the government didn't see fit to take into considerations both recommendations.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the motion?

Mr. Speaker: I think I should put it before the House first of all. Mr. Germa has presented the report and moved its adoption.

Mr. Bullbrook: I attempted before, during the question period, which is all too restrictive, to voice my own personal concern in connection with the terms of reference. Now the history of this: The Premier is absolutely correct in voicing the traditional aspect in matters of this nature. On royal commissions, judicial inquiries, unless under the particular statute, it's totally the prerogative of government, through the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to develop the terms of reference and advise the commissioner, or the inquiry officer, what those terms of reference are.

The background of this—and I want to convey this, if I may, to the Premier through the Speaker—I think personally through correspondence that he and I have had over the last few months, he recognizes, I hope, on my part a total understanding of the function of government, the function of the legislative process, the function of appointed people. So I support, generally, what he says, that the terms of reference should be, to a great extent, the prerogative of the government.

However there is a different situation here. We are in a minority situation. The Premier is the first one to constantly tell the people in Ontario that minority government can work; and it works through one equation only, and that is reciprocal co-operation in this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bullbrook: Hear, hear.

Now what happened was this: There was a motion, as I understand it, for the appointment of a select committee. Many in this party agreed with the motion, that there should be a select committee.

If I might be permitted to just digress for a moment, I totally disassociate myself from the attitude of the government House leader that there is something necessarily unduly partisan in a select committee; quite the contrary. My recent experience with the select committee on company law has been exactly the opposite, it almost reminded me of the

days of the private bills committee. There was nothing partisan about it at all. I believe that the majority of members of this House have attempted, in that context of a minority government, to deal in a fairly non-partisan fashion, and would have attempted to deal in a fairly non-partisan fashion in this matter so important to us all.

Mr. Nixon: Just like they did with the Hydro building. Remember that one?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, we tried there.

Mr. Nixon: A select committee was all right then. You had a majority, remember.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Sarnia has the floor.

Mr. Bullbrook: But be that as it may, we've apparently come to a conclusion that all parties will subscribe to the judicial inquiry process. So be it; I, for one, will support that.

But the terms of reference, as slightly elicited from the government House leader, in effect, Mr. Speaker, talk only of the judicial inquiry looking into wrongdoing with respect to that matter. This whole matter of Ronto, that whole exercise of judgement, although it is a governmental and ministerial judgement, in the context of a minority government situation I say to those on this side of the House: Although we don't want to precipitate anything unduly on this matter, let's hope that minority government could work, don't give up our rights with respect to this one, it's too darn important. If we're going to permit them to draft terms of reference solely restricted to the question of wrongdoing, I can tell members right now that we're going to absolutely fetter that inquiry officer. Members are not going to do what they intended to do at the public accounts committee to begin with, and that is to analyse the expenditure of government funds, or unilateral ministerial judgements which are wrong and costing the taxpayers millions of dollars.

I say this to you, Mr. Speaker, the motion just made by the chairman of the public accounts committee is entirely appropriate when he talks about 10 days for us to have the terms of reference, and we should be able to debate those terms of reference in this assembly. I say this to you, sir, in closing, as much as we admire the personal integrity and ability of the various House leaders of the parties, that's not good enough. It can't be good enough. It doesn't in any way demean their collective activity, or what they do for all of us. We each have a right, nay a duty, to be able to get up on our feet here and discuss those terms of reference. I for one attempted, as vigorously as I could to point out to all members of the House that although it is traditionally the function of government, of their own initiative, and unilaterally without consultation, to go ahead and make appointments and to structure the appointments and develop the terms of reference, if we're going to make this minority government work—because it can work—then let's have the legislative process involved in that.

It's not asking too much of the Premier to do that, because the Premier, in response to the various points of order by my colleague from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, did say "vote against it"; twice he said "vote against it." This is the question I'm putting: How is he going to vote against it? How do we vote against the terms of reference that he has developed himself?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Through a motion.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is this what he is talking about? This motion today?

Mr. Nixon: This motion has the terms in it?

Mr. Bullbrook: This motion has no terms in it; and that's the problem that I, as one member, face.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You weren't even there for any of the discussions in the public accounts committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia has the floor.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am not a member of the public accounts committee; and I'm not voicing my concern in the context of being a member or otherwise of the public accounts committee. I'm trying to point out that voting against or for this motion doesn't answer the very question that burdens me.

Mr. Nixon: That's right.

Mr. Bullbrook: Nobody knows the terms of reference.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, at the time we considered whether or not a public inquiry would be a suitable method of dealing with the Ronto affair, we in the NDP caucus gave a great deal of consideration as to whether or not it would be better suited to be dealt

with in a standing committee of the Legislature or a select committee of the Legislature. We decided that it was appropriate that it should go to a public inquiry. We decided that on the basis of a feeling that those doing the inquiring would only be able to come to satisfactory conclusions if the terms of reference were suitable.

In the matter of Ronto, the matter of the government's decision to exempt Ronto from the payment of tax has been before the Legislature for some long period of time. The standing committee on public accounts had it before them for a long period of time, and it really now is a matter before the Legislature and not just simply a matter before the government. While I would always be happy to sit down with the other House leaders and chat about the terms of reference, I feel much like the member for Sarnia who just stated that, "I wouldn't want to take upon myself the responsibility for determining whether or not the terms of reference put forward by the government were suitable in terms of dealing with the entire matter of the exemption granted."

To begin with, it isn't a matter of looking into whether there was wrongdoing or not. It's a matter of trying to determine whether or not all of the information necessary was available, and the terms of reference have to make it clear that that is the purpose of the inquiry. The terms of reference also have to make it clear that it's not simply a matter of determining whether the amounts of money which may well have been paid had the tax been applied ought now to be paid, but whether there were other moneys paid to other persons, or groups of individuals, which may or may not have influenced the decision of government.

I don't know how the government intends to draw its terms of reference. I recognize, as one speaks of it, the traditional right of the government to govern, and I don't very often make any inroads into that traditional right, but I do frankly feel that if the terms of reference are drawn sufficiently broadly to allow the commissioner to look into all matters related, and if the terms of reference in specific draw his or her attention to matters which are of particular attention and to which specific attention must be paid, then of course the terms of reference could receive the concurrence of the House and the inquiry would serve the purpose which we all intend it to serve.

[3:30]

I worry, now, about the possibility of the terms being drawn restrictively, even inadvertently; and I don't quite understand why we couldn't have had those terms of reference laid before the Legislature in order that the members, who are now all involved, could have had the opportunity to review those and to make some recommendation to the government, which could, if it wished, have chosen to ignore them. If the government felt and could argue sufficiently strongly that the suggested changes were in some way or another reducing the function and capacity of either the government or the public inquiry, then that argument would have stood up under public scrutiny and the public would have supported the government's position.

I feel that we are getting into a hornet's nest over very little and that it would have been much better if the government had simply accepted the fact that it was being asked by the public accounts committee, in a unanimous decision supported by all parties, that the terms of reference be placed before the Legislature before such time as the appointment of the commissioner, that it concur with that and agree that that is a reasonable thing to do in the circumstances, given the amount of legislative debate that has already taken place around the issue, and trust to the Legislature, as it has to in all other matters, to make a reasonable judgement about what constitutes sensible terms of reference.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I may say to the Premier that his bedmate in this situation, the official opposition, in presenting it to the committee this morning, made it conditional that they would vote for this on the fact that we would have a say in the terms of reference. It was fully understood —that was our vote—that the public accounts committee would have a say in the terms of reference and other things such as the framework and guidelines of the inquiry. It was modified from the select committee, for reasons I won't get into here now, but the facts are that that was the condition of the vote this morning. I think the House leader beat the gun bringing that in before the chairman (Mr. Germa) brought his motion in, but that was our understanding this morning and all parties voted for that.

I may be wrong, I don't know, but I know that we thought at that time that everything was conditional on us having a say on the terms of reference. If that is not the case, I think we should very seriously study what we are talking about.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to this question very briefly. I am not a member of the public accounts committee and my knowledge, except for one or two occasions, is based entirely on the discussions I have had with my colleagues from the New Democratic Party caucus who sat on that committee. I have, however, been closely associated with the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) since he first raised this matter in August of last year about the propriety of the exemption which was granted, and I would say to the Premier and I would say to the House leader that the question was not in anything but a very minor and secondary way the question of undue influence or impropriety or anything related to that.

Mr. Nixon: That's exactly right.

Mr. Renwick: The basic question and the fundamental question which was raised—

Mr. Nixon: Was whether you should exempt them.

Mr. Renwick: —by the Ronto matter was, and may I try to phrase this in an effort to be helpful to solve the dilemma which has been presented to the House by the failure to have a proper debate about it, the key question which was raised throughout the whole of the discussion of Ronto, both in this House and in the public accounts committee, would in my judgement run something like this: Would the then minister, properly advised and fully informed, have granted the exemption which he did? It would appear to me that that is the primary question; and if I understood what the House leader for the government was saying today, the terms of reference as indicated in the statement he made would not have covered that question. From that question, and very much as a secondary one, might very well flow the question as to whether or not there was any undue influence or impropriety or favouritism or whatever you wish to call that, but that is very much a far distant secondary question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point or order, so there is no misunderstanding, the House leader did not read the terms of reference to the House. He said, very simply, that there would be a judicial inquiry, that it would include, amongst other things—I haven't even read his statement. What I was saying in reply to the hon. member for Brantford was that we would have terms of reference. My experience has always been that these terms of reference are sufficiently broad to accommodate the interest of the public, which I assume is the interest of the members of this House.

I don't want to prolong this debate, and there are some things I could say in almost a partisan sense—

Mr. Deans: Well, don't.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What I understand the House leader for the New Democratic Party is saying is—and I ask for clarification—that he would like an opportunity—

Mr. MacDonald: Enter the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm just asking for a little information that might—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Premier rose on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, I'll ask the question after. I'll let the member for Riverdale put it. But I just want to make it clear the government has not set out the terms of reference. I don't want any misunderstanding.

Mr. Renwick: I do appreciate the opportunity to conclude my remarks, with the leave of the Premier. I did not intend to say that the House leader for the government specified, specifically, the terms of reference of the committee; but he did indicate the general framework, in which his thinking was directed, about those terms of reference. In the statement which he made, he did not address his attention to what I believe to be the key question. I say to the Premier and to the House leader of the government, is it not acceptable that, whatever the actual language may turn out to be, something in the nature of the statement which I have made is the question which should be asked of the royal commission? Namely, would the then minister, properly advised and fully informed, have granted the exemption he did?

Mr. Lewis: Do you object to that as part of the inquiry?

Mr. Nixon: The House leader for the Liberal Party made an excellent suggestion, I believe, which he hasn't been able to act upon. He indicated that one way to proceed in this matter would be for this debate to adjourn and be left adjourned until such time as the terms of reference are placed before us. Then we could resume the debate and there might then possibly be an occasion to express approval or disapproval of the terms. I thought that suggestion was a good one.

On the other hand, the debate has proceeded and I believe it is an important one—I, certainly, believe it is. With your permission, sir, I would like to contribute my views.

Mr. Ferrier: He doesn't want to be upstaged.

Mr. Nixon: I do believe that an important point has been made in that the reference to the public accounts committee was not to find out what Eddie Goodman was doing in all this business, but specifically for the public accounts committee to review the decision to exempt Ronto from the payment of the tax. One of the very significant resolutions that was before the committee for a long time, and might very well have been acted upon, was to recommend that the House instruct the government to remove that exemption; in other words, to collect the tax. I was a member of the committee—at least for one of its meetings—and we were looking at the matter not as a great political scandal—although, in fact, it might be—but as a matter of accounting for public funds, and that exemption in particular. Certainly on that basis I felt, and still feel—although I have no particular objection to the royal commission—that it was a matter for the public accounts committee; and when it became too burdensome and elaborate for the public accounts committee—obviously demanding the presence of proper counsel and other assistance for the committee—I felt that a select committee should be empowered to continue the investigation on that line.

Personally, I felt that if the results of the investigation were similar to the information already provided to us by the auditor, then the resolution calling on this House to instruct the government—if such a motion is in order—to go out and collect $500,000 or $2 million, would have been a proper result rather than some other approach.

My own feeling is that a royal commission is used under these circumstances when there is a cloud over the reputation of an individual or where there is some indication of malfeasance. Surely, in this instance, it is the judgement of the government in granting the exemption. Certainly if you're going to have a full review of the situation there are other collateral matters, to which the member for Brantford has already referred, such as the payment of commissions, and the additional exemptions to a former member of the racing commission. It makes a very interesting tale indeed and surely the royal commissioner will have to go into that. I think our prime interest is the fact that the government has exempted Ronto from the payment of $500,000 in tax. We even feel it should be $2 million in tax, and that that is why it was referred to the standing committee and why the standing committee moved to have it referred to a select committee.

The suggestion by the House leader for the Liberal Party that there be an adjournment of this debate until we have a look at the terms of reference is a good one. I might also say I don't think there have been many occasions in the past where it was felt that the terms of reference of royal commissions were unduly restrictive. I do recall one occasion when some complaint was expressed in the House following the establishment of the terms and the government of the day was good enough to amend and expand the terms themselves. Surely that is their prerogative and a procedure which precedent has already seen established. I hope members of the House will have a chance to express their views on the terms of reference by their debate and by their vote, and I think there is a quite clear and easily understood procedure whereby that might come about.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of the motion that is before the House at the moment—

Mr. Nixon: You are the man who took the message to the committee.

Mr. Drea: I want to draw your attention to one very basic fact: There were no conditions in that motion. The mover of the motion this morning very courteously supplied me with a written copy of the resolution. There were some people—some members, I may say, of that committee, but not of my party and not of the official opposition party—who seemed mystified as to what the rules of the House were. They asked for certain information. Certain information was supplied to them by a member of the committee—not of my party—on a voluntary basis. If, on that basis, the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) was so confused that he thought there were conditions in a written motion, then Mr. Speaker I say to you when we get into a debate, that that motion contains six or seven lines and it is very clear and it very concise.

The particular time designation in there is of 10 days. It was my understanding that because of the difficulties of the committee in coming to grips with the finality of the situation—not the merits of it but the finality of it—that the 10 days was a period of time during which the government would have to take a position on the matter. As a matter of fact, if the tapes were to be replayed from

this morning, there is a very clear indication that if the government did not take a position on this particular motion, the committee might very well have to try to suggest another vehicle, or indeed go back to the select committee route. That is the impact of the last two lines of the resolution, that the terms of reference—in other words—there would be a commissioner—would be placed before the Legislature within 10 days.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, had I interpreted those last two lines as a committee directing the government on what it was going to do, I would not have seconded it.

Mr. Conway: Are you changing your mind?

Mr. Drea: The intent of the motion that has been brought before the House this afternoon and which was passed unanimously—even though there were three members who were mystified, confused or what have you, in the end they came around—was to bring to finality—

Mr. Nixon: They are not used to the Tories and the NDP being in bed together. One of you has cold feet.

Mr. Drea: —the question of the tax exemption to Ronto. This was considered to be the most expedient, the most fair and the most efficient vehicle to bring about finality one way or the other. That is all it was.

[3:45]

Mr. Sargent: Point of order, point of order.

Mr. Drea: For those who say that they were confused and there were conditions, I am prepared to have the tapes played back, because there was no confusion and there were no conditions.

Mr. Nixon: It has nothing to do with the royal commission anyway.

Mr. Sargent: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member makes reference to "three members who were confused."

Mr. Conway: Burn the tapes, Frank.

An hon. member: It is you, Eddie.

An hon. member: Frank Drea, Frank Drea and Frank Drea.

Mr. Sargent: The three members who were "confused," as he says, were not in bed with the government. The Liberal Party goes straight down the line and we were not party to the NDP and the government making a deal.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member does not have a point of order. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre will continue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That just adds to your confusion, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: A deal has been made and we were not party to the deal they wanted to make.

An hon. member: You will be, next time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to continue on—

An hon. member: Please don't.

Mr. Drea: —but I want to decry this mention of "a deal was made." Let's put it on the record.

Mr. Conway: You don't look like Monty Hall.

Mr. Drea: The first time that I knew anything about the motion that the member for Wentworth North was making was when he had the courtesy this morning, just about a minute before public accounts started, to send me a typed photo copy of it. I had never seen it before, and indeed, I suppose if he had asked for my comments on it, I would have said I thought it was a first-class idea, but he did not. I seconded the motion purely on its merits, I am getting a little bit sick and tired—

Mr. Sargent: We know you are sick all right.

Mr. Drea: —that every time there is a motion of any bipartisan nature in this House, there is some redneck who gets up and says a deal was made. There was no deal made.

Mr. Lewis: When the chips are down in this House it won't be this party that will stand up and support you—when the crunch comes next week.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, the discussions which have been held by the House leaders during the end portion of the question period concerning this matter have come, I think, to the conclusion that the terms of reference to which the report makes mention can be made available to all members of the House within a comparatively short time. The Premier, in his exchange today with various members asking questions on this subject, has

suggested that those terms of reference may be available as early as tomorrow. If such is the case, we will then have the opportunity to review those terms of reference, which may prove to be acceptable or may require some additional encouragement. I suggest that once those terms of reference are known, there will be an opportunity for us then to return to this debate, should that be necessary. We can then resolve the matter, since we are talking now in the absence of knowing what those terms will be.

MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that section (h) of clause 37 in the provisional standing orders as approved by the House on December 16, 1976, be amended by deleting the section and substituting the following:

"(h) No question will be put to the House before 5:50 p.m. The votes on all items not opposed at 5:50 p.m. shall be stacked and put forthwith. If a division is requested by five members, there will be a five-minute division bell, following which all questions will be put forthwith."

Hon. Mr. Welch also moved that section (j) of clause 37 in the provisional standing orders as approved by the House on December 16, 1976, be amended by adding the following:

"and that all bills intended for debate be introduced at latest on the Tuesday of the second week previous to the week in which such bill is to be debated, and that notice of a motion intended to be debated be printed on the Tuesday of the second week previous to the week in which such motion is to be debated."

Motions agreed to.

ESSEX COUNTY FRENCH-LANGUAGE SECONDARY SCHOOL ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved first reading of Bill 31, An Act to require the Essex County Board of Education to provide a French-language secondary school.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Stong moved first reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, this bill defines hospital pharmacists and establishes a bargaining unit of hospital pharmacists as an appropriate unit for collective bargaining.

PATIENTS' RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Dukszta moved first reading of Bill 33, An Act respecting certain Rights of Patients receiving Health Care Services in Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Dukszta: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to declare and protect certain rights of medical patients in Ontario. The bill is divided into three parts.

Part I of the bill is designed to protect the confidentiality of a patient's medical record. The bill declares a general prohibition against disclosure of a medical record, but allows for some exceptions to ensure proper treatment and care of the patient. The patient also has a right to access to his own medical record. A person who violates these provisions may be found guilty of professional misconduct in a disciplinary proceeding.

Part II of the bill is designed to ensure that a patient is provided with adequate information about the proposed form of treatment before giving written consent to the treatment. This information must be provided to the patient in order for consent to be considered as informed consent. When enacted, this part will amend the existing procedure for providing written consent established by regulation under The Public Hospitals Act. It would also affect any other procedure where written consent is required.

Part III of the bill is designed to protect persons who are admitted to a psychiatric facility as involuntary patients under The Mental Health Act. This part amends that Act by creating additional review procedures to protect a person from being detained unnecessarily as an involuntary patient. In addition, the duration of a certificate of renewal is reduced to ensure that the patient is examined on a frequent and regular basis by an independent physician while he is detained as an involuntary patient.

Mr. Speaker: May I just suggest, and point out to the hon. member, that the explanation is supposed to be brief, explaining the principle; not filling or flushing it out too much. His explanation was slightly long.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Stokes: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The motion that was just introduced amend-

ing standing orders would preclude the hon. member for Parkdale introducing that motion for debate two weeks from today. I think it is patently unfair.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I agree. It was quite clearly understood as a preparation for this—and the clerk at the table perhaps hasn't been clear on this—that we were making an exception as far as the hon. member was concerned. It was because of the confusion with respect to the interpretation that that amendment was put in; it was not to cover this particular one but subsequently.

Mr. Stokes: But my point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that it be made abundantly clear to all members of the House that that amendment to the standing order will prevail with the exception of this motion which precipitated the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I appreciate that clarification and this opportunity; I thought I had made that point clear earlier.

PROCEDURE FOR PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

Mr. Speaker: Before calling the orders of the day, it has been suggested that before the first private members' period under the provisional rules, I should outline as clearly as possible what I understand to be the consensus of the House respecting the procedure to be followed.

My understanding is this: When the routine proceedings have been completed, the orders of the day are of course the two prescribed items of public business. The time from the commencement of such proceedings until 5:50 p.m. will be divided equally between the two orders. When debate on the first order has concluded, the Speaker will immediately call the second order for debate. When debate on both orders has been concluded, if no petition adverse to a vote has been filed in accordance with provisional order 37(f), the Speaker will put a question on the first order as follows:

"Shall there be a vote on this motion? Any members opposed to a vote must now rise."

If 20 members rise, a vote is of course blocked. But if any less than 20 members stand, a vote will be ordered and stacked. The same procedure will then be followed with respect to the second order of the day. If votes on both the orders are blocked that, of course, ends the proceedings.

If, however, a vote is ordered with respect to either one or both of the orders, the Speaker will proceed in the usual way to call for the voice vote, the ayes and nays, and give his opinion as to whether the ayes or nays have it. If that opinion is accepted, the vote is so recorded.

If, however, five members stand in their places in the usual way to call for a recorded vote in either one or both cases, there will be a five-minute division bell after which the recorded vote or votes will be taken.

The time allotment for each member speaking will remain as heretofore with this exception: The mover may, if he wishes, reserve any part of his 20 minutes for a reply at the end of the debate. He must, however, advise the Speaker beforehand of his intention to do so and as to how many minutes he is so reserving.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch: Just before the orders of the day are called, I wish to table the answers to questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 16, 17 and 19 and the interim answers to questions 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18 and 20 on the order paper. (See appendix, page 442.)

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

NATURAL DEATH ACT

Mr. Maeck moved second reading of Bill 3, An Act respecting the Withholding or Withdrawal of Treament where Death is Inevitable.

Mr. Speaker: I will announce very shortly exactly when half-time is up for this particular order.

Mr. Moffatt: And then change ends?

Mr. Maeck: By luck of the ballot, Mr. Speaker, I have been chosen to present the first private member's bill under the new rules passed by this House last December 16. These rules, as hon. members are aware, allow greater opportunity for private bills to become law in this province.

I am well aware of the honour falling to the member to present the first bill, but I am also mindful of the importance of the situation. Accordingly, I have chosen to bring forward for consideration a bill based on humanitarian principles which should commend themselves to all members.

If this bill is passed into law, it will not have widespread or general application; however, it will have great significance for many citizens in a time of anguish. I believe that a bill which has as its aim the alleviation of suffering is always worthy of favourable consideration.

[4:00]

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by outlining the principles which lie behind the bill and which motivated me to bring it forward. Let me also attempt to make clear both what the bill intends to achieve and what it does not intend to achieve.

Some time ago it came to my attention that medical technology had advanced to the point where it is possible to keep a human being alive by artificial means when one or a number of that human's vital functions have been irreversibly damaged by accident or disease. It is possible to prolong a patient's life beyond the point where he or she would die naturally, but with no hope that the patient could ever recover.

In some instances the prolongation of life by artificial means gives added pain to the patient. But in all instances, however, it means added pain, anguish and concern for the patient's family, attending medical personnel and the clergy. I must point out that I am not talking of a very large number of cases. Informed estimates conclude that fewer than two per cent of hospitalized patients reach the stage where artificial prolongation of life is a consideration. But for that two per cent, and for those concerned with their treatment, it is a serious problem. It occurred to me that a mechanism could be devised to allow the alleviation of suffering for all concerned when death is close and inevitable.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the passage of a natural death Act in the state of California, and saw that with certain modifications such legislation could be enacted here. Through the courtesy of the Attorney General of California I obtained a copy of their legislation, along with a fairly complete file of the arguments heard during its passage. It is important to note that the California legislation took over two years of drafting and amendments before it was signed into law by Governor Brown.

There are, of course, differences between the legal and legislative powers of California and Ontario. What I am presenting in this bill, however, are the best features of the California Act combined with what expert counsel indicated appropriate for Ontario. In other words, the ground for such legislation has been broken and many of the arguments regarding theology, morality, ethics and humanitarianism have already been heard.

By this I do not intend to say that there should be little or no debate on the bill. On the contrary, it is my expressed intention to direct this bill to the standing committee on social development should it receive second reading today. It would be my hope that that committee would hold extensive and comprehensive hearings on both the principles behind the bill and its specific provisions.

I would like to have all interested groups and members of the public make their views known on this legislation. We all have the right to consent or refuse to consent to medical treatment today. What this bill intends is that while patients would normally consent to such treatment when there is hope of recovery, they might wish to limit that consent when artificial means are contemplated to keep them alive beyond their time of natural death. That is to say that this anticipates those instances where artificial means serve only to prolong a death watch instead of leading to recovered health. What this bill seeks is to allow a patient to meet his inevitable death with dignity and a degree of comfort.

There are three principles which underlie this proposed legislation. The first is that the individual should have the right to decide whether he or she is going to die a natural death where the possibility exists. I cannot stress enough that Bill 3 falls into the category of permissive legislation. No one would be compelled to limit his consent to have his life prolonged or sustained by artificial means. The proposed legislation would allow only those who wish to do so to indicate their desires on this question.

The working of the bill is such that only those who have reached the age of majority, who are in full control of their faculties and who are not under pressure from any source, can execute a directive for the guidance of their physician. It was my original intention that sane and healthy individuals could execute their directives before fatal illness or accident befell them. I anticipated citizens filling out directives in much the same manner as we fill out, or do not fill out, whatever the case may be, the consent forms on our driver's licence under The Human Tissue Gift Act.

It is possible, however, that patients might wish to execute a directive at or near the

time they are diagnosed as terminally ill. So, provision has been made for both categories: sane and healthy, or sane and terminally ill. It is my hope that individuals who wish to, would fill out the directive when they're healthy. In this connection, hon. members will observe that there is provision for prompt and effective revocation of the directive should the patient change his mind. As well, legal directives will remain in effect for only five years.

Arising from the first principle is that responsibility for an agonizing decision will not fall on grieving members of the patient's family. If a directive has been executed by the patient, family members will be relieved of a terrible burden at a time when they are already distraught. Attending members of the clergy are often troubled as well by the plight of the patient and the family. They, too, will be relieved if a directive has been executed beforehand.

The third benefit to arise from granting the individual right to limit heroic treatment is that medical personnel will be spared the responsibility of deciding to limit treatment. There will be no question of liability for any act done or omission made in good faith under the provisions of this bill. Attending physicians will simply be following the clear wishes of their patients when there is nothing to be done to restore life processes. It should be noted as well that in cases where terminally ill patients have not or cannot execute a directive the physician will carry out his responsibilities as he always has.

In sum, the intent of Bill 3 is to allow individuals to take it upon themselves to spare their families, clergy and medical attendants the agony of deciding whether to prolong suffering when death is inevitable.

Having stated the intention of the bill, let me go on to indicate what the bill does not intend. Here I want to be very specific, Mr. Speaker, because some questions have been raised despite the fact that the humanitarian objectives of the legislation are quite clear.

In the first place, the bill does not in any way make provision for euthanasia or mercy killing. It deals only with the circumstances surrounding a death that would occur in any event. Criminal activity which results in the taking of a life is dealt with under The Criminal Code of Canada and is a federal responsibility. Nonetheless, I stress as strongly as I can the fact that the specific provisions of Bill 3 do not allow the taking of a life. They deal with a death that would take place naturally and inevitably. Death is not to be hastened in any way.

Similarly, any death occurring naturally under the provisions of this bill cannot be considered a suicide, and such is specifically stated in the bill. Let me explain the safeguards that have been written into the bill. Anyone signing the directive must do so in the presence of two witnesses who cannot stand to benefit in any way from the death of the individual. Secondly, the existence of an irreversible and terminal condition must be diagnosed by two physicians who are not responsible for the care of the patient in question. In the case where two independent physicians cannot agree that a condition is terminal, the directive will not take effect.

Another safeguard has been drafted to guard against the taking of an innocent life. Provision has been made to nullify the effect of a directive when the patient in question is female and expecting a child.

What I have been endeavouring to explain are the basic humanitarian concerns which motivated me to bring this bill forward.

To repeat them once again, the aims of the legislation are: One, to allow an adult in clear control of his faculties to decide that his inevitable death will take place with as much dignity as possible; and two, that by allowing an individual to choose not to have his moment of death postponed by artificial means, he and he alone will absolve his family, clergy and physicians from having to make an agonizing decision.

This bill, I believe, has been drafted in such a way as to prevent any consideration of the taking of life. As a former police officer and member of our armed forces, I know only too well the awful reality of someone causing another to lose his life. What I am concerned with are those rare occasions when, by virtue of accident or disease, an individual's death is certain and imminent as certified by the diagnosis of two qualified physicians. The situations I am talking about are those in which an individual might be kept clinically alive by artificial means for some period of time but who would have no hope of recovery.

May I now turn to some of the practical aspects of the bill? As various members are aware, I have canvassed a wide sector of religious, medical and community leaders concerning the principle of the proposed legislation. The response has been extremely positive, especially from those who have had to deal with terminal patients on a regular basis. It should be of interest to hon. mem-

bers that what is proposed in this bill parallels much of what is already in practice.

The code of ethics of the Ontario Medical Association, for instance, has two clauses which bear on this matter, and they read as follows: "An ethical physician will allow death to occur with dignity and comfort when death of the body appears to be inevitable." The second says: "An ethical physician may support the body when clinical death of the brain has occurred but need not prolong life by unusual or heroic means."

The Ontario Medical Association is on record in supporting this code of ethics, so these statements are statements of the association's policy. I know the OMA is in support of the principle of my bill and I look forward to hearing from its representatives should the bill get to the committee stage.

As I indicated, the mail and telephone calls I've received since it became known that I would be presenting this bill have been very positive. Well over 80 per cent of those who have communicated with me have indicated their support and many of the letters which indicated opposition to it were, I believe, based on a misunderstanding of the specific provisions as safeguards of the bill. This is understandable because they didn't have an opportunity to see the actual wording of the bill until it was introduced and printed.

It is my sincere belief that virtually all original opponents of the bill can rest more easily now that the provisions and safeguards have been spelled out. Yet it would appear that the primary concern of those who indicated opposition to this bill was that it would promote euthanasia. As I hope I have made clear, it does not.

The taking of a life is a crime under The Criminal Code and the provisions of the bill do not alter that in any way. This bill deals with natural death, not unnatural death. Here I should also point out that I have specifically and deliberately left out any provision for delegation of authority for executing a directive. It is to be made by the individual and no one else. This is to further ensure that only the wishes of the patient will be recognized.

Another concern that has been expressed comes from doctors who wonder what will happen to patients who do not sign a directive. Section 6 of the bill clearly states that physicians will carry on in their normal manner. The provisions of the bill will apply only to those who sign a directive.

In conclusion, I would like to share with the hon. members an example of what this bill is all about. Some time ago, I appeared on a radio show on London's Station CFPL to talk about this particular bill. I wasn't able to hear all the telephone calls that came in but the station's programme manager wrote to tell me about them. In part he wrote:

"I think you would have been moved had you heard the call I received just before the programme signed off. A middle-aged man called to tell me he is a terminal cancer patient whose prognosis is very bleak. He said that not a day goes by that he does not pray for death to come swiftly since he suffers even with the administration of drugs. He supports very much your idea. His very moving conversation, I thought, showed us a side of the great moral question here that most of us cannot see clearly from our vantage point of good health."

It should be readily apparent that the provisions of this bill, if enacted cannot help this man at this time. No one has been able to shorten his life by any means, but once his death was imminent he could be allowed to die a natural death without prolonged suffering.

I have received many letters expressing equally moving and genuine sentiments. It is my hope, if this bill progresses through the legislative process to become law, it will serve to assist those citizens who are afflicted and distraught or who may become afflicted and distraught. The aim of this bill is to bring a measure of comfort in the face of awful reality.

I would like to conclude by asking support for this bill on second reading in order that the aims and objectives of it can be studied by the standing committee on social development. There may be amendments required to give full and fair meaning to the humanitarian objectives of this bill. There may be amendments required to give further protection against abuse. In any event, I strongly believe in the goodwill the bill has elicited and I look forward to hearing from hon. members who will take part in the debate.

I understand that whatever time remains to me under my time allocation can be used in order to answer questions or make corrections or clarifications. I would be happy to use that time for these purposes.

[4:15]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. Dukszta: How many minutes, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No more than 10 minutes.

Mr. Dukszta: Fine. I actually will do it in seven and a half. It is exciting to participate in a debate in the best parliamentary tradition when a bill can be debated freely, voted upon I hope as freely, and in response only to the dictates of one's own reason and conscience. It is also felicitous that Mr. Maeck's bill presents us with a moral conundrum. I have talked about the bill with church fathers. I have read on the Quinlan case. I have consulted with my good friend, the member for Downsview (Mr. di Santo), about the implication of Mr. Maeck's bill in the context of class analysis, but ultimately I have come to the realization that the bill affects me primarily in two ways—first, as a physician, and second, as a human being.

First, as a physician, I play a specific role in society, a role which carries certain responsibilities, power and some privileges. Second, as a person, I can identify myself with a situation described by this bill. I can see myself with a terminal condition, incurably ill, knowing that I am facing death and possibly having to make a decision whether to live or die. These two roles, however—me as a physician and me as an ordinary human being—carry different role prescriptions which are in some sense contradictory.

The contradiction in my two roles is quite simple. As a person, I believe the decision whether I live or die is my own. I do not mean this in the more general context of our daily living, for clearly everything I hope for and do hinges on other people—whether it is my work relationship or pleasure. Yet when it comes to the moment when I am incurably ill and with no hope of living and totally alone, or when I come to a point when no longer do I find life tolerable or meaningful, then I reserve to myself the right to make the decision to die.

The logical and often intolerable contradiction between this existential position and my role as a physician and psychiatrist comes when I am faced with a patient who I know is dying, who I know I cannot help by any known means, and who I know is aware of this and wants to die. Yet I will then proceed to institute heroic efforts to prolong life, give painful treatments, and start massive and uncomfortable life support systems, knowing full well these efforts will be useless, for I have unhesitatingly followed the prescription of my role as a physician. The physician is entrusted, and rightly so, with the responsibility for saving life, for prolonging the life of the patient to the best of his ability and power.

More often than not the patient would be glad that all efforts were being made to help him or her, and they would fool themselves that such heroic efforts were going to be successful. This I consider to be my proper responsibility and work, and I was happy to be of this minimal use. Yet on many occasions, a more aware individual would say to me: "Why are you doing this? You know I am dying. Let me die in peace."

I wouldn't and I couldn't listen to such statements. I am compelled as a physician to do my utmost. I would do everything in my power, I repeat, even if I knew my patient didn't want these heroic measures instituted on his behalf, for I refused and I still refuse to take this decision on my own shoulders. Fear of legal repercussions and civil suits for negligence is only a part of it. The core of my decision to institute these needless and hopeless treatments is my total refusal to accept the responsibility for ending that life, even if it is only by omission.

It is not my decision. I don't want that power and I shall never accept it. It is the individual's decision and if the individual is fully aware of the facts of his incurable position and makes a decision, then I can go along with it, applaud his or her spirit of fortitude and simple human dignity, and hope the same for myself.

As a psychiatrist, I have to deal with individuals who are suicidal. The ethics of the profession and the law are quite clear on this. Anyone who decides to kill himself or herself is at best of unsound mind and the responsibility of the psychiatrist is quite clear: The psychiatrist must prevent it.

Let me give you a example. A friend tells me that he has made a decision to kill himself. "I don't want to go on living," my friend says. "I am not depressed. I have just had it." My responsibility here is again quite clear. I have to make a decision as to whether or not my friend means it, and if he means it, I have to fill in Form I under The Mental Health Act which specifies that a person who is dangerous to himself or herself must be protected. One may say that if my friend really wanted to kill himself, he shouldn't have told me, but it doesn't change the fact that at the moment he tells me, I have to act whether he likes it or not.

Human attitudes towards the right to die vary from society to society. Let me quote from the Roman historian Tacitus, from his Annals of Imperial Rome: "At Rome"—

this was following the failure of a conspiracy —"the massacre was continuous. Pomponius Labeo, whose imperial governship of Moesia I have mentioned, opened his veins and bled to death, followed by his wife. Such deaths were readily resorted to. They were due to fears of execution, and because people sentenced to death forfeited their property and were forbidden burial, whereas suicides were rewarded for this acceleration by burial, and recognition of their wills."

Even in western society, attitudes to suicide and death vary and are ambiguous. Although the church has always disapproved there was a tacit societal approval, expressed, for example, by an officer disgraced, or facing disgrace, who killed himself rather than subject his regiment to the spectacle of a trial and public opprobrium.

I remember my father talking of an acquaintance of his, an officer who took regimental funds, who killed himself before he could be arrested. "He took the nobleman's way out," my father said. But honour was so bound up with rank that in effect to kill oneself was a privilege reserved only for people of rank.

Mr. Maeck's bill is consciously quite limited, but the conceptual thrust of his bill is embedded in the wider context of our societal attitude to death, whether "natural" or by one's own hand. I do not, therefore, think I have strayed far from discussing this wider context, and I have quoted extensively —not as extensively now as the last time— from Tacitus because those passages illuminated for me how our attitude to death is a reflection only of our society and not of immutable truths.

Clearly, this bill reflects these wider perceptions and I accept and laud it. For me, when this bill becomes law, as I hope it will, the logical contradiction between my role as a physician and my belief system will be lessened.

It has also made me reflect on what I believe and what I consider important. Our life is an uncertain, transient, solitary, brutish and short one. The very fact that it is so transient, however, fills me with an uncomplicated, probably very physiological, appreciation of just being alive.

There is, of course, one certainty in my life, and that is that I shall die. Maybe it is only false and unbecoming pride in us, when we are such clearly transiently sentient beings, that makes us care how we die. But I do care, and I insist that when the time comes that death is imminent, or when I have come to a decision that death is the only alternative, I want to decide for myself. I want to decide not egotistically, but because my very commitment, and my choice of the moment for my death, is in itself an act of human dignity and an act of freedom.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to state very clearly that I agree with the basic premise or principle of the bill; that is the right of each and every individual to decide what type of medical attention will be given to him and whether or not it shall be given. With that I cannot quarrel.

Secondly, I would like to commend the member for Parry Sound for introducing this bill, because I believe it is an issue that needs to be debated publicly. For too long the subject of dying and all that is associated with it has been taboo in our society. As a matter of fact it is as much today as the subject of sex was 20 years ago—you simply didn't talk about it. I am not suggesting that we go as far with this issue as we have with the first one.

An hon. member: Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak against the bill. However, I want to make it very clear to the member who introduced it that anything I say should not be intended to imply motives to him or those people who support it. I'm speaking to the bill itself.

I have to speak against the bill for three reasons: The first one is I believe that it is not necessary legislation. One thing government should not do is introduce legislation that is not needed, because that, in my estimation, is bad legislation.

The second reason I would speak against it is because it will in fact create more problems than it solves. I cannot personally see any point in creating more problems than we already have.

The third reason I'll speak against it is because there are significant moral and ethical values involved in this. As a matter of fact, as late as yesterday I was still not sure which position I was going to take, but in order to help me come to that point I met with the doctors, the administration staff and the medical ethical committees of the two hospitals in my community. I spent about two hours with each of those groups and unanimously all of them opposed it—all across it.

Why do I say that this bill is not necessary? It is because what the bill proposes to do can already be done. An individual right

now can say to his doctor: "I don't want that to be prolonged." If the individual is not capable, the family can do it. They can say to his doctor: "I don't want that to be done." The returns from the latest survey among doctors, both in Canada and in the United States, suggest that 94 per cent of doctors would respect that request.

The other thing the bill says, is that doctors would be protected from prosecution, if in fact they were to do it. Once again, the information that I have is that there has not been a successful prosecution of a doctor for doing such a thing in the last 40 years—as far back as it goes. So the bill isn't necessary for those reasons. The second reason I say the bill is not necessary is because the core and the centre of the medical history and the medical situation in this province, in this country and in North America is the private individual doctor-patient relationship. I'm suggesting that the last thing we want to do is to introduce legislation to introduce government into that very private, very personal doctor-patient relationship.

The other point on which I think it is not necessary is because we're talking here in terms of trying to anticipate what is likely to happen. I would suggest that I could decide at this point in time to sign such a piece of paper and three years later, four years later or four and a half years later, before that thing automatically revokes itself, I may find myself in a very particular situation of life and death and I may feel very differently about it. But because of my position at that time I am unable to revoke it. I may be sentient and I may be sensible but unable to communicate.

I would suggest that on an issue like this one cannot plan in advance and we should not legislate in advance. It involves a particular point in time that is exclusive and cannot be looked at in any other way. At that particular point in time, the patient, his or her doctor and, if necessary, the family have to make that decision. The law and the government should stay out of it.

I am suggesting, secondly, that I must oppose it because it will create problems that don't exist now. This comes mainly from the seven or eight doctors that I specifically spoke to yesterday. I am coming back to the point I made earlier. This may not be intended, but the fact simply remains, if this is passed into law, if it becomes legislation, then the doctor feels that his hands will be tied. At the present time, he makes a decision on the spot, a decision relating to this particular point in time with this particular patient. But if we have such legislation, and let us say there is no signed statement—I know what the bill says—the doctor is going to say, "What do I do?"

What I feel is going to flow from it, what the doctors say will flow from it, what the medical ethical committees say will flow from it is that it will not reduce what we are trying to reduce but will increase it. What will happen is that medical treatment that should be given, from a medical point of view at that particular point, will not be given. At the other end, medical treatment which perhaps should not be extended will continue to be extended because the doctor cannot know what was in the mind of the patient, because he did not sign this particular piece of paper. That's what we have to be concerned about. That's the kind of problem we are going to create that does not exist at the present time.

[4:30]

Let's look at the bill itself. It says that in order to make the final decision, two independent medical opinions have to be brought in. As a doctor pointed out to me yesterday, if a patient is wheeled into the emergency ward from a very serious accident, the doctor has to make a decision now—not 15 minutes from now; not an hour and a half from now —so somebody has to run out and round up two other people to help him make the decision. By that point in time, the man's dead.

Or, conversely, it's 3 o'clock in the morning and the hospital is practically empty; when the nurse finds the patient and the doctor moves in, he has to make a decision right then and there. What does he do? Does he call his colleagues at home, get them out of bed and say, "Get over here. I need you to help make this decision"?

This bill is tying their hands; it's creating a problem which the medical profession says doesn't exist at the moment. That's bad legislation. Why create a problem?

What about the ethical and moral decisions we have here? What are we talking about here? I know the member indicated that the intent is not to support euthanasia. But let's face it: In fact, what we are talking about here is, to use the terminology, passive or negative euthanasia. A life is being terminated. That is euthanasia. It is not positive euthanasia, I will admit that; but may I read one little point into the record? This is what I meant earlier when I said I am not imputing any motives to the member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has one minute.

Mr. Sweeney: Robert H. Williams, professor in the department of medicine, University of Washington, and long an advocate of euthanasia, made this observation:

"However, it seems unwise to attempt to bring about major changes permitting positive euthanasia until we have made more progress in changing laws and policies pertaining to negative euthanasia."

Here's a doctor in a school of medicine, an exponent of euthanasia, who says: "Look, fellows, let's get this little bit in first. That's step one. That's the moral, ethical problem. It's the thin edge of the wedge." I say, we support this legislation at our peril.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I'm very pleased to be able to speak today on this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, but more particularly on the process that has led to this privilege on our part.

Mr. Conway: It's called minority government.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it's a great day that we, the members of this House, can speak our minds—emotionally, as we've just seen, and to the member's credit; and intellectually, as we have also just seen, and to that member's credit. I think it is a fine day that that should happen.

I want to congratulate the member for Parry Sound for his fortitude in bringing in this bill. It certainly is one of some controversy; there shall be no doubt of that. But I think this is the kind of action that the people should expect from their representatives. So, to the member for Parry Sound, (Mr. Maeck) I give a good deal of credit.

I would like to be very brief, because I would hope that many members would avail themselves of the process of speaking on the type of bills we see today. Therefore, I think we can express our opinions in a very few minutes and do it effectively.

I would have to react a little bit to the remarks by the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney). I thought he viewed one of the instances in far too short a term. I suspect that no self-respecting physician would not do the ultimate in terms of life-sustaining drugs, facilities—the works, if I may put it that way —in the short term. If someone arrived at the hospital tomorrow, I would imagine that every facility would be used to protect that patient's life until a fuller and more careful assessment could be made. I think the member viewed that point from far too short a perspective.

But let me say why I would like to see this bill supported. Basically there are two reasons. One, it gives the individual a great deal of opportunity to express his or her own self-determination. I think we need more of that in this province. I think we are not superimposing government legislation, we are indeed giving the privilege to the individual to make a determination as he or she sees fit.

But perhaps my strongest reason for supporting this bill is because of my understanding of the Christian beliefs that I profess to have. Some might disagree with the Christian belief and I am not asking anyone else to take either my understanding of the Christian belief or, indeed, as they themselves understand the Christian belief. But I think surely that the message of this past weekend clearly demonstrates that there is no fear in death, and if we take another view, surely we have missed the salient point of the Christian belief.

Mr. Good: We all want to go to heaven, but not today.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think the member really confuses the basic issue, at least as I perceive it.

Mr. Ferris: There is a difference between heaven and hell.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: This is not a bill to prematurely end life. It is a bill that will not permit the overextension of life beyond the natural and normal method of sustaining life. I think there is a significant difference.

So as I understand it, and particularly as I understood the teachings, as I was able to read them, of Sir William Osler, without doubt the most famous and renowned physician in Canada, he viewed death as though it were to sleep. I think we should be given as individuals this dignity, that we should not be asked to prolong our lives, but we should have that dignity to end our life in a natural and normal fashion.

To end on that thought I would say I believe all of us who believe in the Christian faith must have the right to die by the same faith that we have lived. And that seems to me to lead us to the point where we could die a normal and natural death as outlined in the bill that the member for Parry Sound presented.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I think it best in this debate not to advert to specifically religious propositions or presuppositions. It can be handled on a broader basis. Let me read the oath of Hippocrates: "I swear by

Apollo the physician, by Aesculapius, and health and all heal, and all the gods and goddesses, that according to my ability and judgement I will keep this oath and stipulation." And in the body of the oath it says it will preserve life.

The reverence for life is probably as close to an absolute as we can get in this society. On the other hand, the fear of the undergoing of suffering is very relevant. Suffering on one side can be quite ennobling; on the other side it can be demoralizing and dehumanizing. It depends upon the flux and direction of circumstances.

I think it should be abundantly clear to this assembly that this is a bill neither having to do with suicide or, properly speaking, with euthanasia. It is not a happy death bill. Maybe you could stretch it by talking something about negative euthanasia. That is not really even within the dimensions of the thing.

Everyone I think in this assembly, or I suspect pretty well in any case as far as the tenor of this legislation is concerned, would be opposed to a direct taking of life. He would be also opposed to an omission which has the eventuality of bringing death about where otherwise means could be taken. But the area in which we are dealing here, all moral codes that I know of wouldn't take exception to, namely, you don't of necessity use artificial and extraordinary means to keep a human being alive, particularly if that human being doesn't wish to remain alive.

With that I nevertheless find the legislation defective. And largely for the reasons that were given by the member for Kitchener-Wilmot. Listen, we legislate too much. The present status out there with respect to the medical profession in the handling of people who are terminally ill is well enough to be let alone. They use prudence. They use mercy. They are perfectly aware of the incidence of suffering. They will withdraw the mechanisms to let a person die naturally. They will not unduly sustain life as some kind of biological feat.

We are too influenced by the Quinlan case in this particular. The jurisprudential problems surrounding the California situation are quite different, involving tort suits against physicians, et cetera, either in their failure to provide mechanisms to prolong life or in their failure not to provide them. So it goes both ways.

As to the legal profession, we know of nothing comparable to that, nor within the ambit of the common law is that a procedure or a mode of address and I quote, "at least at the present time." Therefore, the matter rests well enough.

Once you bring in the legislation, what the member for Kitchener-Wilmot said is absolutely correct: If, into the emergency ward comes an individual badly smashed in an accident of some kind, what does the physician do? Does he go searching for the card in the first instance? Does he say, "I wonder if this fellow happens to have a card indicating his desirability?" On the other side of the question, as he attends to the patient, suppose he finds there is such a card? Does he have to construe that as a truncating of any further treatment? Is he not to do anything to help this human being?

Let us assume the human being in this instance—the member says all these cases are rare, so let's have rarity within rarity—is unconscious and can't indicate at that particular stage one way or the other. An awful lot of conditions that come to a hospital are terminal if they are not treated. That's the nature of the thing. Therefore, in the particular situation he may feel that if he treats in the face of a card, he could very likely be subject to suit.

We raise the Hydra head by bringing the legislation forward. If there is no card, as at the present time, a discretionary decision in the wisdom of the physician is made as to how to treat, when to treat, to what degree to treat, all these matters, and if here is no card the legislation may very well be construed in the opposite sense, that he must treat and he must treat with every means available. Otherwise, again he'll stand the possibilities of damages in a court action.

Why engender all that fuss? Over and above that, there's the whole host of phrases here that have to be worked out and determined and more precisely defined. The word terminal, as in terminal condition, is not a word even among the medical profession, as I understand it, easily arrived at by any means. The incurable condition. What is an incurable condition? I don't think there is any definitive determination in the medical profession as to what an incurable condition is. Some conditions that appear to be incurable are not incurable. People are cured.

Then there is the whole situation with respect to the use of "imminent." When is imminent imminent—two weeks, a few hours? Again, there is enormous flux in here, a very great difficulty in making the determination. So what do we gain? We open the Pandora's box to bring explicit legislation in and cause confusion and compound a situation which could be very well left alone.

Another point that has been brought to my attention is with respect to transplants. Sometimes it's necessary to use life-sustaining mechanisms or artificial means to keep people alive in order to perform the transplant, to have the time, et cetera. Are they not to do that in face of a card or if the individual can't consent one way or the other? What if you have two cards, one for transplant and one for which you de-terminate?

[4:45]

While I think pretty well every member of this assembly has deep respect for the member's intention, for what he is trying to do—don't let him follow California on the thing. He is not improving the situation by doing so. In my opinion, he is not helping the medical profession. Certainly, he is doing nothing in terms of law to assist the courts. He is confusing the issue. I'm going to have my final dig: they send my bill out to a royal commission; this is a very deserving subject for the same treatment—and that's probably terminal too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I want to inform the hon. members that the mover and the sponsor of this bill still has four minutes of his time left in order to answer questions and he will be recognized at 4:50.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That leaves me three minutes, which is all I need because everything has already been said. I will oppose the bill for a number of reasons, most of which have been given by the previous speaker and the member for Kitchener-Wilmot and which have been pointed out to me by those people I conferred with in my own area, as the mover of the bill well knows. I have also spoken with him on a personal basis with regard to the bill and I don't intend to allude to that; but he fully realizes my reasons for opposing the bill.

The explanatory note, if that was all the bill represented, would, I think, be acceptable to almost every member in this Legislature. But the bill does go much farther and brings into play other things which, I believe, are not in the best interests of society. The bill is, in itself, another intrusion of government into the rights of the individual by setting up a law which is very difficult to be reversed if, in fact, it does not work out well. We have a lot of those laws on our books; they stay there—and the public suffers in the long run.

I firmly believe the bill also takes away from the medical profession some of the rights it now has to make decisions. If the person himself who has, or has not, signed the card is not in a position, because of his state, to make a decision for himself, I firmly believe his family and his physician together should make that decision as to whether the extraordinary means that are being used, or could be used, should be withheld.

I would point out to you that I have spoken with the members of the medical profession in my area—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Maeck: Give him some more.

Mr. R. S. Smith: They have expressed their opposition to the bill, and so have the directors of one of the hospitals in my area. I should also point out that I have spoken to at least two people who feel that if such legislation had been in place and they had received one of those cards, they would have not received the extraordinary means that prolonged their lives well beyond a few weeks, and into years and years. I think that is perhaps a significant point when you talk to people who have had that experience.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I presume to say that I just think the quality of the debate and the exposition of the various arguments has been just superb. It's obvious that the exercise that we've undertaken under the new rules is a most advantageous one to us and the public and I compliment it.

If I may say to my colleague from Parry Sound, I found the most telling argument for those who oppose his legislation—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Reid: Yes, he wants his opinion.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. I appreciate your indulgence. The most telling argument is the fact that the legislation seemingly is redundant. There is nothing under the law at the present time that deprives an individual of the right to say to his physician: "I don't want that type of treatment." I'd ask the hon. member then to respond to the question: Why do we need the legislation, in view of the redundancy?

Mr. Maeck: Probably that's the first question I should deal with because I have only a couple of minutes left. The reason I feel there's a need is simply this: It's all very well to say that the doctors and the family can sit down and make a decision. If someone should suddenly have a stroke, as an example,

he's not able to speak. Perhaps he's never indicated to his family his feelings on this matter. So his family does not know what his desires are. His doctor doesn't know. He suddenly has a stroke and he has been declared terminal. What does the doctor do? He and the family must take on that authority and make that decision. I don't believe it's the doctor's place or the family's place to make that decision. I think I should have the right to indicate that ahead of time. I just feel that that is important.

The member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) mentioned that 94 per cent of the doctors would carry out the patient's wishes. Okay, what happens to the other six per cent? Who's looking after those people? There are those six per cent out there, if that's the case, who, if they become terminal, are going to be put on life-sustaining machinery whether they want to or not. I'm not saying that's a general practice, but I am saying that I as an individual or any adult as an individual should have the right to decide whether or not he should be put on life-sustaining equipment if he becomes terminal and if he's been declared terminal by at least two other physicians besides his own.

The matter of somebody being pulled up out of, say, a car, after an accident or so on, being taken into the hospital and being ignored, I think is a little far-fetched. I don't think any doctors can diagnose any case in 15 or 20 minutes. I think the natural reaction would be for them to give them aid. This directive is not going to be enforced in 10 or 15 minutes time. I don't think that's an argument.

I don't know if there's anything else that I wanted to mention or not. The member for Nipissing mentioned the rights of the medical profession, suggesting they might be taken away. It's not my intention to take away the rights of the medical profession at all. I don't think the bill does that, but what it does is relieve those people of the responsibility of having to advise the family what should be done. You or I or whoever has signed the directive made that decision for them.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Some consider that their right and their responsibility.

Mr. Maeck: Everyone is entitled to his own opinion on this matter. It's permissive legislation. You don't have to sign a directive if you don't wish. But if it did become law and you decided to sign a directive, you, in effect, would be making the decision rather than asking your family or your clergy or the doctor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Sweeney: You can't make that decision in advance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question of whether or not there will be a vote on this item will be decided at 5:45. We'll deal with item 2.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. Lawlor moved second reading of Bill 4, An Act to provide for Freedom of Information.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has the floor for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. Lawlor: The freedom of information bill before the House today is founded on several matters. It's an amalgam of many sources and statutes. The base of it is the bill of the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) of an earlier date, somewhat built upon and fleshed out. We looked at the American statute which passed through the American Congress in 1967 and was amended fairly substantially since that time, particularly in 1974, and the bill produced by Jed Baldwin up in the federal House—he calls it The Right to Information Act. Our bill—and that's an editorial "our"—is set up along somewhat different lines.

Honourable mention should be given to a man called Vasilkioti, the Conservative candidate running against the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), who drafted a bill and presented it to us at an earlier time, and to the Swedish legislation.

Can there be any question that such a bill is needed? We in the opposition know it direly. We know it from the dearth of information that flows. It's kind of commentary, a curious one, on the democratic process that such a bill should be found necessary at all; that in an open system of government, such as we supposedly have, we don't feel that's the way it operates.

Under this particular head, I would like to quote from the joint Senate-House minutes of proceedings in evidence on the joint standing committee regulations and other statutory instruments, written in this instance by Eugene Forsey. I don't quote Eugene too often any more. He's kind of a purblind, maladroit fellow as far as I'm concerned, particularly

on the Quebec issue, but on matters of this kind he has an exemplary capability. I want to read into the record at page 32-47:

"The complaint most often made and most intensely expressed concerning the provision of government information was that the practice of the Canadian government"—and this, of course, includes the Ontario government—"although enshrined neither in principle nor policy, was to release only that information which was considered advantageous or harmless and automatically to withhold the rest. The operative principle seemed to be, 'When in doubt, classify it'."

I would dare say, if this thing is finally opened up somewhat, that 80 per cent of the information that is held in secret at present would be revealed as a great revelation on the day of judgement and that only 20 per cent would be withheld for very good and obvious reasons.

The chief weight of the legislation, and the conceivable argument against it, has to do with the privacy of individuals. I think it's just as well to deal with that first. It may be said that this legislation before us doesn't adequately protect or forfend in this regard. I would ask the members of the House to look at section 3, where the exemptions, the non-disclosable items, are set forth. The first two have to do with security and foreign relations. The fourth says:

"Documents, the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

I admit that was borrowed from the American statute. It has held over the whole period. It hasn't been amended. It stands and it is the most succinct and direct way of protecting personal privacy. We want to keep the exemptions in this kind of legislation to the very minimum. The whole purpose of the legislation is in the direction of disclosure. Where the disclosure is not warranted in that rather narrow sphere, then of course it has to be adequately protected.

Next, I want to point to clause 8:

"Documents that are excluded from disclosure by statute."

If we look at the statutes having to do with taxation matters, we will invariably see clauses in there making for confidentiallity of financial reports and all kinds of information having to do with the internal operation of businesses, particularly corporations. It's already in most statutes in this regard.

[5:00]

If whatever government exists sees fit, with respect to areas of information touching the personal lives of citizens which ought not to be easily disclosed or readily available for whomever wants to snoop, then that can be put into any piece of legislation. If there's legislation now that doesn't contain a clause and they believe it should contain such a clause—in the area of welfare, in the area of health and the area of education—so be it. You could pass a statute. At least we would get the opportunity to canvass the proposition in this House and it wouldn't be used unilaterally and arbitrarily by some cabinet minister, et cetera who is simply anxious to protect his own flanks—

Mr. Conway: Shame.

Mr. Lawlor: —from all directions.

Mr. Conway: Shame.

Mr. Lawlor: Protection is given in this legislation to the minister of the executive council, but it seems to me that it didn't want to go very much further than that. We all respect cabinet secrecy; it can't make decisions otherwise. Nevertheless, a great deal of information, reports, various types of documentation is given to the cabinet upon which to make the decision which should be available to us too so that we can see the basis upon which these decisions were made.

It should go beyond that. We should know what the alternatives discussed might be, but I do not think you can penetrate into the closure of cabinet as such or would we want to do so nor does the legislation call for that. On the contrary, the legislation specifically excludes that sort of thing.

The structure of the bill, as to the first part, defines a public document in a very broad way. That has been worked over, expanded—and it's not in line, it's fairly new drafting—to try and cover the whole area as to what can be elicited, what is being sought and to cover the ground pretty thoroughly.

The second section is interesting because here's the major problem. In the United States, and to some degree in Sweden too, the freedom of information legislation has spawned something of a bureaucracy and has proved fairly costly to the public purse to make disclosures as required. I thought that initially at least, to get the legislation off the ground, to get it into operation, it would be best to cut out all that and simply move to the heart of the matter, reposing a certain amount of faith in the public servants, et cetera, in this particular regard. So I say that, subject to the exemptions, any person

may request in writing any public document from a government organization, where the request reasonably identifies the subject matter, or a list of public documents affecting the subject matter, and upon receiving the request, the government organization shall make available as soon as possible such a document or list of documents for examination. It does. It's not perfect but it does save a great deal of cost.

In the United States under their Public Information Act, they have gone to a system of indexing with elaborate provisions—many sections and so on—it is a system of indexing all these internal memorandum, all the internal documentation, manuals and everything else which they publish every quarter for the perusal of the general public. The minister is perfectly right. This has been abused by certain corporations in the United States in working over that particular material and making demands upon it.

I don't see at this stage publishing all these lists. People who want to know something within, say, a particular area of nuclear energy or something of that kind, know with some specificity what they are after. The government servants can say, "Well, this is what we have available internally. What do you want?" And there has to be some reciprocity in order to get the thing operating.

I am one of those who believes that the office of the Ombudsman should not be contracted, restricted or truncated in any way. On the contrary, it should be expanded. The role and functions of the Ombudsman are not sufficiently full and warranted and operating in this province at the present time and so I thought—and this is what the Swedes do; they have an Ombudsman in this particular regard—I thought that if there was a dispute between a government agency and whoever is out there wanting information that was denied, that the Ombudsman could be the referee. Why not, in this particular? Then, if that didn't appear to be quite palatable, let's take it beyond that, by way of sealed documentation, to the courts, because a government agency might, under various circumstances particularly, not want to accede to the Ombudsman—its own creature, so to speak—and would want to take it on, if it felt the matter was of sufficient secrecy and importance, to a judge of the high court. So be it, and one has no exception to that.

And then if there are other areas open up with respect to what may or may not be legitimately asked for—provisions made in the regulations. But, again, the legislation goes one step further and says we all chafe under the present system touching regulations—we all spend all our nights reading the Ontario Gazette. In this particular situation, I say that the standing committee of the Legislature having to do with regulations—which is a kind of dormant body if ever there was one—might peruse the regulation exempting a particular area and give its approval.

Again, we keep it within the legislative intent. The matter is controlled and operative through this body, where it has to be, and ought to be, and I trust would be regarded by all members of this House as an innovative measure. It is one way in which the British Parliament, by the way, does fairly often with respect to their regulations, and which we have never done. That is, indeed, a great shame.

You see the balance of the sections having to do with cost and so on, preventing vexatious and frivolous proceedings to be taken. A person, if he forces the thing up to the high court, very well might have to pay the costs if he hasn't got good grounds for asking for this thing and for pushing it thus far. I think that's a warranted and worthy provision.

The minister will talk about our kind of constitution being different from other constitutions. I am inclined to agree, in this kind of legislation, with Professor Rawlyk that the constitutional issue, while important and to be cognizant of, is not all that important. The problem is is the information available or ain't it? If we need it and we want it, are there legitimate grounds for withholding it? That, in any system of government, would be the primary consideration. I don't think that all this malarkey and all this background paper that we have been subjected to—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I hope you read it before you comment on it.

Mr. Conway: You insulted the Attorney General.

Mr. Lawlor: I read it with great care—three times, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Conway: You are going to upset the Attorney General.

Mr. Foulds: Your batting average isn't very good, Roy.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: It's a lot better than yours.

Mr. MacDonald: Philadelphia is coming to town.

Mr. Martel: If Carleton Williams is heading up that study you're lost.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Can we have some order, please? You're taking the time away from the member for Lakeshore. This is a structured debate.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Structured? It is a very structured presentation.

Mr. Lawlor: I put it to this House that adequate provision for privacy is made in the terms of this legislation. I put it to this House that the other subterfuge and various traducings attempted in this particular background paper, pointing out the Wall report —the Wall report is a report which fundamentally says that confidentiality should be lifted, to some degree, from the civil service and that internally through the civil service they should make these decisions. Guidelines could be laid down—you have no necessity for legislation under this head. Things are fine as they are and you ought not to open it up in this particular way.

Mr. Bullbrook: What did you do with all those brown paper bags we sent you?

Mr. Lawlor: It's a case of arterial sclerosis over there. You do get hardening of the arteries. All bodies, particularly when they've been exercising too long end up with a kind of cretinous condition. This government has been so self-enclosed and so habitually addicted to withholding information over the years that it finds it quite impossible to do gracefully what the times call for, and which most other civilized jurisdictions do voluntarily. What does this government do when this kind of legislation is mooted? It immediately turns around and says that it's going to appoint—it wasn't quite sure what kind of commission it was going to appoint for quite a while. The Throne Speech says some kind of commission. The government got around finally, the following day to say it was going to be a royal commission.

The minister has seen, I trust, the remarks made by some of my colleagues about the constitution of that commission, particularly as to its chairman. We have grave misgivings about the operation of that commission. It's already predelicted, through its chairman, in the government's favour.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As an Irish nationalist, are you offended by the use of the word "royal"?

Mr. Lawlor: Have you suddenly gone simple-minded?

Mr. Conway: It wasn't a very long trip.

Mr. MacDonald: Fred Shero is going to look after you.

Mr. Lawlor: I, therefore, knowing and holding for an idea whose time has come, ask all members, since I trust this is a free vote on all sides of this House, to vote for this legislation. If members find there's some minor weakness somewhere—

Mr. Reid: Just in the speaker.

Mr. Lawlor: —and I can't lay claim to total perfection in these matters, it can be amended in committee. It would be welcomed in these terms, but if members want to flesh something out or make it clear, so be it. The legislation has great validity and I particularly want to commend the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) for having been the first to introduce the matter to this House.

Mr. Singer: I start off my remarks in this debate by complimenting the hon. member for Lakeshore in bringing this bill forward. Those of us who have been here for a while have become absolutely frustrated at the inability to obtain information from government, information that the people of Ontario are entitled to get and that their representatives are entitled to get. What we receive instead of information is a bunch of gobbledygook, subterfuge, plots and cute answers. A bunch of nonsense emanates from the government benches, and there is no free exchange of information.

It's sufficient for the day that the government is in charge and can order the business of the province. That is their duty and responsibility. But at least they are supposed to be a democratic government. One has to wonder at the extent of democracy, at least in the minds of those who have governed in this province for some 30 years or more, when they refuse to give to the other elected representatives who don't happen to wear their same party badge information which will allow appropriate discussion of matters of public concern.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember with me that over the years we have asked time and again for the records and the minutes of the Ontario Housing Corporation. There has been great concern in the minds of a number of us as to the method whereby the Ontario Housing Corporation buys and sells and deals in property. I thought we are making some progress with the newest Minister of Hous-

ing (Mr. Rhodes)—and I'm sorry he isn't here today—who promised this House over a year ago that he was going to work out some method whereby the minutes of the Ontario Housing Corporation could be examined by members of the Legislature.

He put a couple of caveats into that kind of a study. He said "You wouldn't want to make public matters affecting personnel." Perhaps not. "You wouldn't want to make public matters affecting a transaction not yet to be completed." Perhaps not. "You wouldn't want to make public matters which would seriously affect the marketability of a particular piece of real estate." Perhaps not. After we got the various caveats from the Minister of Housing, the matter died, yet to come back to light again. None of us yet has been able to see the minutes of the Ontario Housing Corporation and what they would reveal, or to see any explanation of some of the most peculiar dealings in land—at least as they appeared to us, at least as they appeared to the media and at least as they appeared to voters.

I am very happy to see that the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) is next on the list to join this debate. I hope he will give us something more than the pap that is contained in the so-called white paper.

[5:15]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Have you read it?

Mr. Singer: Yes, I've read it; I've read it in detail.

I wonder why, and I would ask the Attorney General—through you, of course, Mr. Speaker; I wouldn't engage in this kind of talk—I would ask him to explain to us when he gets on his feet, and I'm sure he will, why it has taken this government all these years to bring forward nothing more than a really nebulous white paper which promises action some time in the future. Why is his word in the white paper any more useful or valid than the word of the Minister of Housing, which he gave to this House a year and a half ago when we asked him—was it for the 10th, 12th or 15th time?—to let us have a look at the minutes of the Ontario Housing Corporation?

What I say substantially is this: There is no reason to believe that this government is serious when it talks about disclosure of information. There is no reason at all to believe it's serious, because questions sit on the order paper. He, the Attorney General, and his colleagues give us these snappy answers—they think they are very clever—they sit down and we don't know the answer. Or the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) for instance. What better evader of fact is there than the Treasurer, who makes a loud political attack on people seeking legitimate information to appropriately consider matters of government policy?

Having said that, I say that my colleagues and I are anxious and eager to support a bill which will force as quickly as possible, and bring about as quickly as possible, a system of disclosure of information. I think this has to be an immediate part of the legislative procedures and provisions of the province of Ontario.

I agree with the hon. member for Lakeshore that his bill is something far less than perfect, and there are a number of changes I would like to see in it. However, in principle I have no hesitation in supporting it. For instance, I wonder whether or not we really should appoint the Ombudsman as a person who is going to sit in judgement on whether or not particular pieces of information are relevant or come within some of the exclusions that the Act provides.

Mr. Lawlor: Why on earth not?

Mr. Singer: I believe that there is a very serious danger that can be further aggravated by giving to the Ombudsman yet more power to make decisions which will set him over and above the Legislature. I would like to see section 4, referring to the Ombudsman, deleted from this statute and whatever review there has to be perhaps entrusted to the court.

I'm not too happy with the kinds of exclusions as they are worded; they're pretty broadly drawn. I would think if we had a little more time—perhaps in committee—the definitions set out in section 3 could be expanded and made more specific.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, again we commend the introduction of this bill. We believe it deserves the support of all members of this House. The test is going to be, when the Attorney General speaks, as to whether or not he is serious. We've heard far too long from him and his colleagues, and from his predecessors and their colleagues, that they believe in the freedom of information. They give lip-service to democracy, but let them put their lips where their principles lie and let them support this kind of a statute.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member for Eglinton.

Mr. Moffatt: The opposition critic.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that I'll be able to make a little more useful contribution to this debate than was made by the member for Wilson Heights.

Mr. Singer: Just say you'll support the bill.

Some hon. members: Support the bill!

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I should state at the outset that I ought to be very pleased with the interest of the hon. member for Lakeshore with respect to this obviously very important and most crucial topic. I'm certainly willing to concede that the introduction of his bill is at least a useful contribution to the continuing investigation of what should be the best approach. However, as I've already clearly indicated in the Throne Speech debate, it is my view that the legislation is, firstly, premature—

Mr. Nixon: Shame.

Mr. Lawlor: Fifty years too late.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —and, secondly, contains very substantial defects; I'll touch on some of these in a few moments. In my respectful view, it would be not in the public interest to support such legislation.

The member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) has acknowledged the fact that his legislation is based to a very large extent on the US freedom of information Act. He has also referred to Sweden as well, and recognizes the fact that both those Acts are obviously based on very different constitutional principles and are not appropriate to the Canadian experience. In relation to the, I think, very important background paper, it should be pointed out that in Canada very little scholarly attention has, in fact, been paid to the many issues that have been raised, and certainly there has really been very little detailed analysis of the US and the Swedish solutions. The debate in Canada, as a matter of fact, has been confined to date to a relative handful of contributions and those are referred to in the white paper.

I think it should be pointed out again that the experience in the US has been very useful and has demonstrated the enormous cost that has been involved in enforcing the rights under the Act. It has not only added enormously to government bureaucracy but because of the litigation—

Mr. Bain: It would be cheaper not to have an election either.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —the member should be interested in this—and because of the adversary system that has been set up there, the principal beneficiaries of the US legislation have been the large corporations, because they are the only people who have been able to afford the very costly litigation that is engaged in in relation to whether or not there has been a compliance with the legislation.

Mr. Conway: That would make it like the Tory party.

Mr. Drea: The Marxist mind always has the answer.

Mr. Lawlor: You think it is a sop to the socialists, do you?

Mr. Drea: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I point out again that it is recognized in the United States that the treatment, in the US, of freedom of information and privacy in separate legislation has caused enormous confusion and uncertainty in relation to interpreting both Acts.

If I may turn to the bill that has been introduced, I should like to make some specific comments in relation to what I view to be very substantial defects. First, the list of exceptions in section 3(1) raises more questions than it answers. For example, what constitutes "a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy" in paragraph 4? The same expression in the US freedom of information Act has certainly spawned a great deal of litigation and it is yet to be satisfactorily defined. I think just simply to crib some legislation from another jurisdiction and assume that this is going to serve the interests of the people in Ontario is really not a very useful approach.

Mr. Martel: You had better vote against Lorne Maeck's bill in a little while.

Mr. Lawlor: You are not even considering your legislation.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The exceptions in paragraphs 6 and 11 contain the potential of rendering the right of access declared in section 2 almost totally meaningless. After the member attempts to establish precise criteria for disclosure in sections 2 and 3, the bill then goes on to empower the Ombudsman to order the release of documents when in his opinion it is in the public interest that this be done. This is section 4(3). The effect of this provision is to eliminate from the bill any identifiable criteria.

Mr. Nixon: The member for Lakeshore was trying to protect the government.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Furthermore, I think section 4 does raise very fundamental questions about the role of the Ombudsman. For example, in no other instance does he have the power to direct or order that things be done. He can recommend only. Paragraph 8 of section 3(1) of the bill specifically exempts from the requirement of disclosure, "documents that are excluded from disclosure by statute." The effect of section 4(3) is to permit the Ombudsman to rewrite the statutory exemptions; and I think the same may be said about section 7, which confers power on the Lieutenant Governor in Council to order the release of any public document where it is in the public interest to do so.

I suggest Mr. Speaker, that a fundamental defect of the bill—

Mr. Kerrio: It is premature?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —is that it promotes an overly legalistic approach to the question of access to public documents, and it certainly encourages both the individual and the government to adopt adversary stances.

Mr. Lawlor: I wish I had kept my 2½ minutes now.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As I indicated, furthermore, the bill ignores the most fundamental importance of dealing with information privacy and automated data processing in the same bill, and if the member was really acting in the public interest he would recognize the wisdom of dealing with both those issues at the same time.

Mr. MacDonald: Now you are casting doubt on the hon. member's motives.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Finally, when any dispute over the release of public documents reaches the courts, again at this point in time the judge—at least as I read the legislation—would appear to have a wide open discretion to determine the issue—in the member's words —as he thinks fit, without reference to the specific section 3(1); for example the exclusions or the Ombudsman's opinion of where the public interest may lie.

So quite apart from what I say is premature, the bill itself will create far more problems than it will ever solve. It may well be a bonanza for lawyers, but I certainly don't think that was in the hon. member's mind when he introduced the legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my first words must be of thanks to my colleague from Lakeshore for introducing this bill.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They are turning the lights off.

Mr. MacDonald: That's right. The darknesses will descend on us when we have to vote on this this afternoon.

Mr. Conway: The lights are dimming.

Mr. Reid: You are casting us all into darkness.

Mr. MacDonald: I trust you are deducting all that time off mine, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: All of this is time; it's all counting.

Mr. MacDonald: My luck of the draw this year on the private member's bills brought me in 70th position, so it would have been some time in the 1980s—

Mr. G. I. Miller: Pity.

Mr. Reid: Well that's about your relative standing in the House.

Mr. MacDonald: The fact that my colleague was willing to bring this in is an evidence not only of it being a personal concern of mine and of his, but a personal concern of this whole party, because we have given it the first place in terms of private member's bills.

Mr. Drea: As a party?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Lakeshore has dealt with the substance of this bill and, given the restraints of time, I am not going to deal with the substance of the bill any more. I want to deal with the political context in which we are considering it.

It was widely believed that the government was going to bring in a bill on freedom of information. It was almost an open secret; the press was speculating on it. Yet when the Throne Speech came down we discovered that the government had said it had opted for a commission on freedom of information and individual privacy.

The best comment I have seen on that is not only the little stiletto effort of it being a spurious commission, but the lead editorial of the Hamilton Spectator on April 5, right after the Throne Speech, drew attention to the great challenge today to get governments to be a part of the people instead of government being separate from the people. They

said the theory that government is part of the people is being shot to pieces because it is becoming a separate entity, groping in various ways to work out some new mutually acceptable relationships with the public.

Then their comment on what is happening in Ontario was as follows: "In Ontario this effort has taken a strange and pathetic form—a commission on freedom of information and individual privacy. The commission on freedom of information is not a noble attempt to restore decent relations between the people and government. It's an admission of government's failure."

[5:30]

This study is not needed; we study things to death. This government has the greatest propensity of studying things to death, instead of acting to come to grips with solving the problem.

Mr. Conway: It is just their socialist instinct.

Mr. MacDonald: The Attorney General was quoted on radio this morning as saying: "We don't want to stumble into this issue." This afternoon he had a new version—"It's premature." How something can be premature when it's as long overdue as this mystifies me a little. I think he should have a discussion with the hon. Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson).

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Read the background paper carefully.

Mr. MacDonald: We'll come to the background paper in a moment.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Carefully.

Mr. MacDonald: The proposition that we are stumbling into this issue is just a piece of nonsense. The government may be stumbling into the issue, they may be backing into the issue; but we have generations of experience with regard to freedom of information in Sweden, we've had a decade of experience with it in the United States. In Ottawa Jed Baldwin has been leading something approaching a crusade to get freedom of information legislation passed in the House of Commons. He now has the backing of the Bar Association in Canada.

It's interesting that a Tory in Ottawa finds that he is bucking the Liberals and they won't break down the traditional inhibitions to freedom of information; whereas when we get down here the opposition is attempting to deal with the Tory government and facing the same road blocks.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: What about your friends in Ottawa?

Mr. Nixon: You Tories didn't think of it when you were in a minority situation in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has the floor. Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: I want to come back to the province of Ontario. The Attorney General was aware of the fact that a very significant group of Conservative lawyers had been working on this issue for quite some time.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Vasilkioti will be sitting in this House after the next election.

Mr. Nixon: How well the Tories do down there in St. George.

Mr. Conway: Remember March, 1973, Roy?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: That was premature.

Mr. Foulds: You stumbled into that.

Mr. MacDonald: Last fall, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General got up and criticized the hon. member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) because of his contribution. His function here this afternoon is to run interference and to play games with an important issue. That's all he's done so far.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member for York South will return to the principle of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: I am dealing with the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker. If you want to bring the Attorney General to heel instead of interrupting, then you would have some justification for trying to get me back to the principle. We've wasted about three or four minutes. A little bit of even application of the rules of the House around here—

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will rule impartially.

Mr. Conway: The Attorney General is the one wasting time.

Mr. Moffatt: Who is that Speaker?

Mr. Drea: You wouldn't treat the Speaker that way?

Mr. MacDonald: If he deserved it, I would.

This government is backing into this issue in spite of the fact that it had a group of Tories who have studied it, who know that it is time, that it is not premature for a bill

to be brought in. They have made their representations to the Attorney General; the Attorney General's department prepared a bill; the bill went to the cabinet; and the cabinet took flight. The cabinet decided that they could not run the risk of the kind of freedom of information that would be passed by a government in a House in which they were a minority; so they've gone off to study it further because they're good.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is the attitude. And what is the attitude of this government? Let's start right with the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Last April the Premier was interviewed on CFTO by Tom Clark. The question was: "Do you think we have too much secrecy in government?" The Premier's comment was: "I don't think there is. I think there are some people who feel there is too much secrecy. I think actually there's a great deal of public information, in fact more public information than probably either the media or the public generally can assimilate."

That's the attitude of this government. It always has been, and the whole cabinet has taken on that kind of an attitude.

Mr. Martel: You never release anything.

Mr. MacDonald: The net result of it, Mr. Speaker, was that a month later the Conservatives held an annual meeting and there was a revolt—at least it was termed a grass roots revolt on the front pages of the Globe and Mail which always reports authoritatively on the Conservative Party.

Mr. Makarchuk: It's a revolting party.

Mr. Moffatt: That's true.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier then said that they were reviewing the situation; they were reviewing it and the result is that we now have this going off into a study.

Our problem, in terms of the attitude, is the tradition. We have a tradition of administrative secrecy in the British parliamentary system which makes a mockery, makes it impossible to have the kind of open government that we need in a modern democracy. Something has got to be done to reverse that tradition of administrative procedure.

We've had studies by COGP and they've said we should have a declaration of communications policy. We've had studies by the Wall report which said there should be less confidentiality; and I agree that both the COGP and the Wall report backed off when it came to the proposition of having legislation.

The AG's report, or this study paper that he's prepared that he's so proud of, is a rehash of all of that stuff. They have elevated it to a threat to the British parliamentary system if we don't go into this carefully, because somehow or other we're going to challenge this administrative secrecy which is sort of core to the whole British parliamentary system.

Mr. Speaker: One minute to go.

Mr. MacDonald: Right:

Mr. Conway: Does Bill Kelly like this bill?

Mr. MacDonald: The Attorney General argues that it is not appropriate to the Canadian experience. I suggest that it is appropriate. I suggest that his own colleagues in the Conservative Party told him at their annual meeting last year that it was appropriate. I suggest there's a group of lawyers, some of whom he thinks may be in this House after the next election, who have presented a bill to him; and his ministry has prepared the bill and brought it into the cabinet, and now he is backing off from this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree there may be defects in this bill. Nobody for one moment would argue that in as complex a bill there might not be defects. But this bill has been before the House three times before. It has had the support of spokesmen from all parties on each occasion which it was debated. I suggest now is not premature. Now is the time, long overdue, to pass the bill. Send it out to committee, improve it where it needs to be improved; but let's come to grips with this issue instead of studying it still more.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to speak in favour of the bill before us. I certainly feel that if anything were put in the way of a free and democratic vote on the bill in the House it would be a tragedy indeed. I see some of the back-bench Tories—there are only six of them, of course—coming in in preparation for the disposition of this order of business, and I would certainly warn them against expressing any view against a free vote in the House.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member who has just spoken is entirely correct. It has been before the House on three occasions; it has been supported on all sides; and it would be a

shame indeed if the will of the House were not now carried forward.

Interjections.

Mr. Makarchuk: They don't believe in democracy.

Mr. Nixon: I want to quote just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, from a publication I know you read carefully called "The Parliamentarian"—

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: It is an article from January, 1977, having to do with cabinet confidentiality and the Crossman diaries. We're not talking about getting into disposition of cabinet secrets or anything like that. As a matter of fact, it is accommodated in this bill. But Lord Chalfont, whom I read regularly—

Hon. Mr. Welch: That's why you don't make sense.

Mr. Nixon: —in being quoted in "The Parliamentarian," quotes a man whom I do respect and do read regularly, Mr. Jo Grimond. Jo Grimond said on one occasion in the Mother of Parliaments, and I quote from him: "The bureaucratic frame of mind, self-regarding, secretive, hierarchical and averse to open discussion, is a major, though perhaps well-intentioned threat to our society." I will tell you that the passage of this bill and its acceptance wholeheartedly by the offices of government would do much to strengthen our method of government and reaffirm our commitment to true democracy; which surely is that decisions are not taken in secret, that the basic information available to government is also available to the public and that the public does have a right to know. So I say that it is a matter of high principle for every member of the House to respond to this bill before us and not to use some sort of a legal loophole in the rule to dispose of it otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You agreed to the rules.

Mr. Singer: It is at your peril.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You agreed to the new rule. Don't start talking about loopholes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: The only other matter that concerns me is that the rumours in the newspapers may be correct, that before this bill goes through and becomes law this House might be dissolved. I would assure you, Mr. Speaker—and I know it must concern you deeply—as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, when we form a government we will move this legislation in this Legislature, without delay.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: However, I am confident that the goodwill that has marked the debate this afternoon will carry forward into the taking of the vote and that no one is needlessly going to obstruct the declaration of the majority will in the House at this time.

Hon. J. R. Smith: You are going the way of the dinosaur.

Mr. Nixon: I just want to say something about an objection raised by the Attorney General. In his sort of quavery voice he said that this is going to cost a lot of money. I feel that is really an inadequate argument for a person in his capacity to put forward.

I do want to quote from a report that was in the Southam News Services by Ben Tierney, which I'm sure others have read. In that report he quotes from the research undertaken by the Library of Congress in the United States responding to a review of the American freedom of information statute. I quote from this article:

"The library researchers also tend to disagree with complaints concerning the cost of meeting requests under the Act. In 1975, the Department of Defence offered figures to Congress which suggested the department could be forced to fork over close to $6 million. But, according to the figures produced after the law was in effect, the defence department actually reported an expenditure of only $405,000." This was in the United States of America.

I feel that the arguments put forward by the Attorney General were simply to obstruct the passage of this bill. If our commitment to the private members' hour is something other than just a debating society and is a real one—and I know that the government House leader has made a real commitment to it—then we cannot allow the objections of the Treasurer, who has conveyed them to the Attorney General, to stand in the way of the passage of the bill.

I feel the bill is well drawn. If anything, the hon. member who put it forward was perhaps too careful about protecting anything that the government might want to keep in its secret files. As a matter of fact—and I hesitate to open myself to an interjec-

tion from him—it sounds as if he were already the Attorney General—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Stop playing politics.

Mr. Nixon: —and attempting to protect his own butt before there were even any blemishes on it.

I would just say to all of those who might be concerned about a change in government that it appears to me if the NDP were elected, and God forbid, we would have the same sort of commitment to the concept, but drawing back from the application, that we have been so critical of in the Conservative side.

When I see that long list of exclusions, including that classic one that the Tories always use, which says something to the effect that "in case we haven't thought of it already, anything else we want to exclude we can do so by law," then that is unworthy of the hon. member for Lakeshore. If it does go to committee, as I trust it will, I for one would move that that be struck out.

I cannot agree, however, with my colleague when he objects to the role of the Ombudsman. I believe that is an approach that is supportable, although if the Attorney General did make a good point it was that the Ombudsman should not have the power to enforce but simply to make a recommendation, because his recommendations in our political system should be tantamount to a decision having been made.

I trust this bill will not be obstructed. If it is not obstructed, I know it will pass this House and add one of the most useful laws to the books of this province.

[5:45]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has up to four minutes.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. It will be less than a moment.

Mr. MacDonald: Be consistent.

Mr. Kerrio: Thank the Lord for small mercies.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Time is very short.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I shall be less than a moment. I give my respects to my friend the member for York South. I supported his private bill. If he had brought in this kind of a private bill at that time, I would not have supported it.

Mr. Nixon: The fix is in. You did it this morning and now you are doing it again.

Mr. Reid: That must be a reversible coat you are wearing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: I would appreciate a sense of decorum in this House on this historic occasion.

Interjections.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the hon. Attorney General, has said it far more eloquently and far more expertly than I, what is fundamentally wrong and—

An hon. member: That's true.

Mr. Nixon: You are standing on your head.

Mr. Drea: —fundamentally invalid in this presentation. I am not going to repeat his remarks. I endorse them. Number one, this bill is premature.

Mr Nixon: No.

Mr. Drea: Number two, it is redundant, because this government is far more concerned about civil liberties and the protection of the individual—

Mr. Nixon: You are wrong twice.

Mr. Drea: —than those who have a continued obsession with crime.

Interjections.

Mr. Drea: Above all, number three, with subsection 2 of section 3, it is probably the most dangerous piece of legislation put forward in this House since the infamous Bill 99.

Interjections.

Mr. Drea: I am very much surprised—I am very surprised—as a matter of fact I am quite taken back—

Mr. Warner: You should be taken back somewhere.

Mr. Drea: —that such a noted professional civil libertarian as the mover of this bill would put into any statute over which he had some control, and I presume he had some control in the drafting of this—

Mr. Lawlor: Some remote control.

Mr. Drea: —that subsection 2. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, if the government was refusing to do something for somebody be-

cause they had a criminal record? Read that subsection 2. The criminal record gets to be a part of the proceedings of a standing committee. When he thought about this and when he drafted this, he should have taken a look at the protection of the individual.

Interjections.

Mr. Drea: But knowing the mentality that produces this kind of legislation—

Interjections.

Mr. Drea: —I will say there apparently are no lengths to which those who want to snoop and to pry and to get rid of any private considerations will go. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martel: That won't get you a cabinet post.

Mr. Conway: Keep you out of the bedrooms of the nation.

An hon. member: You are right where you belong.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Can we get on with the business of the House now? We will deal with these orders in accordance with the instructions as laid down this afternoon, dealing first of all with the first item.

Mr. Maeck had moved second reading of Bill 3. My first question is, shall there be a vote on this motion? Any members opposed to a vote must now rise.

Mr. Reid: Explain what you mean.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there is any doubt about what I mean, this isn't voting against the bill necessarily. We are voting as to whether there will be a vote on the bill, and if 20 members rise we will not put it to a vote later. I will ask that question so that we are quite clear. Any members opposed to a vote must now rise. There are not 20, so this will be stacked—

Mr. Reid: There are 19 over there.

Mr. Speaker: —for the possible division. Yes, the first item will be sent to a vote.

The second item had to do with Bill 4. Mr. Lawlor had moved second reading of Bill 4. Again I will ask the question, shall there be a vote on this motion? Any members opposed to a vote must now rise.

Sufficient members having objected by standing, a vote was not taken on Bill 4.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have a matter to decide yet; there will be a vote on second reading of Bill 3. May I just remind the members that this is a recorded vote, as I am sure most of you are aware; and, since the voting pattern may be divided in this or any of the other items on which we will vote in future, I would just remind the hon. members that they should in their turn rise and bow before they expect their name to be called. I just point that out because many people stand after their names are called. You'll have to stand first.

The House divided on Mr. Maeck's motion for second reading of Bill 3, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Auld	Bain
Belanger	Bernier
Birch	Breaugh
Bryden	Breithaupt
Cassidy	Brunelle
Cunningham	Burr
Davidson	Conway
Davison	Deans
Drea	Di Santo
Dukszta	Eakins
Eaton	Ferris
Evans	Foulds
Ferrier	Good
Germa	Grande
Gregory	Hall
Grossman	Kerrio
Hodgson	Lawlor
Johnson	Mackenzie
Jones	Mancini
Kennedy	Martel
Lane	McClellan
Lewis	McKeough
MacBeth	McNeil
MacDonald	Miller, G. I.
Maeck	Newman, B.
Makarchuk	Nixon
McCague	Reed
McMurtry	Reid
Meen	Renwick
Miller, F. S.	Rhodes
Moffatt	Riddell
Morrow	Ruston
Newman, W.	Smith, R. S.
Norton	Stong
Parrott	Swart
Philip	Sweeney
Samis	Welch
Sandeman	Wells
Scrivener	Williams
Shore	Worton
Singer	Ziemba—41.
Smith, J. R.	
Stephenson	
Taylor	
Timbrell	
Villeneuve	

AYES

Warner
Wildman
Wiseman
Young—50.

Ayes 50; nays 41.

Motion agreed to.

Ordered for standing committee.

Mr. Nixon: Don't tell me the Conservatives are going to keep us from voting on freedom of information.

Hon. Mr. Welch: While our attendance is at this level, Mr. Speaker, perhaps this would be the appropriate time to discuss the business of the House for next week; it will just take a minute.

On Monday of next week we have the concluding Throne Speech debate, with a vote Monday evening at 10:15. On Tuesday there will be legislation in the afternoon, and we'd like to serve notice that we'll call Bill 28 on Tuesday afternoon. Then at 8 p.m. the Treasurer of Ontario wants to have a brief word with us.

Mr. Martel: He probably won't have anything new to say.

Hon. Mr. Welch: On Wednesday of next week the resources development committee and the general government committee will meet in the morning, with the resources development committee able to start consideration of estimates. The social development committee will meet in the afternoon and it also will be ready to start considering estimates.

On Thursday afternoon, of course, there will be debate on ballot item No. 3, the notice of motion by Mr. Singer, and on ballot item No. 4, Bill 10 standing in the name of Mr. Johnson.

On Thursday night, if required, we will continue second reading debate on Bill 28. Then we'll proceed with the bill introduced today by the Minister of Education dealing with the Essex school. On Friday we will continue with that legislation, if necessary, and if there is time, start second reading of Bill 26, the Act dealing with the proposed Ministry of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the government House leader would like to call the order of business for the evening?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The first order.

Clerk of the House: First order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

The House recessed at 6:05 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 419)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

1. Mr. Bounsall—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Ministry of Health indicate how many persons, who were suggested by the Memorial Society Association of Canada, and specifically, who are they, if any, have been appointed as the representatives of the public to the Board of Funeral Services and to the Funeral Services Review Board under The Funeral Services Act, 1976? Would the ministry indicate the background and interests of all appointees that qualify them to serve as public representatives on these specific boards, including any business or professional involvement with funeral directors in any province in Canada? Tabled March 29, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell):

On January 5, 1977, the Memorial Society Association of Canada, Hamilton, Ontario, sent us a letter naming three nominees for consideration to the Board of Funeral Services and the Funeral Services Review Board:

Mr. Fred P. Schneider,
344 Old Chicopee Drive,
Kitchener.

Mr. Eldon D. Weber,
106 Maplewood Place,
Kitchener.

Mr. Eric Gowen,
418 Oakdale Crescent,
Thunder Bay.

Many other names have been submitted to us for appointments to these boards but, as yet, no firm decisions as to the final selection of these boards has been made.

The composition of members to the Board of Funeral Services will comprise five funeral directors, one of whom is not licensed to establish and maintain and who does not direct the operation of a funeral services establishment, and three lay persons who are not licensees under the Act.

The Funeral Services Review Board will comprise three lay persons not licensees under the Act.

Consideration will also be given to ensure that there will be representation from all areas of the province.

3. Mr. Angus—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would each minister indicate the exact method that they use to monitor and control expenditures against budget allocations, and to monitor uncommitted funds? First tabled November 2, 1976. Tabled March 31, 1977.

Answer by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food:

Each branch director receives a monthly computer print-out showing: Budget allocation for the year; expenditure for the month; accumulated expenditure; unexpended budget, i.e. balance remaining at the month end; percentage of expenditure to budget.

This information is given separately for each sub-activity within the branch and is detailed into the various types of goods and services purchased, casual wages versus those of regular staff, et cetera. The reports are summarized and provided to the division heads for their information.

Each branch director is responsible for ensuring that his or her expenditure will not overrun budget allocation. Larger branches and institutions have on their staffs someone with accounting knowledge who assist in these determinations and accumulate the value of committed purchases. Smaller branches may not have this expertise and the budget officer in the accounts branch pays special attention to assist.

Towards the end of each fiscal year branch directors are required to submit monthly statements indicating projected over or under expenditure of budget allocations. These are considered by the ministry's administrative executive committee which consists of the deputy minister, division heads, and other senior staff.

If approval is given for an increased expenditure in a particular programme (in accordance with Management Board's rules) which is to be offset by an underspending elsewhere, the "budget allocations" on the monthly expenditure print-outs of the branches concerned are adjusted, i.e. the budget for the branch with the expanded programme will be increased and the branch that is to provide the offsetting funds will be reduced accordingly.

In a programme involving a large expenditure on grants, such as farm tax reduction, special reviews are necessary, bearing in mind that there is no pre-approved commitment as is the case with a purchase order for goods and services. In other words, the commitment to pay depends on receiving an application from a farmer. Thus, we have to rely on experience and monitor progress closely with the programme managers concerned.

Answer by the Ministry of the Attorney General:

The Ministry of the Attorney General utilises the concept of responsibility accounting, and separates the budget allocation to the ministry into cost collection centres which relate to identifiable management units.

Actual expenditures, as they are approved by the responsible managers, are charged to the cost collection centres concerned and a monthly report and analysis is made of significant differences between budgeted and actual spending.

Corrective action is taken to resolve variances; in the case of variances which indicate that underspending will occur, forecasted underspendings are reported to Management Board, through Treasury, for set-off against any forecasted overspendings.

Answer by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities:

1. Programme managers and/or branch directors are responsible for reviewing and updating cash flow forecasts each month as well as pre-authorizing actual expenditures.

2. An in-house computerized data entry system compares all proposed expenditure with the applicable budget. The system is programmed to warn of possible future overspending and to reject any actual overspending at the activity or executive control level.

3. The financial system provides finely detailed monthly information statements of current month and year-to-date expenditure totals and comparisons with budget forecasts. Explanations are required for any significant variances.

Answer by the Ministry of Community and Social Services:

Responsibility centres are established in accordance with legislative and operating requirements. Each responsibility centre manager is required pursuant to the Ministry Manual of Administration to approve commitments prior to their initiation by way of implementation or procurement. Procurement procedures are detailed in the manual and afford further opportunity for controls. A computerized allotment control system is used in the accounts branch on a daily basis. Individual items are tested at the vote and item or other appropriate control level.

The ministry produces monthly financial reports by responsibility centre. These allow for comparison to forecasts and allotments. They also lend themselves to update similar to accrual/commitment accounting by way of comparison of detailed disbursement listings to commitment records.

Aggregated financial reports of the same nature are prepared for review of managers at the divisional or other appropriate levels. The ministry's senior management carry out their responsibilities in monitoring and control through this process as well as other management processes of review and approval.

Answer by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations:

The ministry has three integrated systems in place to monitor and control appropriations and actual expenditures.

The first is a computerized financial reporting system which records actual expenditures and compares them with forecasts on a monthly and year-to-date basis. Programme heads are required to report monthly their explanations of significant over/underspending variances, including effects on level of service.

The second is a commitment control system which records costs of purchase orders and contracts for services against appropriations at the time the commitment is approved. When combined with recorded expenditures the ministry has a highly accurate financial position system on a day to day basis.

The third system deals with management performance reporting that allows an up to date comparison of costs and results, both planned and actual. With it the ministry can monitor programme performances and support the government's Managing By Results (MBR) programme.

Through the combined use of these systems the ministry has had advance warning of significant over/underspending variance and has been able to recommend re-allocation to cover unforeseen costs or has volunteered budget constraints to the Management Board.

Answer by the Ministry of Correctional Services:

Expenditures by vote and item are controlled and monitored in main office by the utilization of an internal accounting system which provides on a daily basis, budgets, year-to-date expenditures and funds unexpended.

Budgets are calendarized by cost centre at the beginning of each fiscal year. Monthly expenditure reports are forwarded to each cost centre. These reports detail expenditures for current month and year-to-date as well as indicate budget for year-to-date, variances, budget for year and amount unexpended.

These monthly reports are analysed by the budget section in main office and reasons obtained for unusual trends in expenditure patterns. A report on the financial position is presented monthly to a budget planning group by the budget accountant based on the above-mentioned analysis.

A budget status report is received from each cost centre by the 15th of the month following month end expenditure reports. Managers are asked to report on expenditure to date and estimated expenditures for the fiscal year with explanations of anticipated over or under expenditures. These are received on a quarterly basis for the first six months and monthly thereafter until the end of the fiscal year.

Answer by the Ministry of Culture and Recreation:

The Ministry of Culture and Recreation has an accounting and financial information system which provides budgetary control by programme, division, branch and unit.

The financial statements produced by the finance branch, are reviewed weekly with the programme managers responsible for each account, and continuous liaison is maintained on budgetary allocations and expenditure levels.

Answer by the Ministry of Education:

The method used to monitor and control expenditures against budget allocations, and to monitor uncommitted funds in this ministry consists of the following major elements:

1. At the start of each fiscal year when ministry budget allocations have been finalized, each branch director or responsibility centre manager prepares a monthly calendarization of projected expenditures.

2. Actual expenditures and commitments are entered into and recorded by the ministry financial information system. This is computer based.

3. Branch directors/responsibility centre managers are responsible for managing and controlling their expenditures against forecast. They are assisted by the financial information system which gives them figures for the month and year-to-date, comparing actual expenditures with forecast, and a supporting report gives long and short term commitments comparing those to total budget to show availability of unspent funds.

4. The facility exists in the system to reject any transactions which would overspend any allocations and this can be done to any desired level.

5. In addition to the above, the budget services branch summarizes and analyses the information in a concise report which goes to the deputy minister and the respective assistant deputy ministers as the basis for immediate corrective action as appropriate.

Answer by the Ministry of Energy:

Budgetary control is primarily the responsibility of programme managers who must ensure that the expenditure and commitment of funds are within the limits of their respective budget allocations. In a support capacity the accounts and office services branch of the ministry monitor, daily, actual expenditures vis-a-vis the budget allocations and conduct a monthly analysis of expenditures and expenditure trends.

Specifically the method is as follows:

1. At the end of each month the ministry's financial information system produces financial reports for the programme managers. These reports provide sufficient detail with regard to the budget allocations, actual expenditures to date, outstanding commitments to date, and residual funds available for the balance of the fiscal year, to enable the programme managers to exercise appropriate control over expenditures and budget allocations.

2. Simultaneously the accounts and office services branch analyse the reports and, in consultation with the programme managers, review the status of expenditures and budget allocations and project anticipated requirements for the balance of the fiscal year.

3. On an ongoing basis as part of the expenditure processing function the accounts and office services branch monitors all expenditures in relation to the budget allocations at the appropriate level (programme/activity; executive control). If budget allocations are reduced to a questionable level, if they are not being attended to as a result of items 1 and 2 above, the programme manager is advised and the matter addressed. The day-to-day monitoring process ensures that expenditure documentation is not processed if there are insufficient funds within the budget allocations.

Answer by the Ministry of the Environment:

In the Ministry of the Environment, the primary responsibility for monitoring and controlling an activity budget rests with the branch director. He is accountable for the budget performance of each activity under his direction. He is also responsible for reallocating any uncommitted funds in order to meet activity priorities.

The financial services branch provides a commitment and expenditure control for each activity within the ministry and a system has been developed to provide financial information to all levels of management within the ministry and to the central government agencies as required.

The system produces reports which reflect budgets, expenditures, outstanding commitments and uncommitted balances.

A "management report" which reflects the actual expenditures to date and the total requirements of an activity compared against the budget allocation is produced at regular intervals. This report forms the financial basis for any reallocation of uncommitted funds which may be necessary to meet ministry priority.

Answer by the Ministry of Government Services:

The ministry maintains a financial information system which reports monthly or more frequently:

(i) The calendarized budget allocated to each responsibility centre;

(ii) Actual expenditures for each responsibility centre and any variances; and

(iii) The total expenditures for the Ministry compared to targets.

Each programme manager is responsible for continuous monitoring of the commitments made against his allocated budget and for taking immediate corrective action, as required.

An ongoing record of the actual expenditures and the unexpended balance is maintained for each appropriation.

Answer by the Ministry of Health:

The Ministry of Health uses the following process to monitor and control expenditures against budget allocations, and to monitor uncommitted funds;

1. Annually, projections are prepared by programme managers showing their monthly budget requirements for the ensuing fiscal year. These are then co-ordinated by the fiscal resources branch, which reviews them with the ministry's management committee prior to submission to Management Board.

2. During the year, monthly expenditure reports are provided to the programme managers, showing in detail, the accumulated expenditure for the year-to-date and the percentage of the annual estimate then expended. According to the complexity of the programme, supplementary records of expenditure commitments are maintained by individual programme managers.

3. Each month the fiscal resources branch prepares the financial information system report, which measures actual expenditure against forecasts and makes a re-forecast for the balance of the year. Explanations for significant variances are obtained from the operating branches.

4. A variance report is prepared and presented to the management committee of the ministry and a decision is taken at that time to reallocate funds, et cetera, as appropriate. Constraints proposed by Management Board are agreed to or an amended proposal is made to Management Board for consideration and acceptance.

5. Operating branches are advised by fiscal resources branch of the outcome of these deliberations.

Answer by the Ministry of Housing:

Expenditures are monitored and compared to budget allocations by a process of continual recording, reporting and comparing year-to-date expenditures to budgets. Reports issued at regular intervals inform ministry officials and operating personnel of moneys spent and unspent or committed and uncommitted to-date. All expenditures are governed by government-wide regulations and individual transactions are approved by authorized officials.

Answer by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism:

After Management Board has approved the estimates submitted by the ministry, each director provides a detailed breakdown. This detailed budget forms part of the ministry's monthly financial statements. At the same time, the directors submit an annual calendarization, which is an estimated cash flow of the funds that they control.

The monthly financial statements indicate the cumulative actual expenditures. Significant variances with the original calendarization are investigated and any necessary adjustments are made to revise the cash flow.

Answer by the Ministry of Labour:

This ministry uses a system of recording actual expenditures which, supplemented by an internal system of commitment accounting, permits us to record all purchase requisitions as they are received.

Although each branch head is responsible for expenditures incurred on his behalf, the budget section monitors all expenditures and commitments to ensure that the branch head is advised if it appears that the individual budget may be exceeded.

Answer by the Management Board of Cabinet:

Budgetary control is primarily the responsibility of programme managers who must ensure that the expenditure and commitment of funds are within the limits of their respective budget allocations. In a support capacity the accounts and office services branch of the ministry monitor, daily, actual expenditures vis a vis the budget allocations and conduct a monthly analysis of expenditures and expenditure trends.

Specifically the method is as follows:

1. At the end of each month the ministry's financial information system produces financial reports for the programme managers. These reports provide sufficient detail with regard to the budget allocations, actual expenditures to date, outstanding commitments to date, and residual funds available for the balance of the fiscal year, to enable the programme managers to exercise appropriate control over expenditures and budget allocations.

2. Simultaneously the accounts and office services branch analyse the reports and in consultation with the programme managers, review the status of expenditures and budget allocations and project anticipated requirements for the balance of the fiscal year.

3. On an ongoing basis as part of the expenditure processing function the accounts and office services branch monitors all expenditures in relation to the budget allocations at the appropriate level (programme/activity; executive control). If budget allocations are reduced to a questionable level, if they are not being attended to as a result of items 1 and 2 above, the programme manager is advised and the matter addressed. The day-to-day monitoring process ensures that expenditure documentation is not processed if there are insufficient funds within the budget allocations.

Answer by the Ministry of Natural Resources:

A computerized expenditure accounting system is employed by the financial management branch to report the information required at each level of administration for control purposes. Expenditures including accruals to date, as compared to budget forecasts are reported on a monthly basis to line managers.

The line manager has full responsibility for ensuring that his expenditures stay within budget and for taking whatever steps are necessary to meet the programme targets which were approved. It may be necessary from time to time to request reallocations of funding to meet these targets and, here also, responsibility rests with the line manager.

Reports showing the comparison of total ministry expenditures with expenditure forecasts are also generated for the purpose of appropriation control by the financial management branch budget officer and the Management Board Secretariat.

In addition the expenditure figures produced by the system are compared each month with the cash flow statements submitted to the Treasury division and any discrepancies are explained.

Answer by the Ministry of Northern Affairs:

The ministry uses accounting services provided by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications which records actual expenditures against its appropriations, and, in addition, maintains a number of accounting "sub-systems" and records, which include commitments, in order to provide financial information for budget control.

For control purposes, every programme manager is provided with a monthly statement, which highlights the original budget, estimated expenditures to date, actual expenditures to date and balance of funds available.

The ministry's overall budget is reviewed and monitored at the end of each month by senior management.

Answer by the Ministry of Revenue:

1. Each branch (or activity) within the ministry is allocated a definite portion of the estimates, i.e. its expenditure "ceiling".

2. Each branch prepares an "expenditure cash flow forecast" which portrays how its allocation is expected to be expended on a monthly basis for the coming fiscal year. The forecast not only provides detail by standard account classification but also by sub-item.

3. A branch statement of budget performance is produced for each month-end which reflects the budgeted expenditure versus the recorded expenditure and the variance, both on a monthly and year-to-date basis. In addition, this statement reflects the annual allocation, funds spent to date and uncommitted funds.

4. Shortly after the statements of budget performance are produced, the finance and policy planning group of the ministry reviews them with each branch manager with a view to monitoring and controlling their expenditure against budget allocation and to keep track of uncommitted funds.

Answer by the Ministry of the Solicitor General:

The Ministry of the Solicitor General uses a computerized financial reporting system to record financial information for the current month and year to date. This system also provides for the reporting of commitments which are deducted from unspent balances to show the funds available for further operations.

Within the ministry, each branch manager receives a monthly financial report listing actual expenditures and outstanding commitments for each expenditure classification. The branch manager has the primary responsibility to ensure that expenditures are kept within the funds budgeted for that expenditure classification. The financial services branch of the ministry monitors the reports and requests explanations for those items that are being expended at a rate greater than budgeted. It is also determined if savings can be effected on items that are being under-expended, considering the moneys spent and committed to date.

Answer by the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs:

Budgetary control is primarily the responsibility of programme managers who must ensure that the expenditure and commitment of funds are within the limits of their respective budget allocations. In a support capacity the accounts and office services branch of the ministry monitor, daily, actual expenditures vis-a-vis the budget allocations and conduct a monthly analysis of expenditures and expenditure trends.

Specifically the method is as follows:

1. At the end of each month the ministry's financial information system produces financial reports for the programme managers. These reports provide sufficient detail with regard

to the budget allocations, actual expenditures to date, outstanding commitments to date, and residual funds available for the balance of the fiscal year, to enable the programme managers to exercise appropriate allocations.

2. Simultaneously the accounts and office services branch analyse the reports and, in consultation with the programme managers, review the status of expenditures and budget allocations and project anticipated requirements for the balance of the fiscal year.

3. On an ongoing basis as part of the expenditure processing function the accounts and office services branch monitors all expenditures in relation to the budget allocations at the appropriate level (programme activity; executive control). If budget allocations are reduced to a questionable level, if they are not being attended to as a result of items 1 and 2 above, the programme manager is advised and the matter addressed. The day-to-day monitoring process ensures that expenditure documentation is not processed if there are insufficient funds within the budget allocations.

Answer by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications:

The ministry records actual expenditures against its appropriations, and in addition, maintains a number of accounting "sub-systems" and records, which include commitments, in order to provide financial information for budget control.

Provincial Roads and Transit Programmes: Individual districts and regions monitor relevant contracts and project expenditures individually and report monthly by means of a balance sheet which show allotments, current year expenditures, and an updated forecast of expenditures for the current and subsequent years.

The overall monitoring and control of expenditures against budget allocations, and identifying uncommitted funds is done by the priority development branch, and the financial branch.

All transit projects are pre-approved by the minister. Expenditures are monitored against the funds provided for this purpose in the ministry's annual estimates. The day-to-day control is in the hands of the agencies involved—ONTC and TATOA.

Municipal Roads and Transit Programme: Method—Municipal bylaws and pre-approval by the minister.

Funds are committed against bylaws and pre-approvals within the limits of the funds appropriated for this purpose in the ministry's estimates.

All municipalities are required to submit quarterly financial statements which are analysed by the municipal branch.

Other Programmes: For control purposes every head office manager is provided with a monthly statement, which highlights the original budget, estimated expenditures to date, actual expenditures to date and balance of funds available.

The ministry's overall budget is received and monitored at the ministry's monthly finance committee meetings, through the FIS report to the Ministry of TEIGA and also with Management Board.

Answer by the Office of the Premier; The Cabinet Office; Provincial Secretariat for Justice; Provincial Secretariat for Resources Development; Provincial Secretariat for Social Development:

As the administration unit of the Premier's office has the responsibility for the control of expenditures this answer is made on behalf of the Premier's office, Cabinet office and provincial policy secretariats for Justice, Resources and Social Development.

The Premier's office, Cabinet office and policy secretariats being administrative in nature, the major portion of their budgets is for salaries and wages and employee benefits.

All purchase documents, service contracts and expense claims are approved by the deputy minister/deputy provincial secretary or authorized delegates against calendarized budgets. A senior official for each activity has the responsibility for the portion of the budget allotted. There is a central control in the Premier's office, Cabinet office and each of the secretariats providing information and monitoring functions.

At the close of each month a report is submitted from the administration unit of the Premier's office to each deputy minister, showing by standard accounts classification, current month expenditures, expenditures to date, appropriation and balance of unexpended funds.

Answer by the Minister Without Portfolio (Mr. Henderson):

I have an accounting system which is reviewed once a month. I am provided with actual expenditure on a monthly basis which is reviewed by members of my staff in my office.

4. Mr. Angus—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Industry and Tourism advise what percentage of equipment and materials utilized in the reconstruction and development of the Minaki Lodge complex originated in (a) Ontario, (b) other Canadian provinces, (c) the United States of America and, (d) other foreign countries?

Answer by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism:

Writs and statement of claim have been made regarding Minaki Lodge Resort Limited, and this matter is before the court. Therefore it is not considered appropriate at this time to reply to these questions.

5. Mr. Angus—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Industry and Tourism: 1. Please provide a complete breakdown of cost expenditures to date for Minaki Lodge; 2. the total number of man hours to date for the restoration of Minaki Lodge; 3. the home community and number of man hours worked to date by each individual on the Minaki site (whether the employee worked directly for a contractor, the Minaki board or the province of Ontario); 4. the names of all contractors, sub-contractors, consultants, and suppliers who have been associated for a fee with the restoration of Minaki Lodge; 5. the total amounts paid to each contractor, sub-contractor, consultant or supplier as listed in the answer to item (4) in this question; 6. the number, type and cost of all work that had to be re-done due to faulty workmanship, poor materials or inappropriate materials being used; 7. the amount of revenue that has been generated by Minaki Lodge since the government of Ontario assumed ownership; 8. the amount of revenue for each year for the ten years prior to the acquisition of Minaki Lodge by the province of Ontario; 9. the anticipated service area of the lodge in terms of potential guests; 10. the present operating cost of Minaki Lodge; 11. the anticipated operating cost for Minaki Lodge should it ever be completed and operated by the province of Ontario; 12. the present market value of Minaki Lodge; 13. when and if completed under what terms will it be operated by the province of Ontario, or some other outside party; 14. the number of native Canadians employed in the restoration and maintenance of Minaki Lodge and the total number of man hours worked; and 15. how much long term employment will be created for the native Canadians?

Answer by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism:

Writs and statement of claim have been made regarding Minaki Lodge Resort Limited, and this matter is before the court. Therefore it is not considered appropriate at this time to reply to this question.

16. Mr. Ziemba—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Revenue indicate the amount of retail tax revenue 60 days and more in arrears and why this amount has not been collected? Tabled March 31, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener):

The amount of retail sales tax assessed revenue outstanding over 71 days* and under active collection was $5,621,778.00 at February 28, 1977. The above amount represents 0.31% of twelve months' revenue of $1.8 billion.

The above amount does not include accounts which are in the process of appeal, bankrupt estates or amounts that have been otherwise identified as uncollectable.

Amounts remain uncollected due generally to the taxpayer's current financial circumstances and my ministry's collection policy is to make collection arrangements which safeguard against loss of tax revenue while permitting the taxpayer to continue his business operations wherever possible.

17. Mrs. Campbell—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Ministry of Health table its audit of Browndale (Ontario) and all pertinent material gathered in the course of that audit? (Notice of Motion for a Return on this subject tabled October 28, 1976). Tabled March 31, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell):

The former Minister of Health, the Hon. Frank S. Miller, wrote to Dr. Stuart Smith on July 20, 1976, and again on September 16, 1976, stating that it has never been the policy of this Ministry to release working papers respecting any audits performed by our internal audit staff.

I support this position, and reiterate that in the accounting profession and in the audit practices of the Provincial Auditor it has never been the policy to release working papers of an audit. With respect to the position of the Provincial Auditor I refer you to the debates of March, 1970, relative to a request from Mr. Singer for a copy of a specific audit report and to a similar request in 1974 of the Provincial Auditor from Mr. Sargent. In both cases, the Speaker upheld the Provincial Auditor and the individual audit reports were not provided.

19. Mrs. Campbell—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Provincial Secretary for Social Development table the following reports and studies of the Council on Troubled Children and Youth: 1. Report on Young Persons in Conflict with the Law; 2. Study of children's mental health services in northeastern Ontario; 3. Study of psychological services for disturbed children in Ontario; 4. Study of school board programme involving psychiatrists; 5. Study of the NYIAC; 6. Report of the review of existing legislation; 7. Study of various funding arrangements under each Act; 8. Statistical data from the council survey; 9. Report on the implications of the repeal of section 8; 10. Report on research and development within each ministry; 11. The proposal for interministerial research and development? Tabled March 31, 1977.

Answer by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch):

It appears that the question arises from matters discussed in the Annual Review of the Interministerial Council for Emotionally Disturbed Children and Youth, dated July, 1976.

Some of the items cited in the question do not exist in the form of a written report; others are in the form of Cabinet submissions or internal communications and, therefore, will not be made available. Final reports are not available for certain tasks which are still in progress.

Following are notes with reference to specific parts of the question:

1. Report on Young Persons in Conflict with the Law: This was a response from the Council for Troubled Children and Youth made at the request of an interministerial committee established by the Provincial Secretary for Justice. The committee was assigned responsibility for the co-ordination of the Ontario response to the federal government's proposals for new legislations to replace The Juvenile Delinquents Act.

Comments raised by the council were incorporated into the official response which is now a public document available through the office of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, and which was provided as a background document during the estimates of the Justice Policy Secretariat in November of 1976.

2. Study of Children's Mental Health Services for Disturbed Children in Northeastern Ontario: In an internal communication, the council provided comments to the Ministry of Health concerning mental health services for children in northeastern Ontario.

This is now part of an ongoing study, referred to below in number 3.

3. Study of Psychological Services for Disturbed Children in Ontario: The council has been directed by the Cabinet Committee on Social Development to review the provision of psychiatric, psychological, social work, and related support services to school boards. This work is in progress.

4. Study of School Board Programmes Involving Psychiatrists: The council was requested to review a pilot project involving the provision of psychiatric services to school boards. Its report took the form of a submission to the Cabinet Committee on Social Development.

5. Study of the North York Interagency Council: This is a current research project under the auspices of the contractual research programme of the Ministry of Education.

The study is being carried out by Environics Research Groups Limited under a contract running from September, 1976 to August 31, 1977.

6. Report of the Review of Existing Legislation; 7. Study of the Various Funding Arrangements under each Act; 8. Statistical Data from the Council Survey.

Questions 6, 7, and 8 are related and may best be commented on together.

One of the first tasks undertaken by the council was to become as fully aware as possible of existing programmes and services for emotionally disturbed children. This was undertaken in two ways:

(a) A review of existing legislation, characteristics, funding arrangements and distribution of services; and

(b) A survey of over 400 facilities, agencies and societies which offer a provincially supported service to disturbed children.

The results were utilized in compiling the Directory of Services for Troubled Children which was published in December, 1976, and in Cabinet submissions leading to the recently announced decision to consolidate elements of children's services into one ministry.

9. Report of the Implications of the Repeal of Section 8: This document was a submission to the Cabinet Committee on Social Development, containing policy options with regard to the repeal of section 8 of The Training Schools Act.

10. Report on research and development within each ministry; 11. The Proposal for Interministerial Research and Development: There is no formal written report on research and development within each ministry. During a series of meetings, the council discussed possible mechanisms for interministerial research with researchers in the Ministries of Health, Education, and Correctional Services.

As a result, a Cabinet submission is being prepared.

2. Mr. Angus—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Government Services list the previous owners of all property purchased by the government of Ontario in the ridings of Fort William and Port Arthur in the last 15 years, including all properties purchased by provincial corporations; and would the minister indicate the common and legal name or description of the property Old Fort William, Consolidated Government Building, et cetera; the purchase price each time it changed hands during the last 15 years; the name(s) of the realtor(s) who handled the transactions; and the order of sale leading up to the purchase by the province of Ontario? Finally, would the minister indicate the reason for purchase by the province and specify whether expropriation procedures were used to obtain the property? Tabled March 31, 1977.

Interim answer by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. J. R. Smith):

A complete answer to the question will necessitate contacting all ministries, agencies, boards and commissions to obtain the pertinent information. Since the complete answer cannot be obtained within the 14 calendar day limit, this interim answer serves notice that the complete answer will be forthcoming as soon as the information has been obtained and compiled.

6. Mr. Angus—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Housing table a list of all land purchased by or for the Ministry of Housing or the Ontario Housing Corporation which is as yet undeveloped; would the minister list each property by community, legal description, common name or address, the names of the last three (3) owners, date(s) that title changed hands, the purchase prices, the realtor(s), and the fees paid? Tabled March 31, 1977.

Interim answer by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes):

The answer to the above-noted question will be time consuming to prepare. My staff are presently working on the response and upon completion, I will forward the answer to you.

7. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation an itemized list of all sales and dollar value of sales of the UTDC to date, and table such information in the House? Tabled March 31, 1977.

8. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation estimates of noise level from ICTS, vehicles at various distances in comparison with CLRV or any advance light rail system, e.g. Boeing Vertol, and table such information in the House? Tabled March 31, 1977.

9. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation estimates of power consumption by ICTS vehicles in normal operation as compared with power consumption of a PCC-TTC vehicle and the CLRV and table such information in the House. Tabled March 31, 1977.

10. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation operating costs estimates of ICTS operating commercially with and without automation, and table such information in the House? Tabled March 31, 1977.

11. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation an itemized breakdown of the budget for the three-year ICTS and LRV testing programme and the means by which this venture is being funded, and tabled such information in the House? Tabled March 31, 1977.

12. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation capital cost estimates for one mile of ICTS operating commercially at grade, below grade and elevated, broken down into component parts (e.g. station costs, guideway costs, vehicle costs, etcetera and table such information in the House? Tabled March 31, 1977.

13. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation an itemized breakdown of the estimated costs associated with the test track facility near Kingston and actual expenditures to date, and table such information in the House? Tabled March 31, 1977.

14. Mr. Cunningham—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications undertake to obtain from the Urban Transportation Development Corporation a list of senior personnel and their salaries and benefits, and table such information in the House? Tabled March 31, 1977.

Interim answer by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications:

On Thursday, March 31, 1977, the Member for Wentworth North tabled eight questions on the order paper, numbered 7 through 14, related to the activities of the Urban Transit Development Corporation.

Because of the extent and complexity of the information requested, the minister has indicated that more time will be required in order to provide responses.

15. Mr. Nixon—Inquiry of the ministry:

1. What are the names of the individuals, and corporations if any, which have made donations to the Ontario Heritage Foundations; 2. What is the nature and value of the individual donations and how was each evaluation arrived at? Tabled March 31, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch):

Pursuant to the motion carried in the House, December 16, 1976, 10b, please be advised that an extension will be required to fully prepare an answer to this question.

18. Mrs. Campbell—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Ministry of Health table a list of properties purchased with public funds by Browndale (Ontario) for use in their treatment programme, the price paid for these properties

and their previous owner and will the ministry provide the House with the legislative authority which permits this expenditure?

Interim answer by the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell):

I will table a list of properties leased, rented or purchased by Browndale for use in their treatment programme, and whatever other information I have regarding the price paid for these properties. I will be unable to provide information which we do not have within the Ministry of Health and to which I do not have access. I am prepared to indicate in my answer the areas where there is a lack of information.

20. Mr. Eakins—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Ministry of Health table a list of all properties leased, rented or purchased by Browndale (Ontario) with public money; the value of such property; the present owner; the previous owner; and the rent and terms of rent for each property where applicable? (Notice of Motion for a Return on this subject tabled October 28, 1976). Tabled March 31, 1977.

Interim answer by the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell):

I will table a list of all properties leased, rented or purchased by Browndale with public money, and the present owners, but I will be unable to provide information which I do not have, or to which I do not have access. I will be indicating the information which I do not have in my answer.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 14, 1977

Land speculation tax exemption, statement by Mr. Welch ... 395

Essex County French school, statement by Mr. Wells ... 395

Point of order re compendium of information, Mr. Lewis ... 396

Mental health services, statement by Mr. Timbrell ... 396

Dismissal of male nurse, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Philip, Mr. Cunningham ... 398

Metro construction projects, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis ... 399

Barrie annexation proposal, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Lewis ... 400

OHC occupancy policy, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Bain ... 401

Land speculation tax exemption, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Bullbrook ... 402

Points of order re Ronto inquiry, terms of reference, Mr. Nixon ... 402

Forest fires, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Reid, Mr. Foulds ... 404

Lincoln Place Nursing Home, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Grande ... 405

Pan-Am Games, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Mackenzie ... 405

Lake Erie contamination, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Mancini ... 406

Tabling compendium of information re regional development, Mr. McKeough ... 407

Ontario Malleable Iron, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Moffatt ... 407

Provincial credit rating, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent ... 407

Health care costs, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Dukszta ... 408

Market value assessment, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Peterson, Mr. Good ... 408

United Asbestos plant, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Bain ... 409

Browndale, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Eakins ... 409

Industrial waste disposal, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis, Mr. S. Smith ... 410

Aid to the Third World, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Good ... 411

Report, standing public accounts committee, Mr. Germa ... 412

Motion to adjourn debate re report, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to ... 417

Motions re provisional standing orders, Mr. Welch, agreed to ... 418

Essex County French-Language Secondary School Act, Mr. Wells, first reading ... 418

Labour Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Stong, first reading ... 418

Patients' Rights Act, Mr. Dukszta, first reading ... 418

Point of order re amendment to standing orders, Mr. Stokes ... 419

Procedure for private members' hour, Mr. Speaker ... 419

Tabling answers to written questions, Mr. Welch 419

Private members' business on second reading of Natural Death Act, Mr. Maeck, Mr. Dukszta, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Parrott, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Bullbrook 419

Private members' business on second reading of Freedom of Information Act, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Singer, Mr. McMurtry, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Drea 429

Natural Death Act, Mr. Maeck, second reading 440

Recess 441

Appendix, answers and interim answers to written questions 1 to 20 442

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Brunelle, Hon. R., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Maeck, L. (Parry Sound PC)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of Colleges and Universities (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Government Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)

Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)



No. 12

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, April 14, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker called for the quorum bells.

On resumption:

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Speaker: When we were last on this item of business the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I believe, was about to begin his remarks. He may continue.

Mr. Moffatt: Nobody is here, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you all for coming tonight; a very intelligent-looking group—better than usual over there.

Mr. Nixon: Got to get a handful of Tories in.

Mr. Sargent: I had to ring the bells on the advice of Bob Nixon. He said, "We can't speak to a poor crowd like that." So, we are in business now.

Interjection.

Mr. Sargent: I must confess that at the start of this session the polls gave our party a very sad outlook. How wrong they were; how things are developing now.

An hon. member: Look at them quiver.

Mr. Sargent: But the amazing part of that was that we have a very aggressive member from Niagara Falls, Vince Kerrio, here in our midst. He had a dream, and the dream was that the polls were flying across the province—the dream was that there was an election held thereabouts—and the vote came down. There were 62 Tories elected and 62 NDP elected and one Liberal. And that Liberal was Vince. And when he set out for the first sitting of the House, he found that Bill Davis had sent a liveried chauffeur and limousine. Stephen Lewis sent down Ian Deans to work for Vince. When he walked into the House, Bill Davis walked to the door and he met him and took him across to the seat, put his arm around him and said, "Now, Vince what are we going to do today?"

I thought the balance of power was so flagrant at that time. The Tories are now being nice to our friends on the right here. They are in bed with them already—trying to stay in power.

All these years I have been standing in this House speaking—flogging the government as I think I am doing, doing my part as a loyal member of Her Majesty's opposition—for this one time, instead of saying what is wrong with the government, I thought I would talk about what is right with the government.

Mr. Nixon: Short speech tonight.

Mr. Sargent: How right Bob is, how right.

An hon. member: Are you sitting down—are you?

Mr. Moffatt: You have just heard it. Margaret, move over.

Mr. Sargent: But without sitting down right now, I want to tell you that I sat down without my speech writer and I looked at the paper for a long time and I couldn't get started. What is right about this government? So I have to change my course, right now. I want to say that I have the greatest respect for the members of the House, individually; I really do. My remarks across there may not be to your liking, but I want to say—I have said this to fellows in our caucus—that each and every one of you is a success. A lot of people think that because you are elected to Parliament, you are a success. That is not a fact. You were a success before you were elected to Parliament and from here on it is downhill. I want to say to each and all of us in this House, as Ella Wheeler Wilcox said:

". . . the two kinds of people on earth I mean/Are the people who lift and the people who lean."

[8:15]

I think each of us individually are lifters and I qualify those remarks before I start because I do have the greatest respect for us individually.

The things I'd like to talk about are naturally the hospital in Owen Sound, the

plight of the beef farmer, Australian beef, losing a $40-million industry in Owen Sound coming up, the great tragedy of youth unemployment, the great costs in the north and west, the Gray Coach Line, the police brutality, Hydro corridors and the question of whether or not the government has the press in its pocket.

Mr. Nixon: Let's start with that one.

Mr. Sargent: We've been watching newspaper reports and our critics have been following the land acquisition in Barrie—a case of three lawyers: Eddie Goodman, a close friend and adviser to the Premier, the law partner of the Premier, and Bob Macaulay, who recently has been retained as a counsel for the Minister of Energy at $1,000 a day. These three lawyers are involved in a deal. It's about a $100-million land deal and by some magic stroke of fate we have these three fellows close to the Premier who are putting together this deal.

If one looks in the phone book in Ontario, one will find about 10,000 lawyers. It's amazing that these three chaps who are so close to the Premier are steering this deal. I'm not going to go into the ramifications of Macaulay or Eddie Goodman in the continuing saga. We'll get on with that later. That comes in the good part of the speech.

Mr. Deans: Go ahead.

Mr. Sargent: I want to say that it must be embarrassing to the members opposite how these things are allowed to happen. I want to qualify what I'm going to say. I've never questioned at this time and place the integrity of the Premier of this province. He has a political machine that has to be and has been well greased over the years and will continue to demand its cut, a piece of the action. I say as long as the Premier is head of this party and allows the big guns to wheel and deal, to have the keys to the treasury per se or whatever, he has to take his part of the blame for allowing these things to happen. In the States it's a criminal offence to sell a political contract and in this country it has been going on blatantly.

We have a great need in my area for housing for our citizens. It's a sad commentary that the majority of Canadians will never own their own home. As I've said before, Ontario housing is so restricted that no one is allowed to build in this most wealthy country in the whole world a house that he can afford. Now let that sink in. This party over here with all its power and all the billions of dollars it collects every year cannot make it right that a man can build a house that he can afford. What kind of democracy do we live in?

We heard the other night the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) read a prepared speech written by a speech writer. He never deviated from his speech. He reminds me of an old English politician who said, "I find that your lordship has changed his politics."

"Yes," his lordship replied, "and I am ready to change again if you can make it worth my while."

Political opportunism is what is happening. There are many of us in this party who could be bribed to go to that party if we wanted to, but we have to live with ourselves. These are some of the things that—

Mr. Foulds: Would you repeat that, Eddie?

Mr. Sargent: Well, you'll probably get some offers along the way too, Jimmy.

Mr. Moffatt: This is interesting. I like this.

An hon. member: He said reflex.

Mr. Sargent: In our economy a great majority of the people never own a home. That's happening right now, today. We have thousands and thousands of beef farmers wondering whether next year the prices will be enough to meet their mortgage needs. That's happening right now. We have the shocking situation of half a million young Canadians under the age of 25 who cannot get jobs—and this government here in Ontario is doing nothing about it.

Mr. McNeil: What are your friends in Ottawa doing about it?

Mr. Sargent: You're so right, Ronny. There's a great need. But we should have some leadership here. We are the wealthiest province. We have 65,000 civil servants in this province and we could well get along with 45,000. In New York, the city found itself with a deficit of $1½ billion—and down there they can't have hanky-pank like you fellows and have a continuing deficit of $2 billion a year. They had to clean up their act down there and they fired 60,000 people in the city of New York in one year. They fired 60,000 people to keep the books straight, and that is a fact.

Here we have Hydro—Hydro belongs to the people—raising the rates by 30 per cent. That's happening right now.

Now we get on to things that are important to all of us, the rights of people as far as the law is concerned. We've been watching Mr. Headline, the Attorney General,

in his battles with Mr. Ballard, a great sports jock. In my mind Mr. McMurtry is the biggest athletic supporter I've ever known. I'm glad the cubs have left for that one.

Mr. Moffatt: You've told a few, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: We have here the hopeless situation in our jails and prisons. The morale is bad in all our jails and our penitentiaries. In the States they find that by paying the inmates 75 cents to $1 per hour to produce and learn a trade, the morale is high and it's great for the rehabilitation of their jails. It's a matter of record that the county jails, the Don Jail, are a disgrace in our economy. In Owen Sound the county jail has cells about eight feet by three feet and when one gets on the bed one can't turn around. There are no lights in those cells from 8 o'clock at night until the morning.

Mr. Peterson: How do you know, Eddie?

Mr. Sargent: Well, I could have been an inmate one time, but I have been inspecting them. The new minister said he was going to have a programme to upgrade these jails, but we know that's just talk, because he's on his way out.

We have the news that yesterday a cop shot a fleeing man because he was suspected of having a stolen credit card. Why would a policeman shoot in the back a man he thought had a stolen credit card? Credit cards are only money-making schemes for the banks, and who are we to say that a policeman can shoot a man in the back because he has a stolen credit card? That's what's going on in this so-called police state we have here in Ontario. I for one, having spent a lifetime in politics, am fed up with what's going on. If policemen can't handle their guns take their guns away from them.

Police brutality: We read in the papers last week of how the police took a man into a field and beat him up, then followed him to his home and beat him up with his wife and family there. I say it's a scandalous abuse of the badge, a scandalous abuse of the badge. It's no credit to the Attorney General or to those fellows over there that they allow these things to happen.

One time a few years ago—this is a true story that happened to me—I was out for a walk one night, on a Wednesday night when the House wasn't sitting. I went out for a walk and I didn't have my wallet with me but I had a credit card in my jacket. Going past a radio store on Bloor Street, I saw a radio in the window that I liked. I went in and said: "How much is that?"

He said: "About $85."

I said: "Okay, I'll take it." I had forgotten that I had this credit card in my pocket; I had a number of them. I had reported that I had lost that card about a couple of weeks before that.

So, I gave him my credit card to buy it and it was a long time before he came back to me. A few minutes later two policemen walked in the door and they said: "What's your name?"

I told them my name.

They said: "You'd better come with us." To make a long story short, they took me to the police station and kept me there for three hours. I found some friends down there!

The way they treated me, I just sat there and wondered what the hell would have happened if I had really done something. I wasn't allowed to get off the chair. I couldn't walk around and look at the pictures on the wall. When they had me walk along they held my cuffs down like that. They treat people like dogs. That's the police system and the police state we have in this province. Finally, they took me back to see my hotel room. First of all, they asked me how I could afford all the stuff that I had there.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You were a suspicious character.

Mr. Sargent: I didn't tell them I was a member of the opposition. I should have told them I was a member of the front row over there. All over stolen credit cards there is police brutality in here.

I think about Mr. McMurtry. He has no creative approach to the job he is charged with. I have a long line of things that he should be doing in courtroom procedure, that great backlog in our courts. It's a disgrace.

Getting to the main theme of what we're talking about today, because of the period of unprecedented waste and the plundering of the public treasury in the past seven to 10 years, we've seen our debts climb from $2.5 billion to $11.8 billion tonight—about $9 billion in about five to six years.

Mr. Ruston: All during Davis's time.

Mr. Sargent: That is correct, in a time when the provinces in western Canada are debt free. The state of Illinois was $60 million over last year; they've picked it up and they're budgeting for a surplus. But here we are—

Mr. McNeil: Even your own members are leaving now, Eddie.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What are your friends in Ottawa doing now?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: You can go any time you want, Ron. I wouldn't miss you a bit.

An hon. member: We'll be calling for a quorum, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Sargent: Ronnie is one of my fellow collegians—or fellow colleagues, I think.

An hon. member: They both graduated from the same school.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier says we're going to have to have strong fiscal discipline and Mr. McKeough brings up this malarkey about how he agrees with Ottawa—

Mr. Speaker: I'd remind the hon. member to refer to the members by their riding and not by their personal names, please. Thank you.

Mr. Moffatt: He is a rooky.

Mr. Good: You should be glad he said "Mr."

Mr. Speaker: He's still out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, the Duke of Kent.

They don't call it a deficit any more. They call it net cash requirements.

Mr. Ruston: A shortfall.

Mr. Sargent: A shortfall. And, believe me, it's beautiful what they have in this current statement as of last week. They've raided the Canada Pension fund. There's not a nickel left in it. There's $850 million taken from there this year. From the teachers' superannuation fund, there is $330 million this year; there is $119 million left in that one. In the municipal employees' retirement fund there was $180 million; it's all gone. They even have gone so far as to take the $34 million of a Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation fund.

We have here the total budgetary expenditure for this year. They're going to collect $11.8 billion to pay their creditors.

[8:30]

So you'll be glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that our auditors have come up with a workable solution to our cash flow problems. It is called bankruptcy. Would you believe this, Mr. Speaker, that you and I and the taxpayers of this province are paying about $3 million every working day in interest on the debt we owe—$3 million every working day. By the time this speech is over, we will have paid possibly another $100,000 interest on the debt we owe.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Stop talking, it costs money.

Mr. Peterson: It is worth it listening to you, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: It is worth it. Thank you, David. We'll make you a Liberal senator.

Well, the Toronto Star doesn't like what Mr. McKeough is doing. They will go just so far about this government and then they will stop. But Mr. McKeough says he won't put into force the taxation reform, while, according to the Star, more than 400,000 Metro residents who live in apartments are going to have to pay more than their fair share of property tax this year just as they have in the past 25 years. Mr. McKeough admits the system is almost rotten, but the shameful thing is that the Blair commission gave everyone a chance in this province to have input here and it is very sorely needed.

Mr. Ferris: When they got it, they threw it away.

Mr. Sargent: But Mr. McKeough says that he will not. He said it would be folly. He is quoted as saying: "It wouldn't be good politics to bring this reform in before the election." We don't know how much money this is going to cost us as taxpayers to stall this reform. Is it going to cost half a billion dollars or a billion dollars more in inequitable taxes?

We don't know that, but we do know that he will do anything in the election to get votes. He took $149 million of our money in the Spadina Expressway, using money of ours to buy votes. He spent $85 million of our money for the first-time home owners' grants. There was the new car rebate, and he reduced the sales tax from seven to five per cent. Immediately after the election he put these things back on again, but it cost us hundreds of millions of dollars last election just to buy votes for the party.

Regarding jobs, we are all concerned about them. But the only response of Mr. McKeough, the member for Chatham-Kent, to the Leader of the Opposition, who questioned him about the lack of jobs in his Throne Speech, was to attack the Leader of the Opposition for what's going on in Britain. He couldn't talk about the situation in Ontario; he talked about what is going on in Britain.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the budget next week there will be no answer for jobs, but his budget will, I bet, have a tax cut for the corporate group—a help to big business but no meaningful crash programme for jobs.

This headline in the Toronto Star: "Unemployment Hits Record High." This is war. This is war for a man who has a family and no job. It is not important to the bureaucrats in Ottawa or Queen's Park that a man has no job. That is not important, but if the bureaucrats were threatened with being without a job, it would be war. In the times of war we have war bond programmes to raise money to fight the war. In times of peace, when there are no jobs and no employment, we should have prosperity and peace bonds to raise money to do a crash programme for people. People own this government in this province, and as I said today, not the Tory party. But how do we get that across to the people of Ontario? So if only bureaucrats would call this an emergency, they would find some way to fight this terrible tragedy.

In discussing the first-time home owner's grants in this House, the then Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) stood up and he said, "There is about $12 million we can't collect." And they had almost decided not to bother collecting it. The shocking thing was, he was going to let that $12 million go down the drain because it had been part of a political chicanery to buy votes and they were going to wash it out.

But here they're going to close four hospitals in Jack Riddell's riding, in Bob McKessock's riding and in my riding, to gain $10 million or $12 million, but they're going to wash out $12 million over there.

Mr. Mackenzie: All Liberal ridings, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: Unfortunately, Bobby, yes. It reminds me of the then Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) and the current Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener)! the intelligence they give this House is amazing.

It reminds me of a story about a fellow who called a company one Saturday afternoon and he asked the janitor a number of questions. The janitor couldn't answer any of the questions and when the fellow said, "Don't you know anything about the business?" the man said, "Mister, when I said 'hello' I told you all I know."

That's about the same type of intelligence you get from those two ministers over there. You ask them a question and they blether something at you and sit down in their seat and try to hide. And they're paying them $40,000 a year.

Every so often, Mr. Davis recycles the front bench there for their incompetence in the job they're doing and so he puts them into another department so they can screw that up too. Is it any wonder that Dick Rohmer said—I'm not looking at you, Leo, it's all right.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thank you, Eddie, you are very charitable tonight.

Mr. Moffatt: They can't recycle him any more. He is a non-returnable container now.

Mr. B. Newman: You can sit easily there.

Mr. Sargent: They tell me they're going to put your new office in Minaki, is that right?

Mr. Ruston: They're going to stuff him and hang him over the fireplace.

Mr. B. Newman: It's going to be the western wing of the Ontario Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: How can things be so good and so bad at the same time?

Mr. Sargent: Is it any wonder that Dick Rohmer, the novelist, says that in Queen's Park the civil servants laugh at the cabinet ministers? They run their own show regardless of the cabinet—I know this is a fact. It's bureaucracy in full flight here.

I brought in a bill called Lifeline—a private member's bill that never saw the light of day. It was going to base the use of electricity on a use basis. I couldn't even distribute the bills to the members' desks across the House; that's the free press we have here.

In Owen Sound we have in full flight the branch plant economy; all our plants are American firms and they're closing down progressively. Canadian Pittsburgh are phasing out a $20-million plant and they have to build a $40-million plant for new technology. We're faced with the fact of losing this plant that will have 400 people out of work, millions of dollars' worth of services down the drain and about 400 homes where mortgages will go down the drain too.

We're faced with the fact that in New York state,when Volkswagen were going to relocate, New York gave Volkswagen $70 million to relocate in New York state. We're faced with the fact that Canadian Pittsburgh are going to be offered some lucrative sum to locate in New York state, and, even with the tariffs, they'll be farther ahead. We can't get five cents' worth of co-operation from the Ministry of Industry and Tourism here. That's the

plight of geography and of my being a member of the Liberal opposition.

With regard to Industry and Tourism, we have the case of Minaki Lodge, a firm with total assests of $1.25 million. This ministry gave it a $5-million loan because it's headed up by a few Tories. The "jewel of the north" is what they call it.

I have some problems in my area. We have a lot of truck drivers there and truck drivers are faced now with having a new medical and it's costing them about $25 to $30 per medical. In this province there are hundreds of thousands of truck drivers, and they're faced with the same problem. This Ministry of Health could let them have a medical through OHIP, but the Ministry of Transportation and Communications is doing nothing about it. These people aren't important; they aren't big wheels in the economy, that's why they don't get recognition.

We have blatant disregard of people's rights in the hydro corridor takeovers, and I suggest that before Ontario Hydro can begin any expropriation proceedings whatsoever, an independent, unbiased study must be done by someone with no axe to grind. Further, we believe the above study must include all realistic and alternative means and routes to get the power from the generating stations to the load supply centres at which it may be used. One wouldn't believe what this is doing to the farmers in my part of the country.

We all know the sorry state of hospitals in Owen Sound. We have the great area hospital there, and we have the finest set of specialists and surgeons and doctors in the country there. They have now closed down our nursing school there, and we have to take our food and our garbage up in the same elevator. Most times we have 300 or 400 people waiting for elective surgery, our halls are full of patients, and I can't get any action from this government and I guess I never will.

But on the other hand, they were trying to close the Durham and Chesley hospital and others there, and they came up in the estimates that they increased the payments for labs last year from $35 million to $70 million—and no one knew why this was the case. A 100 per cent increase in payments to labs—but he wants to close our hospitals to save $12 million or $15 million or $40 million.

We in Bruce have the greatest agricultural and beef producing area in Canada, but our farmers are in real trouble. There's a story that a farmer and a tax accountant are sitting down and the accountant comes and makes out the farmer's tax form. He asks, "Does your wife work the farm?"

"Yes, she does," says the farmer.

"The children?"

"Yes, them too."

"And is there a hired hand?"

"Yes, there is."

"Anybody else?"

"Well, yes, as a matter of fact we keep a halfwit about the place."

"A halfwit?" says the accountant. "What does he do?"

"Do?" says the farmer. "Why, he owns the place."

Mr. McCague: He has an investment with no return.

Mr. Ruston: That was like the fellow who won a million, Eddie, who was going to keep farming until he lost it all.

Mr. Sargent: Right, exactly. If farmers ever get organized, all hell's going to break loose for the government. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) should resign. In the case of the advice to the Essex Packers people, it's unbelievable that they could pay that man the money they're paying him. He's supposed to know the answers, and he doesn't even know how to add two and two. It's unbelievable.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He's a real defender of the farmer in the province, and don't forget it. The farmers know they have got a friend.

Mr. Mackenzie: Oh, come on, Leo. Just like the north has a friend in you.

Mr. Sargent: You should hear what they say about you.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's another story.

Mr. Sargent: The farmers don't get paid any statutory holidays, overtime pay, they don't get unemployment insurance, they have child labour—they even legislate school closing so that kids can work on the harvesting. Families all work; there's only one pay cheque. Farmers don't realize their rights today. They have a general acceptance that this is the way it's always been and always will be.

I'm more convinced than ever that the farmer is the biggest gambler in the world. Anybody in the business world today knows the selling price of his goods before he starts to produce them. But in agriculture there's

no way to know this. Many of our beef cattle people are driving their cattle to the market and taking what they can get for them, because they can't afford to take them home and feed them. Now that's a fact.

I'm further convinced that the farmer is the only man in our economy who pays retail price for everything that he buys and sells everything at wholesale and pays the freight both ways. I suggest the farmer deserves every penny he makes. A man does not get up at 5 a.m. just because he wants to socialize with his Holsteins. The farmer works a 12-hour to 16-hour day, 365 days a year with no sick leave.

[8:45]

I want to get across the fact that the consumer is the big focal point. They're concerned about what the poor consumer has to pay for his food. It's about time the people of this country got down on their knees and gave thanks for the bountiful supply of food available to theim in this country.

A farmer doesn't get any holidays—he doesn't even get Christmas Day off. The farmer is at the mercy of the marketing boards, the auction block and the stock market. The wives and the children of the farmers work their knuckles to the bone. They carry 50-pound bales of hay, lift 100-pound sacks of grain, clean up the manure, fight the cows and the calves and drive tractors. All this labour is done without any pay to the farmer or his family for their time and effort. They face plague, disease, drought, flood, frosts and parasites, and they've got to deal with Hydro too.

An hon. member: That's the worst.

Mrs. Campbell: That's the most unkindest cut of all.

Mr. Sargent: Credit's extended to the fullest extent and debt is a way of life for a farmer today.

I'm concerned about education for our kids. Of the one million unemployed, as I said before, 500,000 are under age 25. We are spending literally millions of dollars, as the members know by our budgets here on education, but nothing—not a cent—to provide jobs for them when they graduate. We have a great mismatch, I submit, between the labour market demands and the skills possessed by the current job seekers. They just can't cope; they haven't got the training to go into the marketplace to get jobs. We have exotic courses. High schools no longer prepare students for employment as they once did. Instead they increasingly offer survey courses which only scratch the surface. I believe the job of the school is to teach people how to learn so the kids can later equip themselves, and our school system is not doing this.

We have a great inequity up our way with Dutch Christian schools. The Dutch Christian family is paying about $2,000 a family to educate its child in a Dutch Christian school. It's paying about $50 a month for transportation for that child. So it's a big dollar these Dutch people are paying, but they're still paying their taxes for our educational system in Ontario and there should be some way we can be of equity here in this very needed area.

I'm always impressed by the audacity of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. Here we have a picture of the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Bennett) and all his ambassadors abroad, and this is the biggest put-on I've ever seen in my life—what is going on in this department? Going back before most of the present members were here—when Osie Villeneuve and Don Morrow were here and Art Evans and Bernie Newman—this department was set up as a kind of a political slush fund to look after the party. Bob Macaulay set this up to have all these funds he could dole out to the government's friends under the guise of industrial and tourist development.

This thing has developed into a monstrosity now. Here we've got these people who come here from Brussels, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Stockholm, Sao Paulo—my God, it's like the United Nations. It's a complete duplication of what we have in Ottawa here, but we're spending millions of dollars. No wonder Jim Fleck, who was the 2 i/c to the Premier and had his pick of all the plums in execs to ministers—which one did he pick? He can travel the world and go around and can never be home and touch base. I will give Mr. Fleck credit—I meet him on the airlines in the States quite often and he's always travelling economy; I give him marks for that.

Mr. Peterson: Does he come up to the front to visit you, Eddie?

Mr. Sargent: Jim is not a bad guy, but his skates are a bit dull sometimes.

Mr. Speaker, I have been kind of covering the ballpark here. I respect the time factor, but I want to say that I have got the wheels down now and I am coming in for a landing, Leo.

We have nuclear power. We have a $30 billion commitment. I have a book here called Poison Power. I have read it two or three times. I want to say that we are committed to a $30 billion programme in nuclear power. I say, in a lifetime in politics, a lot of reading, I think we are shooting craps with destiny here.

When not a single insurance company in America will insure a person's life or property against nuclear radiation or any of its fall-out or problems, here we are, we are committed to a $30 billion or $30,000 million programme that is mortgaging the life of our people today and our kids in the future. When it is on full stream it will only carry about 10 or 15 per cent of the total load. We had news reports a few weeks ago that we have to bury the spent fuel rods for 2,000 years. There is a case where, in the burying grounds of these rods, the refrigeration was cut off and they started to boil, and all hell broke loose.

I cannot in a short time tell you, Mr. Speaker, the concern I have. But Mr. Teller, one of the forerunners of atomic power, said "All we can hope to do is guess and hope we guess right." Dr. Oppenheimer, who supervised the creation of the first atomic bomb, was called before the US Congress and was asked: "Is there any defence against nuclear weapons?" He said: "Certainly there is a defence. It is peace." Today we are going down the line continuing to be prostitutes here in this country, continuing to offer our nuclear reactor plants across the world to make money.

In summation, what I am trying to say tonight is that the whole motivation to be in power in government is to control the money flow, and here this year it is going to spend $11,000,800,000. That is what it is all about, to control the money flow. That is why the establishment behind Bill Davis is so concerned about whether or not he calls an election now and does a Bourassa two years before his time, because if he waits two years he can have that money, $11 billion a year, to spend for his friends for two more years. That is what it is all about.

I know politics, and those of you who have been in politics must agree with that. It's control the money flow, and they do control it for their friends. What is of more concern to me is that, knowing the hazards of nuclear power, we continue to go down that road and spend $30,000 million a year for something we need like a hole in the head. President Carter is now trying to stop this proliferation, to slow down the nuclear spread, and I wish him luck.

In closing, I want to say that I hope many of the members have read the book All The President's Men, the sordid story of Watergate, the slender thread of evidence uncovered by two newspapermen who believed that someone close to the president had engineered a break-in. By some magic stroke of fate they found a piece of tape on a lock that shouldn't have been there, and that was the key to Watergate, the disgraceful impeachment of the president of the greatest nation in the world. There is nothing as serious here, but we have had a series of scandals in this province over the past few years. These two newsmen, backed up by a courageous and crusading newspaper, uncovered conflicts and inside dealing which resulted in the turmoil it produced.

There is now unfolding evidence of this province; for example we have the Fidinam affair. I held up in the House a photostat of a cheque for $50,000 and demanded an inquiry. How could a firm which couldn't pay a $1,500 account get a $20-million loan and a $25-million contract? By giving $50,000 to the bagman of the Tory party? I was kicked out of the House that day. But the Premier said okay, we will investigate this stuff. And so they had their own investigation What happened? They said, well, we won't do this again; that's what happened.

But it was a criminal offence to sell a government contract. I bet them $50,000 of my money; I said if they would open up the books of their funding and show they weren't still giving business to the people who supported their funding, then I would forfeit the $50,000. I was laughed down.

The facts are that today we have seen the unfolding events of the Hydrogate, the Moog and Davis affair, the $43-million deal without tender. We've also seen the unfolding saga of Eddie Goodman. He's involved, in his position so close to the Premier that he is using it to engineer multi-million dollar deals for himself and his friends—his clients. It makes one wonder where we are going. Where does the buck stop and when?

I predict that the Premier will risk it and call an election to block the revelations and exposure of the select committee on Ronto. It has already dumped one cabinet minister who is leaving the party.

Why does all this happen, and where is the vigilant press in Ontario? Does the Premier of this province—or, I should say, does the government have the press in its pocket? Hiring newsmen at $36,000 to be executives for ministers. Is this the reward a newsman gets for five or 10 years of good behaviour—

not critizing the government? Is this his reward? There are 26 cabinet ministers, and it is the dream of every newspaper man to become an executive with that kind of money. Should we have legislation that would prevent a newsman taking a job in government until he has been removed from the gallery for three years?

But you'll see how much press this gets. You'll have a deaf ear to that one. In fact, the sad affair is that everyone of us in this House is an important man in his area, and no matter what he comes up with—if he talks motherhood—he won't get an inch of space in the papers of this province today. It's completely a Toronto-based deal and the Premier, or the government, has reporters on these junkets to Italy or Israel or wherever in the world. It's a great thing for a newsman to do all these things, but I think it is too close to the area of conflict of interest.

We will continue to watch the financial saga of the Tories to control the money flow of $14 billion a year. We know the Sun is a Tory paper, but I think there is a cap, a level to which the Toronto Star will go in its support. They will let us go so far and they they will say—Davis is okay, leave him where he is. And we know where the Globe and Mail stands.

So what chance have we—what chance of freedom do we have after 30 years of one party in power? What kind of freedom is this? Someone has said that freedom is a good horse but you have to ride it somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the time of the House. Someone has said that you can't hope to change the whole world but you can change the corner upon which you live. I think all of you and all of us, collectively, are trying to do that for our people.

[9:00]

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, may I first take the opportunity of complimenting you, sir, on your position in the fourth session of the 30th Parliament. I would hope that you would relate to the Speaker of the House and to his deputy my personal congratulations and appreciation for the tremendous way in which they're directing the affairs of this House, and certainly the Chairman in his intermittent capacity as Speaker. The job is not an easy one, I think we all recognize that; particularly in a minority government situation when you're called upon maybe to make decisions, which the former Speaker mentioned, when you have to take those tough decisions. But you've done it well; you've done it with care, caution and I think good judgment; and for this, sir, I compliment you and the people who share the seat which you now occupy for the job that they are doing.

Before I get into the text of my remarks, I must comment briefly on a comment made by the speaker who preceded me. I have difficulty in accepting some of the comments that he has made. The government has been administering the affairs of this province for well on 34 years now, and as I travel the province, and I do travel the province extensively—

Mr. Peterson: Those are your instructions, Leo. You are not supposed to be here.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —on a regular basis, I have to say to you, sir, that we in the province of Ontario are the envy of Canada. We are the most dynamic province in Canada, we're referred to as the banner province; and of course we are the envy of every province, because there are more immigrants coming to this province on an annual basis, more immigrants from outside the country and even from other provinces, to this great province of opportunity here in Ontario.

Mr. Peterson: More unemployment. You are behind the national average of growth rates. Look at the numbers. You are wrong.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is the cornerstone, the anchor of Canada, and certainly as we go into the troubled times that we have with the province to the east of us, all provinces in Canada today are watching very closely and carefully what the province of Ontario is doing and the direction we will take in connection with this problem facing us today.

Mr. Peterson: What is that direction, Leo?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The province of Ontario is the leader among provinces. I have been to many federal-provincial conferences dealing with resources, environment and many other issues, and it's always the province of Ontario that takes the lead, that sets the tone for those particular discussions; and you'll hear the other provinces following very carefully with a "me too" attitude.

Mr. Foulds: You are too charitable.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They look to this province for the direction and the guidance that most Canadians want. I can't accept some of the remarks of the previous speaker. He spoke eloquently and it was well researched in his own way.

Mr. Foulds: The most unemployed.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are the healthiest people, in this province, in Canada today; and the best educated. In fact, we in the province of Ontario have larger disposable incomes than any other group in Canada today, more leisure time, more opportunity to do the things we want.

Mr. Swart: For the 300,000 unemployed.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: After 34 years, there is no doubt in my mind that when that day comes and the Premier decides that the people of the province of Ontario will have the opportunity to exercise their democratic right —and the member spoke about freedom, well, that democratic right is something that we cherish on this side of the House and the people in the province of Ontario will have the opportunity to exercise that right—I have every confidence that when they do, they will return this government in a majority position, to give them the type of direction that they've had for the last 34 years and to give guidance, not only to this province but indeed to Canada as a whole.

As the members of the House are aware, this government will be asking them to approve a bill establishing a new ministry, the Ministry of Northern Affairs with the primary objective of increasing the standard of living of all people in northern Ontario.

Mr. Peterson: And certain cabinet ministers.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I want to spend the next few minutes just talking about northern Ontario and—

Mr. Peterson: The cabinet is too small.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —the needs and the aspirations of that great part of Ontario, because the former speaker dwelt mainly with the problems and the issues south of the French River.

As the person who has been designated to head that new ministry and as a northerner myself, I would like to offer some observations and comments beyond those that have already been made in this chamber, particularly in the Speech from the Throne and at the introduction of this bill. If I may touch on the Throne Speech just for a brief moment, I was particularly pleased that, when Her Honour had delivered that very impressive speech, the response from both sides of the House was practically instantaneous, one of total support and one of just joy and glee.

Mr. Swart: A little overstatement.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think, as I sat here and watched Her Honour deliver those remarks, it was enlightening to me to see the response, the assurances in that area as to what they would say when they stepped out of the gallery before the television cameras.

Mr. Philip: It brought tears to our ears.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They respond in a very positive way because the Speech from the Throne was one that was very carefully put together with the people of the province in mind; and of course on this side of the House the people of this province are first and foremost in our particular minds. I just want to compliment leaders of the opposition parties for their instantaneous response and for their total support of that particular Throne Speech, which was one, I think, that will go down in history, not only for the length of it, but certainly for the content and for the depth and the quality that was enshrined in that particular statement.

First, let me say that I believe that the problems and the needs of northern Ontario can really be appreciated only by those who have lived in northern Ontario or at the very least have travelled in the north extensively and spent some time among the people that reside there. Many northerners often feel their problems and needs are not fully appreciated, even by the well-meaning and intelligent southerners.

Let me hasten to say that I have chosen those words very carefully. Contrary to what some of my more militant fellow northerners might insist, the phrase "intelligent southerners" is not really a contradiction in terms as such people actually do exist; I can assure you of that, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that few people in southern Ontario ever intend to disparage the north. Many are sympathetic, and as I travel the southern part of the province I get that feeling time and time again; but nevertheless it's quite evident that most of the people in southern Ontario simply don't understand the north.

For instance, it is quite common to hear people from around Toronto speak of northern Ontario as though it were some tiny appendix to the south, as being somewhere up there beyond Barrie. I believe the hon. member sitting in the Speaker's chair will recognize that particular community. In fact, northern Ontario actually is most of this particular province. It makes up about 90 per cent of the entire land mass in Ontario and is therefore almost nine times as large as the size of southern Ontario. Thus southerners who are unfamiliar with the north

find it hard to realize what enormous distances there are between major towns and cities. Northerners have learned to take this fact of life for granted. There are children in the north who ride round trips of about 150 miles a day just to get to and from their school.

I recently heard of a general manager of a company based in Toronto who sent a telegram to a branch manager in Thunder Bay. The wire was an urgent message and read like this: "Our board chairman is arriving in Timmins tonight. Please meet him." Within the hour the Toronto man got a wire back from Thunder Bay and it said: "Suggest you meet him. Stop. You're closer."

That is the attitude with regard to many people living in southern Ontario. They just don't realize the massive distances that are involved between our particular communities.

Relations between the north and the south have their lighter moments, Mr. Speaker, but the problems facing the northern part of this province are serious. Most hon. members, I'm sure, are aware of many of the conditions responsible for those problems: the harsh climate; the rugged terrain that often makes construction costly and difficult; the sparse population including sizeable communities of francophones spread over about 90 per cent of Ontario's land mass yet totalling only 10 per cent of the province's population.

Mr. Foulds: It's the 34 years of Tory government—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The great distances between communities, the remoteness from the heavily-populated parts of Canada and the resultant high costs of transportation, and therefore of a great many of life's simple necessities and minor luxuries. Here I'm thinking of such costs as insulation, which is so essential and yet so expensive for the owner of virtually every building in the north. The high cost of fuel for home heating, the high cost of gasoline for driving those enormous northern distances, and the cost of installing and operating sewage systems on the bare rocks of the Canadian Shield.

In regard to the minor luxuries of life, there are very limited choices in television and radio reception for viewers and listeners in the north. These examples point up the unique problems and difficulties of northern living which are seldom appreciated by southerners who have not experienced them. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, northern Ontario has many assets and attractions which people from the south, and elsewhere, have been quick to appreciate; the wealth of its mining resources, the richness of its forests, the abundance of its natural attractions that beckon the tourists and, of course, the hunter, the sportsman and the fisherman.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You and I.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the new Minister of Natural Resources stop heckling the soon to be Minister of Northern Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's not heckling, Mr. Speaker, that's total support.

Mr. Foulds: That's what this is, it's the speech of a back-bencher.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But there is another major resource which, in my view Mr. Speaker, is more valuable than all the others combined and that is the people of the north themselves. Any visitor to the north will testify that northerners are among the most warm-hearted, generous and outgoing people in the world, and yet they manage at the same time to be very close-knit and community-minded.

In the north, the words neighbour and friend are pretty well interchangeable. People rely on one another, partly out of necessity but mostly out of habit. It's all part of the spirit of northern Ontario. Some people will call it the pioneer spirit, but that implies a certain attitude that northerners simply do not hold. Certainly they have the stamina and the determination of the pioneers, but their attitudes and their desires are very much in the 1970s. Their outlook is modern and progressive and the only reason they have the image of poor country cousins is that some of my friends in the opposition, and I refer to the New Democratic members, prefer to picture them that way. They've done it for so many years, in order—

Mr. Foulds: That's a lie.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —to sustain their socialist rhetoric—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You will have to withdraw that comment.

Mr. Foulds: That's a lie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You'll have to withdraw that comment. You can't accuse another member of lying in this chamber, and you'll withdraw it right now.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, The hon. member for Port Arthur knows well that he

cannot accuse another member of lying, and I ask him to please withdraw it.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.

Mr. Foulds: I ask you, on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There are no qualifications. There are other ways of making your point. You've withdrawn the comment. The hon. member for Kenora has the floor.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There's no point of order. There is nothing out of order. I have asked you to withdraw an unparliamentary comment and there can't be a point of order on it. The hon. member for Kenora will continue.

[9:15]

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A great many northerners resent this suggestion that they are living in the past and should therefore be willing to settle for a second-class status within a modern Ontario—and who can blame them? After all, northerners, through their resource industries, produce some $5 billion worth of goods and services annually, and since most of this production is exported it is an enormous asset in the balance of payments for Ontario, for Canada as a whole and for international trade.

Northerners want the same standard and quality of living as the rest of Ontario and this government agrees that they have every right to expect it. Indeed, it is in response to these feelings and desires that the government of Ontario made the decision to form a Ministry of Northern Affairs. As we all know, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) and some of his friends over there have scoffed at this particular decision—

Mr. Deans: No, they are scoffing at you.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —when the Premier made the announcement on February 3 of this year. For this reason, I believe it is worth stating for the record that the response from the north itself is quite different from the response that we heard from the official opposition. Since the announcement was made, a great many letters of approval and congratulations have come to me and to the Premier, and they have been just as enthusiastic as they have been spontaneous.

Mr. Deans: Just wait until you have been in office for a year.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly they have reaffirmed my own belief that the new ministry will enjoy the fullest possible support from all the people in northern Ontario.

Mr. Deans: You will fail at that as you have failed at everything else.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is another point worth putting on the record. I would like to say that I have not forgotten the prediction that the Leader of the Opposition made shortly after the formation of the new ministry. He predicted, if you can believe it, Mr. Speaker, that the new Ministry of Northern Affairs would not last beyond the next election. It's hard to believe that a young man who is so well spoken—and I have a great respect for him—can be so cynical, but that was what he said and it's recorded in all the press of this province.

Mr. Philip: It was not cynical. He was just predicting a new government.

Mr. Deans: It was a political manoeuvre and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I only hope for his sake that he now finds his words very tasty and his phrases very sweet, because he is to going to have to eat every word of them soon after the next election. Of course, he is only one of the members of the NDP who love to make a lot of noise about the north, and I say that with a great deal of sincerity because they have been making a lot of noise. They talk loud and long about giving the north more attention, but when the moment comes for the ministry to do exactly that, to do the things that they have been barking about, they balk, they put up the barriers.

Mr. Foulds: You had the chance for the last 34 years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am convinced that they don't want anything positive done for northern Ontario. They love to poor mouth the north and they want to continue that particular approach that has been going on.

Mr. Foulds: That is a lie. That is a lie, Mr. Speaker, and I am not withdrawing my remark.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You are going to have to withdraw it.

Mr. Foulds: No, I am not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You refuse to withdraw it?

Mr. Foulds: No, I am leaving. I am not listening to that kind of garbage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You will be escorted out of the chamber. I have to name the member for Port Arthur and he doesn't have the privilege of sitting in here for the rest of this sitting.

Mr. Riddell: He won't miss much.

Mr. Deans: He might as well have missed all of it. It is not much of a privilege.

Mr. Morrow: Wait for your escort, Jim.

[Mr. Foulds was escorted from the chamber by the Sergeant at Arms.]

Mr. Deans: You are doing fine, Leo, just keep it up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Kenora can continue.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I regret the member for Port Arthur has taken that particular attitude.

Mr. Deans: He is only responding with the truth.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think that he could have something constructive to say if he really believes in the north.

Mr. Deans: He really does.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is a job to do. I get tired about the poor mouthing of the north. Get on the bandwagon and let's do something about it instead of poor mouthing.

Mr. Deans: What have you ever done? What have you done in 10 years?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, you may be sure that the NDP brag about themselves and the Departments of Northern Affairs that their party operates in the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan—but that's different, of course. When the NDP government does something, or anything, that's called masterful socialist insight. When this government takes a positive step, our critics call it an election gimmick. That's the part that really annoys me as a northerner. It drives them crazy to realize that they will soon have to listen more and complain less. They may even have to do some listening for a change, with a little less talking.

It's not new, of course, for them to want to have things both ways. The reaction to this new initiative will be important. It's obvious that there is a lot of doubletalk going on on the other side; they have outdone themselves, I think, in this particular case. I know that they think, they're fooling the people as they try to discredit the government and the fact we have a deep concern in the north. Just give us an apportunity.

Mr. Deans: We don't have to try, you discredit yourselves.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly there is plenty of evidence to testify to concern over northern Ontario. Just look at the record, it's there.

Mr. Deans: Just look at the record.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm thinking, for instance, of the dozens of initiatives represented by our regional priority budget, which is aptly named because it is directed largely at the northern regions. It is based on many of the most important priorities of northern Ontario people themselves.

Mr. Philip: If your initiatives are so good, why—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I must concede that a great many of our projects under this programme are not very glamorous to talk about, nor are they cosmetic measures or short-term, one-time ventures; quite the contrary, they represent the kind of long-term continued progress that the north really needs—

Mr. Swart: Like your reforestation policy for the last 30 years.

Mr. Ferrier: Why did you close down the northeastern regional mental health centre then?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: New sewage treatment plants, trunk-line sanitary sewers, water lines, pumping stations, improved and extended roads—the list goes on and on. The so-called soft services, social services, also have a solid base in reality that northerners understand and appreciate: Manpower studies to identify the potential of the labour force and thus to direct people's skills into the right channels; plans for extended tourist industry and so on.

Mr. Ferrier: When are you going to build that new office building, the one you announced in Timmins? Is that coming tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I defy any member of this Legislature to scan our long record—regional priority projects, expansion of nor-Ontair, Northern Ontario resources transportation committee, airstrip development programmes, the young travellers programme—

Mr. Philip: You don't have a transportation policy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's have some order, please.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —the Northern Ontario Development Corporation, special municipal subsidies, Isolated Communities Assistance programme—and then tell me that this government's concern about northern Ontario is some kind of election gimmick. It's just straight balderdash.

Mr. Philip: Where is your transportation policy?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The projects which I refer to are ones, of course, which were undertaken long before the decision was made to form a Ministry of Northern Affairs. For this reason there may be some hon. members, perhaps on both sides of the House, who are wondering, quite thoughtfully and sincerely, whether there is a need for such a ministry. I know that question has come before you.

Mr. Swart: Have to put you some place.

Mr. Philip: Chambers of commerce, something like that.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly I can understand the viewpoint of those who say: "But the government has been doing things in the north up to now; would a new ministry do more?" Those are some of the questions that are being tossed out to me by members on that side of the House.

The answer is very simply yes, there will be plenty for my new ministry to do. For one thing, the people in the north themselves have long been waiting for a special voice at Queen's Park, a minister who will be their voice in the cabinet—not just speaking for one or two ministries but on the issues affecting the north, to express the quite different viewpoint held by people who live in the quite different environment of northern Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: What's been holding you down for the last 10 years?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And the members, I give them respect, members on both sides of the House, have always said most emphatically that there are different voices, different logic and different and unique problems in northern Ontario, in that area lying north of the French River.

Thus it will be my role and the role of others in my ministry to identify the needs of northerners, to articulate those needs and to provide immediate, on-the-spot advice to the government as to which measures would be most appropriate in meeting those needs. It will be our task on the one hand to consult continually with local leaders and residents all over the north, to keep the government fully informed of their changing situation. It will also be our task, on the other hand, to co-ordinate the plans and actions of various ministries whose presence and programmes are already very much part of the northern scene.

By these and other means, my ministry will be providing northerners with a stronger and a more effective voice in government; something that is not possible through our system of representation by numbers alone. As a minister, I will be concerning myself especially with the people in the north who understandably feel remote from government. It will be my responsibility to help them find the best ways of using existing ministries, agencies and government machinery to help them solve their problems.

As most hon. members will know or assume, the present network of northern affairs officers who have been part of the Ministry of Natural Resources will become part of my new ministry. This network will be extended wherever and whenever additional offices are found to be useful and economic.

Mr. Ferrier: Put one in Iroquois Falls.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It may very well be.

Mr. Ferrier: It's about time. We have wanted one for five or six years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We have also announced previously that we will post an assistant deputy minister in each of the north's two major regions, one in northeastern Ontario and one in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: Is the regional office going to be in Timmins?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Their further presence in those regions will strengthen the communications and other ties between the north and Queen's Park. As a co-ordinating ministry, our job will also include the assessment of the government's activities in the north with a view to identifying any gaps that may occur

between programmes or between ministerial responsibilities. As circumstances and conditions in the north continue to change, we will be reviewing the government priorities and suggesting the best ways of modifying existing measures or perhaps to phase out some of them in favour of new ones.

While I am assured of receiving a great deal of co-operation from my cabinet colleagues, I know that in some instances there may be honest differences between us as to whether conditions in the north warrant the introduction of different rules and regulations to those that apply in the south. It will be my task at times to persuade the government that in some circumstances we are doing a disservice to the people of the north if we insist on universal application of laws and regulations that were originally intended to deal with southern conditions. What is right and proper in the urbanized, densely populated south is not necessarily right in the much more sparsely populated areas of northern Ontario.

Northerners know what I mean. I am sure most of them could suggest half a dozen examples of southern Ontario-made laws and regulations that should be modified in the north because of the difference in the conditions up there. I know there is no argument with that statement from all sides of the House. I believe that's one reason northerners have responded so favourably to the idea of a Ministry of Northern Affairs. I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that this request has been hovering around northern Ontario for a number of years, there's just no question about it. Various groups have come forward periodically with the idea of a special voice at Queen's Park for northern Ontario, and I am particularly pleased that the Premier and the government have recognized that voice.

Mr. Deans: After all these years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: My problem at the moment is to make them realize that a ministry, especially a ministry with such wide concerns, does not become a fully operative entity overnight. It takes time to build a new organization into an effective, working instrument of the government, of any government. The government's broad policies for the north are there as general guidelines but we have many specifics to resolve. There are questions as well involving ministerial jurisdictions, co-ordination, working arrangements, selection of experienced personnel, largely of course from within the government; and I might also point out transfer of programmes from other ministries and so on.

I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that as we are selecting our staff we are putting particular emphasis on those who have some experience and some knowledge of the problems and the unique requests and concerns of northern Ontario in the selection of those personnel.

The pressure I feel from the north to get on with this process is not what I interpret to be an impatient one; rather it is the same sort of eagerness that I share in wanting to see this new opportunity become a working reality as swiftly as we can make it.

[9:30]

But there is one consolation: The people of northern Ontario know that we mean business. They know it from our record of the past and the current projects and programmes, and so they realize that we have in fact quite a list of accomplishments on which to build this new ministry.

One category of these falls under the regional priority budget, which I mentioned earlier—a package on which we will be spending in excess of $53 million over the next fiscal year. Another important item, and one that is carefully ignored by those who criticize our record in the north, is this special general support in the form of grants which the province pays to northern municipalities to help them keep local property taxes down. Many times this is just sloughed off or ignored.

I doubt whether it's widely known, but it is a fact that property taxes in the north have been reduced significantly as a result of these grants. In 1976, for example, property taxes were 35 per cent lower per household in the north than in the south, even though northern municipalities must inevitably spend relatively more because of the higher costs in the north.

There are a great many other Ontario government programmes that could be mentioned in this context—a half a million dollar fund to enable the small isolated communities to install basic services. And I might say, Mr. Speaker—and I know you're interested—we had $250,000 to be allocated to the remote communities of northern Ontario. The Treasurer of this province (Mr. McKeough) made this announcement in late November. We worked very closely with the Unorganized Communities Association of Northern Ontario—commonly called UCANO—with which we are all familiar, working closely with them in sending out the bro-

chures and the application forms and getting the information out to the northern affairs offices. I'm pleased to report to you, sir, that we wound up the year with a total disbursement of about $233,000, which was indeed a record and it was certainly recognized by all those who were involved.

As you may be well aware, in that particular programme our emphasis was placed on fire protection. I was a little annoyed to hear one of the opposition members—I believe he was in the Liberal Party—make fun of that smoke detection programme. As you know, we have granted UCANO in northeastern and northwestern Ontario grants amounting to $33,000 each with which they would make large bulk purchases of smoke detectors that could be sold with a $5 subsidy to the consumer at a cost of about $27 each.

Our thinking behind this was very simple. In setting up a programme in the unorganized areas, it is very difficult to establish a volunteer fire department that could be set up to protect certain structures and homes. It's just not possible in a short period of several weeks to get those people together, get them trained, get the right equipment that could be approved by the fire marshal's office, to protect their structures.

So we took the other route—the sensible route—to do something to protect human life. We thought that if we went this particular route—and this was in consultation with UCANO—if we could get sufficient smoke detectors into those homes—and many of those homes are frame built; they're very volatile. There's just no question about it, if a fire starts there's a limited amount of time for an individual to escape should a fire take place. So we felt that if we could get smoke detectors in those areas and save one life—just one life—in northern Ontario with that particular programme, then indeed the programme would have been a success; and I'm sure it will be.

I say that with a great deal of sincerity. The programme is off and running with the co-operation, the excellent co-operation that we've received from UCANO; and with the northern affairs officers throughout northern Ontario I am very confident that the programme will continue to be a success and the people in the unorganized areas will respond in a very positive way to obtain those smoke detection devices that will protect them in the event of a fire.

In dealing with this subject the difficulty, of course, lies not in finding projects and programmes worthy of mention, but in summarizing them briefly in a manner that will provide a comprehensive picture of what is happening in the north as a result of the government's initiatives. Even at that, there are serious problems that remain to be tackled and solved, and I am the first one to admit that.

Some of these are as very easy to identify as they are difficult to overcome: The vulnerability of some of these communities where economies are far too dependent on a single resource, or even a single enterprise; the pressure of some communities to provide housing and services in the face of sudden industrial expansion; the pollution that is present where sewage systems are inadequate or where industrial installations cannot be economically modernized to meet today's environmental standards; the need to rejuvenate the mining industry, particularly to encourage exploration for new mines; the need to develop more alternatives for employment; and the pressing need to keep young and well educated people living and working in the north.

Mr. Ferrier: Haven't done very well in the last couple of years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Northern Ontario is justly proud of the large number of distinguished people who have been born and raised there, leaders and prominent achievers in many fields of endeavour, but a deplorably large number of these brilliant and gifted people have found that their aspirations could be fulfilled only if they move south, in some instances even a good many miles south of here. I would not pretend for a moment that all of the problems will be solved by my new ministry, or for that matter by this or any government. If that were possible we would already be well along the road towards solving all of these problems. Such things are never as simple as my simple-minded critics across the aisle like to pretend.

Mr. Samis: Cheap shot, cheap shot.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Just the same, I am convinced that with the establishment of a vigorous new ministry, devoted specifically and exclusively to the north, we will focus attention as never before on the needs of northern people while co-ordinating the actions that spell progress for the north. In my opinion, northern Ontario faces a brighter and more exciting prospect for development and progress than at any other time within living memory. I predict, sir, that the closing years of the 1970s will long be remembered as the beginning of a new era of progress and understanding for the people of northern Ontario.

Mr. Samis: Get this on record.

Ms. Sandeman: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour not to be as provocative as the previous speaker, although I can't let pass one remark that he made. He commented that the Throne Speech, which is the subject of our debate tonight, was very carefully put together with the people of this province in mind. I would have to agree with that short portion of his speech—it clearly was put together with the people of this province in mind. I think every group in this province can find in the Throne Speech some reference to their concerns. They will, however, have to look very far to find solutions to those concerns.

I would like to address my remarks tonight, Mr. Speaker, to one of those groups who got the obligatory notice in passing in the Throne Speech, and that is the senior citizens, the elderly people of our province. Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, mentioned in her speech that her ministry will continue to give high priority to the needs of the aging population; great, the obligatory reference to the needs of the aging population. We wait to see what the priority will be and what attention will be given; and we are told that the number of assessment and placement services will be increased to ensure that senior citizens receive care appropriate to their needs.

I have no quarrel with the provision of excellent, if indeed we could find them, assessment and placement services. They are a priority. But the problem is that it is no good assessing the needs of a senior citizen if you have nowhere to place him or her having completed the assessment. The crying need in this province at the moment is for appropriate placement spots for senior citizens.

We are told that more funds will be designated for home care and home support services. I welcome that initiative, it is desperately needed. I am waiting now to hear the announcement of how much more funds will be designated and how soon.

But I would like to address my remarks to some of the priorities and needs which were woefully lacking in the Throne Speech; the needs of the senior citizens, basically in three areas: income, housing and alternatives to institutionalization.

The basic needs of senior citizens are really the same as the basic needs of all the citizens of this province, and I think we make a mistake if we look too narrowly at needs based on age, whether it be youth or old age; or needs based on sex. We all have particular needs, and one of the major needs is to have an adequate income which allows people to live with dignity and self-respect. But, as we know, in this province more than 50 per cent of the elderly people, the old age pensioners, have very low incomes—incomes which leave then with inadequate amounts of money for rent and food, increasingly inadequate amounts of money as we see hydro and fuel bills increasing over this past winter.

I was told today, by a lady who does volunteer work with senior citizens and with disabled people, that a social worker had come to the home of an elderly lady on, I think, a disability pension—she hadn't yet reached the magic age of 65 but she was not in the first flush of youth—and she was having trouble making ends meet. The social worker went in and discussed her problems with her and ended up by saying, "Well, my dear, you have 80 cents a day for food, you are really not budgeting very well, are you?" and swept out. The volunteer felt that was a totally useless kind of comment to make, but it points up the kind of amounts of money that people are trying to survive on in this province.

The crazy thing that we see at the moment is that there are real financial incentives for older people to go into institutions rather than to stay at home. And this surely makes of Ontario a kind of Alice in Wonderland situation, where it is cheaper for the individual concerned to go into an expensive institution than to stay in his or her own home.

I know the Advisory Council on Senior Citizens, in its annual reports, has brought to the attention of the minister the high costs, borne particularly by seniors, of dentures, hearing aids, glasses. No relief has been given in that field.

Reductions in government support payments often hit the elderly. At a time, I think, when many of us assume that government support payments are carefully geared to the needs of the elderly, we find again the Alice in Wonderland situation. For instance, in the situation where you have a married senior citizen couple—one spouse on old age security, guaranteed income supplement and GAINS, and the other receiving family benefits payments, probably for a disability—when the senior citizen's income goes up, courtesy of a modest amount of generosity on the part of the federal and provincial governments, then the disabled person's

allowance goes down. In fact, the couple's income does not increase at all, but they see their hydro bills increasing, their dental bills increasing, their food bills increasing; and they wonder where justice is for people who have served this province and worked hard for many years.

I know that the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) has received a petition signed by the majority of residents in municipal senior citizens' homes, pointing out to him the burden on active senior citizens of the very low comfort allowance, the fact that there has been no increase in this allowance since July 1974, and that on $43 an active senior citizen is expected to buy all his or her needs in the range of clothes, shoes, overcoats, bus fares —maybe a trip of hundreds of miles in this large province, as the previous speaker has pointed out, to see a grandchild get married. For $43 a month, they are expected to be able to do all that: pay for their personal needs, pharmaceutical needs, soap, toothpaste, haircut—you name it. Out of $43 a month, you are expected to do it if you are a senior citizen in a municipal senior citizens' home.

[9:45]

Another anomaly which creeps into government programmes for the seniors is the extraordinary anomaly in the reduction rates under the GAINS programme to senior citizens. Disabled people receiving GAINS "D" are allowed to earn a modest amount before their earnings begin to be clawed back by the government. But senior citizens may earn not one single penny without seeing 100 per cent reduced from their GAINS cheque. I submit that this really removes the dignity and the feeling of self worth of a senior citizen who would like to work, would like to contribute, would like to feel that he or she can still be useful. What feeling of usefulness does she have, if she is unable, in effect, to retain any of her earnings and, therefore, is likely to throw up her hands and say, "Why should I bother?"

The Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto in its budget guide for the elderly, recently suggested that a senior citizen married couple in Toronto need between $650 and $695 a month. Admittedly, they did include in their budget—and why shouldn't they?—allowances for running a car, for maybe buying the odd newspaper, for having some of the pleasures of life that younger people and older people should expect to take for granted in the rich Ontario of 1977. But on the GAINS pension of $558 a month for a married couple, they're going to be very hard put to afford even the basic necessities in Toronto, when we see the average rents that are specified in that budget guide.

I could wish that other areas of the province were able to document the expenses found by seniors in their areas. I imagine that rents will vary across the province. In fact, the annual report for the advisory council on senior citizens in 1974-1975 made a very firm recommendation to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) about basic living costs.

The recommendation was that, for sometime now, solid and reasonable figures have been discussed in many circles to obtain basic living-costs for seniors. That's the kind of thing that the social planning council tries to do. The Hon. Marc Lalonde has requested that each province research this problem. Since time is running out for many of our 65s, the council has requested the provincial secretary to obtain this information. As far as I know, this information has not been made public. It would certainly be useful, not only for the seniors but for the members of the Legislature, to know what the government believes senior citizens in this province need to live on. That request was made in 1974-1975 and I imagine the seniors are still waiting for a follow-up on it.

The second area in which we are so woefully deficient in this province is in the provision of housing for our senior citizens. One of the major reasons for premature and unnecessary institutionalization is inadequate housing. We have a very much higher percentage of our older people in institutional settings in this province than do many other jurisdictions. Some of that is caused by the fact, as I mentioned before, that the financial incentive is to go into the institution. Another major cause is inadequate housing; people either cannot afford to maintain their homes or are in unsuitable housing where, perhaps because of failing health, they cannot negotiate stairs, and so on, and are forced to move out when there is no need for them to be in an institutional setting.

The Throne Speech promises more rental units for the elderly. This is certainly a welcome promise. But the Throne Speech gives no indication of the size of the problem in this province. A survey done for CMHC suggested that a conservative—if I may use that unfortunate word—a conservative goal would be to provide a stock of non-profit housing for 15 per cent of the elderly. We have in

this province a stock of non-profit housing units for just about five per cent of the elderly. We fall woefully short of even the conservative estimate set up by CMHC. Even to reach a minimum standard we have a long way to go. In my own city, we have as many people on the waiting list for senior citizen units as we have senior citizen units, and, of course, the list is growing all the time because of the lack of affordable housing for people on their own on fixed incomes and the lack of housing which is suitable for the needs of couples or single elderly people.

Rents and maintenance costs are becoming prohibitively high for senior citizens. Property taxes, even with the property tax credit system, are a burden to many. Much of my mail, and I'm sure of other members of the House, comes from senior citizens who are disturbed and distressed by the burden of their property taxes and particularly the education component of that.

Our amendment to the Throne Speech speaks to that problem. We are moving, as part of our amendment, "the failure to moderate increases in the cost of living by refusing to recognize that the present property tax formula places an unfair burden on middle-, low- and fixed-income families." Of course, into that category of middle-, low- and fixed-income families comes by far the largest majority of our senior citizens.

Demographic studies show we will have for many years to come increasing need in the province for property and homes designed specifically for the elderly. This, in fact, doesn't always mean designing specifically for the elderly, but rather means a flexibility in design so that people don't have to move out just because they are elderly, but that housing is available which would suit, say, a middle-aged couple whose children have moved out, and in which they could stay and with which they could cope as they grow older.

The key factor in housing for the elderly, as it is for any other age group, is that we must have sufficient choice and accessibility of units which meet the needs of people. At the moment in this province we do not have either the choice or the accessibility of affordable housing for the elderly. One too often thinks of providing housing by having people move to special units or into institutions, but one of the programmes which other jurisdictions have undertaken with a great deal of success and relatively little expense is to provide structural changes to the homes of the elderly which allow them to stay and to cope with their houses; changes which are as simple as building grab-bars by bathtubs or changing the height of kitchen counters or the layout of kitchen cupboards, or putting a ramp to the front door or things of that kind, which would allow people, perhaps with arthritis or after a minor stroke, who are quite able to look after themselves, to do so without the hazards of living in unsafe and inappropriate housing to which they are probably very much attached, which they are unlikely to wish to leave unless they have to, but which in the present situation they often feel they must move out of because it provides a hazard to their health, and so they add to the growing list of people waiting for Ontario Housing units or waiting to get into a residential situation when there's probably no real need for them to do so.

I think that both a reasonable level of income and the provision and maintenance of suitable housing would go a long way to keeping elderly people out of institutions. I think it's important that we do that for two reasons: One, because most elderly people would prefer not to be in institutions. It's well known to all of us who have elderly relatives or friends that very few of them go willingly into an institution. Many of them would rather not. Secondly, the reason is that the burden on our provincial budget of expensive institutions is unnecessary and we should be finding ways to provide alternatives.

The report of the interministry committee on residential services points up this conclusion. The committee reported that perhaps the most serious matter for the senior citizen is the lack of non-residential alternatives. Despite the established trend away from institutional care, Ontario gives its seniors a strong financial incentive to go inside, especially those on extended care.

Firstly, they are able to live in a style they would be unable to pay for in the community out of OAS, GIS, GAINS, family benefits and pensions. In the meantime, the aged person in the community can barely make ends meet and has extremely little in the way of service to help him stay there. The report points up what I've just said. The irony is that very few people go into institutions without a great deal of reluctance.

The report also, of course, documents the prevailing chaos in institutional services for the elderly, the multiplicity of funding arrangements, the multiplicity of legislative sanctions under which these services operate and, in a sense, is unable to reach any proper conclusion about how those problems may be met within the institutional services.

I'd just like to take a few moments right now to talk, not so much about the insti-

tutions themselves, but some alternatives to institutional care, some preventive services which we are neglecting almost entirely in this province. Our home care programmes are woefully inadequate and I believe that one of the reasons why we have such a high percentage of our elderly in hospitals and homes for the aged, compared with, say, Great Britain, must be because home care was not made an insurable benefit when hospital and institutional care were.

In Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, you probably know that when the National Health Service was introduced, hospital, institutional care and home care simultaneously became insurable benefits, so that there was a real choice among the services for physicians, patients and recipients of care. There was absolutely no financial incentive to go into more expensive institutional care, rather than using services at home which, in our case, have to be bought, are often means tested and are very often not totally available to those who need them.

Again, I think this is part of the extraordinary shortsightedness on the part of the Ontario government. Even relatively minor changes in the home care plan would improve it in the short run—such simple things, for instance, as making home care available for the chronically sick, so that when families are able to maintain the chronically sick at home with the help of home care, that help will be available. At the moment of course, it's not and people, in desperation, with the burden of a chronically sick person in the house, are apt to beg their doctor to find them a nursing home bed or an extended care bed or whatever it might be.

Home care, in my mind, should include a variety of services. Medical service, obviously; maintenance of the home; housekeeping services where necessary; shopping, where necessary; foot care—a very neglected area for the senior citizens in this province. For many people in the province there is not chiropody available on a regular basis. The last figures I saw from Britain suggested that 14 per cent of the senior citizens in Great Britain are getting regular care from a chiropodist in their homes. We're nowhere near that percentage and many elderly people would be a lot more mobile and therefore a lot more healthy if they were given proper foot care.

[10:00]

Other things that I take to be included in the broad umbrella of home care are things like the provision of night attendants so that families may get some sleep and be able to cope with the sick and the elderly during the day. Nothing is guaranteed to make a daughter or a daughter-in-law snappish with grandmother more quickly than loss of sleep and broken nights. The psychological and emotional health of the family as well as the physical health of an elderly person who is sick either in the short or long run is much improved just by the simple provision of someone to be there during the night.

Some elderly people who live alone need help with dressing. Once they have got into their surgical corset or even the straight-forward clothes that we all wear, they are all right; but just to get up and get dressed with arms and legs stiffened from arthritis is too much of an effort.

That kind of thing appears on the criteria for extended care: Do patients need help dressing themselves? Yes, patients may need help dressing themselves but that's absolutely no reason to look at an institutional setting. It is much more reason to say: "How can we help that person get dressed and enjoy the days and nights in their own home?" Some people need help with heavy cleaning in the house. They can cope with the regular chores but cleaning windows and doing the annual spring cleaning is beyond them. In Sweden, for instance, they have what they call heavy cleaning patrols which will go on an annual or semi-annual basis from home to home and do the heavy cleaning for people.

Other things for the elderly, of which we are only beginning to scratch the surface, are things like day centres. Day centres for the well provide meals. They provide entertainment, fellowship and educational resources. They are places where the chiropodist and the public health nurse may be available, or one can provide day hospitals for the physically and mentally infirm. That's a kind of switch on having night attendants at home. If there are people who need some help with their physical or mental problems, one can provide a day hospital for them and take them home in the evening. The family can cope overnight, and during the day they are back in the setting of the day hospital. They don't need 24-hour-a-day, expensive $120-a-day hospital beds.

Another service which I think the government should be considering, and again it is not expensive but it makes all the difference for families trying to cope with elderly people who may be sick or senile, is a system of holiday respites. This can be handled in two ways: Either the infirm elderly person is

taken to a holiday nursing home for two weeks or a month to allow the family to go on holiday or, while the family is on holiday, the home care services move into the home and take over.

I think very often for the minority of people of whom I am speaking—and it is only a minority of elderly people who are infirm as the majority are healthy, strong and active—the emotional and psychological health of their families—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will you keep your conversations down, please? It is only common courtesy to the speaker, the one who has the floor.

Mr. Martel: We are being very quiet. We are not bothering anyone.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, they are being very quiet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, their conversations are quite audible up here. I want to hear the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Martel: You are just trying to listen to both of them.

Mr. Ferrier: You are super-sensitive.

Ms. Sandeman: As I was saying, before I was so politely interrupted, it seems to me that the health—psychological, emotional and physical—of a whole family living together with several generations in one home must be a concern, as well as that of one generation only. Too often we concentrate our efforts on providing care for the infirm senior citizen and very often on finding the institutional place for that infirm senior citizen, where, if we would take cognizance of the needs of the rest of the family, we would recognize that providing holiday respites such as I have mentioned, or night attendants and that kind of thing, would solve the problem in a way which would keep the family happily coping together with the family's own problems.

I have heard members of the government say they would like to see families taking responsibility for their elderly. So would we all, but families must be given support systems if they are to do that of the quality and, I would say, even better than the quality of that which is given in institutional settings. We had an OFY group in Peterborough a couple of summers ago and a group of young people in the summer of 1975 did a project in which they reported on the needs of older people in Peterborough. The survey was very carefully done and very carefully monitored, and some of the results I found quite distressing.

They asked, among other questions: Do you have any problem preparing meals? Of the people they asked, 11 per cent said, yes, they had problems preparing meals. Their comments on this question included such things as, "I'm tired of cooking." "I have no appetite lately", "Sometimes I haven't the energy to go shopping," "Cooking for one is tough"—comments of that kind.

The next question was: Do you have a cooked meal every day? Five per cent of the people answering said, no, they didn't. It seems to me that good nutrition is as important, or even more important, for elderly people than it is for younger people. Peterborough is always said to be a representative community—if you want to test your new instant puddings you take them to Peterborough, if they go there they'll go anywhere. We're just as representative in our mix of senior citizens as any other city, and I would imagine that if 11 per cent of seniors living at home in Peterborough have trouble cooking their meals, and five per cent of them don't eat a cooked meal every day' that's pretty representative of this province, and it's an interesting piece of research that these young people did.

In Peterborough, as in so many other cities, we just can't meet the needs of meals on wheels. We have a small and dedicated volunteer group who are doing the best they can, but they are not reaching that five per cent of senior citizens—not by any means. Nor are we in other centres of the province.

I was very impressed when I was crossing a road in London, England, I think it was about five years ago, and it was around 11:30 in the morning in Camden, a borough of London which has a socialist municipal government and is famous for its level of social services. I tried to cross Euston Road, and I was nearly run down by the fleet of small yellow vans run by the municipality, cost-shared, of course, by the national government, which said on the side "Meals on Wheels, Borough of Camden." They are making, in a community like that, a really concerted effort to blanket the municipality with hot meals at noon for those who really need them. We're not even beginning to meet the level of nutrition for our elderly people that we should be.

Other things that this survey covered were the transportation facilities available for older people; 32 per cent of the older people in our city do not have the use of a car. This was taken to mean not only a car that was owned,

but a car one could use—a friend or a relative's car. So 32 per cent of the people did not have a car, which makes transportation a very important subject for senior citizens. Mobility is of great importance to all of us, and most of use assume that the family has a car; but one in three seniors do not have that privilege in Peterborough, which, as I say, is representative and I suspect that their experience is found across the province.

I think that when we're looking at alternatives for institutional care we need to be more innovative in our approach for living arrangements for senior citizens. Some people like to live in their own home if they can maintain it, some like to move into a smaller apartment, some like the idea of communal living—not institutional communal living, but separate units with a live-in warden. Some senior citizens projects are of this kind, particularly the small projects run by service clubs which are in garden settings, and, in my mind, are very attractive and in high demand by senior citizens. There's never enough of them in any community that I've come across.

The Abbeyfield experiment is another experiment that many seniors in Britain are beginning to find meets their needs. The Abbeyfield people are a private, non-profit-making group who buy up ordinary houses, larger houses in communities, convert them into bed-sitting rooms and rent the rooms at very moderate charges. Each house has its own housekeeper; two hot main meals are provided every day. It's a kind of group home situation for the elderly. We're too inclined to think of group homes for children, but many older people like the idea of a group home, with privacy for themselves.

I've only touched on some of the ways in which we could be providing alternative services for senior citizens in this province, and I don't think that they should necessarily all be provided directly by government, but funding support and leadership is necessary if we are ever to meet the needs of our growing senior citizen population. The funding support and leadership must come from the provincial government, and the provincial government must co-ordinate housing, health, and social services for senior citizens. We were glad to see in the Throne Speech at least a token move—I hope it will be more than that, but we haven't seen the proof yet—a token move toward co-ordinating services for children, but we have the same kind of chaotic mess for services for all age groups in this province, and for senior citizens particularly. Housing, health, and social services must be co-ordinated for that group if we are to make sense of them.

In conclusion, may I say that the Throne Speech promises to give high priority to the needs of our aging population, but it will be an empty promise, like so many other promises in that speech, unless this government addresses itself at once to the pressing problems of income, housing and social services for this group.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that a couple of the New Democrats quickly came over to our side as I rose and we're glad to have them here. Maybe they should stick around for a few minutes to see what the other side lives like.

Mr. Davidson: Because we like you.:

Mr. Mancini: Thank you.

I am very pleased to rise and once again participate in the reply to the Throne Speech. It is an honour for me to be here and represent the great riding of Essex South. Before I go into the main thrust of my debate, I would just like to tell the members of the House that the riding of Essex South is really unique. It's been practically the same as an electoral district for the last hundred years. Very small parts of the riding have been changed and the riding is one made up of many rural areas, it is largely agricultural and we also have a very large segment of industry in the western end of the riding, and also in the eastern end of the riding.

Fishing is one of the main areas where many of my constituents make their living, especially in the Kingsville and Wheatley areas. We are very pleased to have this industry. It has come under some severe pressure from the Ontario government lately, but hopefully we've got most of the problems straightened out in that industry, and the people there can go back to work and make a living.

Mr. Ferrier: Don't make Heinz ketchup, do they?

[10:15]

Mr. Mancini: Just give me a chance. Also, many of the unique things we have in the riding of Essex South have to do with the culture and heritage of many people. I would just like to mention we have many ethnic groups of large numbers that have moved into the riding over the past 30 or 40 years. These groups are very hard-working people. They have established their own ethnic clubs

and are certainly to be commended for their work and for the good they bring to the riding of Essex South. You may also wish to know, Mr. Speaker, that we have a large Mennonite community. They have their own school and pay for all the services that go towards the school out of their own pocket. It certainly is good to see a group as industrious and as hard working as these Mennonite people.

I would also like to mention, as I'm sure many of the members in the House here today recall the former member, Mr. Don Paterson. I just want to let the members of the House know, if they're ever planning a trip to Pelee Island or to Point Pelee or to anywhere in that vicinity, they'll probably drive past an establishment called the Pelee Motor Inn.

Mr. Ruston: A great place for tourists.

Mr. Kennedy: Has it got a licence?

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Paterson is one of the five proprietors and is the president of the operation. I really have to recommend the Pelee Motor Inn as a fine place—

Mr. Bain: What are the rates?

Mr. Deans: What is this, a sponsor?

Mr. Mancini: —to have a meal and to stay overnight.

Mr. Ruston: It has good food! Even the Treasurer would like that place.

Mr. Samis: How much for the next campaign? Are you broke?

Mr. Bain: The foregoing was a public service announcement.

Mr. Samis: Paid for by the taxpayers of Ontario.

Mr. Mancini: I am glad to hear the response from all the members in the House. We really know that Mr. Paterson was a well liked member.

Mr. Ruston: That's right.

Mr. B. Newman: A fine member.

Mr. Mancini: Many of the towns and townships in my area have been on a programme to try to save the heritage that Essex South is so famous for. I'm sure many of the members here know that in the western end of the riding we have the famous Fort Malden museum which brings in a lot of people. We're very proud to have that site there. Also the town in conjunction with having this very fine museum is undertaking a very ambitious NIP programme to really preserve the heritage of Amherstburg. I am sure in five or 10 years from now many members of this House and many former members of this House will probably want to go and drive to Amherstburg just to see the heritage that this council and the people in the area are trying to preserve. I think it's something that we're all going to be proud of.

Also, in the Kingsville area, we have the Ontario Historical Vehicle Association, which has really undertaken an ambitious and hard-working programme in the Gosfield South area. This summer they're going to open it up. They're going to have a mock battle on the land they purchased. They're going to show off many of the old vehicles that they've been able to accumulate over the years, and they also are saving many old, historical buildings which someday we shall really cherish.

I guess I can't mention Essex South without mentioning Heinz, the people that make our ketchup and employ many people.

Mr. Ruston: The tomato capital of the world.

Mr. Mancini: Right, it's the tomato capital of the world. It employs many people and many of the farmers in the Mersea and Gosfield South area bring their tomatoes to the Heinz factory. We're very pleased to have that establishment there.

I'd just like to mention that over the last 18 months the riding of Essex South has had many local issues that have caused great concern to the people of the riding. One of the issues I'm very sorry to say we have not been able to resolve is the issue of ambulances in certain areas of my riding. In the Harrow area we have the Richard Smith Ambulance Service, which is operated through the family of Gerald R. Smith. It is a service of long standing, serving the communities of Colchester North, Harrow and Colchester South—approximately 9,000 people.

Mr. Samis: You sound like the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Mancini: This ambulance service is one that is needed a great deal. It is very unfortunate that the present government has decided to cut the budget to this ambulance service by well over 30 per cent.

We have been able to obtain a petition from the people of the area. It was, I believe, one of the largest petitions ever tabled in this House, and I am proud to say that it was

tabled by myself. It had over 3,000 names on it. But even that was not enough to stir emotions on the government side, so that this ambulance service would not suffer this terrible 30 per cent cutback. I just cannot understand how anybody can conceive that an operation can continue to operate the way it did before with such a stringent cutback.

While I am talking about ambulance services, I must mention the volunteer service in the Amherstburg, Anderdon and Malden areas. It is a volunteer service which has been in operation for quite some time. It is very popular—as a matter of fact, they have a list of people waiting to join the volunteers. It is a well respected organization. We are very pleased to have them and we are, certainly, proud of the work that they do in our area.

Before I move away from the ambulance topic, I just have to say that the public relations from the ambulance director of this province is just terrible. He has been able to upset just about every ambulance director and everybody involved in ambulance work in the whole riding of Essex South. When one person can do that, I think there is a problem.

Mr. Davidson: It's universal. It's universal.

Mr. Mancini: And I sincerely hope that this type of public relations does not carry on. I don't think it is good for the province.

Interjection.

Mr. Mancini: And I certainly don't think it is good for the riding of Essex South.

Mr. Davidson: Nor anyone else.

Mr. Mancini: Another major issue which has troubled the riding of Essex South for nearly a year now is the longstanding problem of transportation for Pelee Island. Pelee Island is the most southern part of Canada. I am certainly pleased to have it in the riding of Essex South, and I am certainly pleased to represent the fine group of residents on Pelee Island. There are only about 250 there, and it is really a unique situation; I think the island has to be treated as such.

Mr. Samis: What about the schools there, Remo?

Mr. Mancini: That is why I feel it is very important that the Ministry of Transportation and Communications does not back off its long-standing promise that it would ensure a good transportation system for Pelee Island. And on July 2, 1976, I received a letter from the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow). I would like to read parts of it: "This is to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated June 11 concerning the improvement of transportation from Pelee Island to the mainland. As you are perhaps aware, the ferry service is viewed as a continuation of the road system. The policy of my ministry regarding ferry service in this province is first of all to encourage private undertakings wherever possible. Only in the event that the private service is not available, the following guidelines are to be adopted:

"1. International ferry services are the full responsibility of the federal government."

I would just like to say that the federal government is now carrying out its responsibility, and is providing one boat which travels between Sandusky, Ohio, Pelee Island and the mainland.

"2. Interprovincial ferry services are the joint responsibility of the two provinces concerned.

"3. Interprovincial ferry services are a provincial-municipal responsibility, with cost allocation based on function and road jurisdiction served."

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, even the Minister of Transportation and Communications knows that transportation between Pelee Island and the mainland is the sole responsibility of the municipality and the province. We also know that the province does give an 80 per cent subsidy for any deficit incurred, but we also know that there are some areas of the province where the whole 100 per cent of the deficit incurred is paid by the province. And surely we know that the people of Pelee Island must come under that second statement, that 100 per cent of the deficit incurred must be paid by the province. It's a poor municipality and it certainly can't afford to pay any deficit in its transportation system.

Before I leave this subject, I would just like to mention that we will be having a meeting soon with the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the federal minister, Otto Lang, concerning this particular situation. I certainly hope that the next time I have the privilege of rising in the Throne Speech debate, I will be able to say that the Ontario government did take action and did provide the people of Pelee Island with adequate transportation service as they do require.

Also concerning Pelee Island, I would like to mention the problem that the new regulations concerning bingos are going to

bring about. I would like to read part of a letter that I received recently from one of the leading citizens of the Pele Island area; he is the principal of the school there, a Mr. Wayne Bedal. He is very concerned that the new regulations do not allow people under 16 to participate in bingos. He states very clearly in his letter that there is almost no form of entertainment on the island because of the size of the population. The bingos, which they hold on regular occasions to support their campaign club, are a form of recreation where all the people on Pelee Island have participated in the past and have used the evening of bingo as a family night outing. We certainly would be remiss if Pelee Island was not given special consideration and if they were not allowed to continue as they have in the past. If we don't look at this very closely, and if we don't allow this to continue as it has, I think we are making a very serious mistake.

I would also like to mention some of the problems that the farmers in my area are having. As you know, Mr. Speaker, on April 6 I raised the matter in the Legislature concerning why farmers have to pay more for their gasoline when they are buying in bulk than they do at the retail level. Surely we can get a better answer out of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) than him always attacking the federal government. I have seen many occasions when we in the opposition have asked the Minister of Agriculture and Food to intervene or to take some steps into correcting some problems, and his first remark is always attacking the federal Minister of Agriculture. I would just like to say that by the time he's done, if he does one-tenth for the farmers that the federal Minister of Agriculture has done, he'll be doing a heck of a lot.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Perhaps if the hon. member is not near his concluding remarks he would adjourn the debate at the appropriate time.

On motion by Mr. Mancini, the debate was adjourned.

On motion by Hon. Mr. McKeough, the House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 14, 1977

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Bernier, Ms. Sandeman, Mr. Mancini 461

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Mancini, agreed to 485

Motion to adjourn, Mr. McKeough, agreed to 485

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)



No. 13

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Friday, April 15, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 1977

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

PARTNERSHIP FOR PROSPERITY

Hon. Mr. Welch: With the Ontario economic conference, Partnership for Prosperity, last February the government began a process of involving all segments of Ontario society in extensive consultation on what the province should be doing to ensure a continuing moderation of inflation after the national anti-inflation programme has been removed.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) suggested at that time that these discussions would continue. In the Speech from the Throne it was indicated that Ontario has set in motion a series of steps which would build upon February's successful initiative.

I would like to indicate this morning that the Premier and some of our colleagues are engaged in extensive discussions with a representative group of individuals coming from a broad range of backgrounds in Ontario—in business, labour, agriculture and other segments of our society. They will be meeting in private session throughout the day to deal specifically with the issues which will affect our immediate and long-term prosperity in this province. We don't expect a consensus or any concrete decisions to come out of these discussions today, but we do expect to receive substantial and useful advice to assist us in solving the problems with which the government must deal.

ENERGY REPORT

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling a report entitled Ontario's Energy Future. I believe it to be the most comprehensive report ever undertaken on this subject.

Mr. Deans: This is the second day in a row.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It examines the prospect of continued sources of non-renewable energy and concludes that there is little prospect that they can be maintained at the present rate of consumption for more than another quarter of a century.

Mr. Sargent: We're sure glad you're there, then.

Mr. Renwick: Bad management.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It further concludes that the world supply of crude oil and natural gas will be essentially depleted by the year 2025. Obviously, this has crucial implications for Ontario, as it has for all industrialized communities of the world. It is evident that we must be very prudent in the use of these depleting resources. It is equally evident that we must intensify our efforts to produce energy from renewable sources.

Mr. Lewis: That's really stunning and profound stuff.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The capital and technological requirements for the development of renewable energy sources are so massive that it will require a world-wide commitment.

The report I am tabling today imposes a time frame for policy planning. It suggests a near term during which we will be largely dependent upon fossil fuels and uranium. We will be almost entirely dependent upon fossil fuels until the end of this century. In the first quarter of the next century, we will gradually shift toward increasing reliance upon renewable or very long-term resources.

The final phase, the long term, will stretch beyond the first quarter of the next century. It will be an era in which we will have shifted to a primary dependence upon renewable energy forms.

Between the near term and the long term will be a vitally important transitional phase. As the name implies, this phase should be marked by a gradual planned shift toward a growing reliance upon renewable energy sources.

Mr. Lewis: This really is such simplistic pap!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The use of such a three-phase planning framework makes very explicit the timing of the choices that will have to be made. Commitments must be made in regard to such proposals as the construction of additional heavy oils and oil sands plants, the secondary and tertiary recovery of existing crude oil, transportation systems, and new initiatives in exploration and development. These are crucially important decisions that must be made now.

Commitments must also be made in regard to the expansion of research, development and demonstration projects that are designed to establish the means of economically producing energy in commercial quantities from renewable sources.

Mr. Mackenzie: Where have you been for 20 years?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we must solicit and gain the support and co-operation of the general public, the private sector, of other provinces, and of the government of Canada.

Mr. Sargent: What a bunch of nonsense you are reading. Why don't you sit down, it doesn't mean a damn thing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The co-operative programme that resulted in the development of the Canadian heavy water natural uranium generating processes, Candu, may be one model for research for the transitional phase; and the Syncrude project may provide another model for the development of the urgent requirements of the near term.

To this end, the report suggests a Canadian council of energy ministers be established. Above all else, we must provide the economic, financial and social environment in which our domestic energy resources can be developed as a national priority.

Mr. Lewis: That's profound.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The report arrives at 26 conclusions relating to the prospective supply-and-demand relationships of conventional fuels; some necessary developments related to the near term; the growing urgency of conservation and improved efficiency in energy use; and the pressing requirements of moving toward a transition to the renewable energy sources of the future.

Mr. Sargent: You're wasting the time of the House. You don't understand it yourself.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I do not expect everybody to agree with everything in the report.

Mr. Davidson: If this is the best report the other one must have been terrible.

Mr. Sargent: Do you understand what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It is my expectation, however, that in addition to providing a prospective policy framework the report will result in increased public knowledge and discussion of the implications of energy to our future lifestyle, the designing of our communities—

Mr. Mackenzie: The public's 20 years ahead.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —the industrial and economic prospects of the province and changes in our society that will have to be effected in the decades ahead.

Printed copies of the report will be available on Monday for all members and the public.

Mr. Renwick: That's too late.

NORTHERN AIRPORTS

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the House this morning that I will be introducing a bill to amend The Airports Act, a bill aimed at broadening the wording of the present Act.

The ministry has been constructing airports in the remote north for some years now; and, in fact, there are 11 in operation at settlements such as Fort Severn, Attawapiskat, Fort Albany, Pickle Lake, and Big Trout Lake.

The new bill will make it clear that my ministry has the authority to lease lands or facilities at these airports—not simply construct, operate and maintain airports as we have been doing.

Leasing land and/or facilities to individuals or corporations, I feel, will increase the usefulness of those airports already in operation as well as those still in the planning or construction stages. I am thinking, for example, of carriers which could then build hangars for the maintenance of their aircraft, or oil companies which could erect petroleum

storage tanks on our airport properties. Both would obviously provide better service in northern locations.

For some years now, MTC has been subsidizing the construction of municipal airports in northern Ontario at places such as Atikokan, Chapleau, Cochrane, Kirkland Lake, Wawa and Sioux Lookout. Some municipalities have found the costs of maintaining and operating them, once built, a strain on their financial resources. I am referring particularly to communities that now have regularly scheduled air service, such as norOntair, which requires a continuous high standard of maintenance.

The new bill will confirm the government's authority to subsidize maintenance and operational costs of such airports as may be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

FOREST FIRES

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, some hon. members have inquired about the preparations my ministry has made to meet the severe forest fire situation which could develop this summer. This is a potential problem with implications throughout the province, as well as possible effects on the communities, industries and the overall economy of the north.

I welcome this opportunity to provide details of steps we are taking to cope with this potentially serious situation. As the members may recall, last summer's forest fires burned some 1¼ million acres, and the direct costs to deal with those fires amounted to over $20 million.

As we have been publicizing, the prolonged drought of the past two years has continued in the north, particularly in the area west of Lake Nipigon to the Manitoba border. Water in the lakes and streams in this area is well below normal levels, and the layer of heavy fuels in the area—meaning muskeg and the heavy slash on the surface of the ground—has dried out to a considerable depth, in some cases to 10 feet. Consequently, when fires start they will be difficult to put out. It would take six inches of rain to bring the area back to near normal, and weather experts feel the chances of this happening are remote.

Our latest report is that only six fires are still burning underground, mainly in the Fort Frances and Rainy River area. My staff feels those will be out during this week. The other fires were either extinguished by ministry staff or went out during the spring runoff. However, the general situation is still acute.

[10:15]

To prepare for this potential threat, we have taken the following steps: A total of $7 million in new funds has been allocated to fire prevention and firefighting this year. This is in addition to the basic allocation of $14 million—in other words, 50 per cent more. About $300,000 of this amount is being used for an intensive prevention programme in the northwest to alert all forest users about the danger. The campaign includes posters, brochures, advertisements and school visits by staff.

To further bolster the prevention programme I declared a ban on campfires in northwestern Ontario as of April 1. This ban does not restrict travel or recreation in the bush, but can do much to reduce the incidence of man-made fires which might get out of control and threaten the woodlands.

Two hundred thousand dollars has been allocated to provide a more flexible fire detection programme. These funds will allow us to put more aircraft in the air for detection, and a portion is being used for infrared equipment on planes to locate hard to find fires.

For the critical burning period, four water-bombing Cansos have been hired, as well as 13 helicopters, on long-term contract.

About 200 extra persons have been taken on to assist our regular fire crews during the summer months. These extra persons are now in training.

About $1 million of the additional funds has been used to purchase forest fire equipment, ranging all the way from firefighting tools, hose and pumps to tents, cooking equipment and sleeping bags.

A number of fire-experienced personnel in my ministry, normally involved in other activities, has been temporarily transferred to the fire control programme to ensure that adequate direction is given to the prevention and firefighting activities. But we expect only minimal interference with our other ministry programmes, such as forest regeneration, fish and wildlife management, parks and mines management; that is if our plans work out and nature doesn't throw us some nasty, unexpected curves.

The approach used in this year's operation is to concentrate on initial attack so that, as much as possible, large fires will be prevented from breaking out. The idea is to get there quickly and keep the fires small. It's the large fires that are so costly and force us to bring in other ministry staff to help out. We have planned our strategy and used our funds so

that the firefighting resources are deployed in all vulnerable areas. This should reduce the moving of people and equipment from one area to another, which was done in previous seasons.

We also hope that our plans will enable the various forest-using industries to function normally with little interference from forest fires. Of course, if any major outbreaks occur despite our best efforts, companies operating on Crown lands may be asked to assist in suppression activities.

It is natural for communities in the affected areas in the north to be concerned about the potential threat. But let me assure everyone that our plans are to go in anywhere to help when needed. Traditionally, towns, municipalities and improvement districts are responsible for fires on private lands, except where they have made agreements for my ministry to automatically step in. But we are aware that many communities do not have the people or the equipment to cope with major outbreaks, and we are ready to help out.

In addition, I might remind you, Mr. Speaker, that our fire control staff have a standing offer to any community to help train their people in firefighting techniques.

To sum up, the potential danger is great for the 1977 forest fire season because of conditions that have prevailed for some time. The concern felt in all parts of the province is quite valid, and we have spent the months since the last fire season preparing for this one.

I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that my ministry is doing its utmost to prevent serious fires from breaking out and, if they do break out, to get them under control with the utmost dispatch. If all sides work together under our leadership we have a solid chance of getting through this forest fire season in good shape.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I, on an opening point of order, simply raise the observation that there are only six members of the cabinet here and that a number of the ministers to whom questions would appropriately be put are not here, and that that, you might convey, sir, is really not desirable.

Mr. Ruston: They're getting reserves in, Stephen.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: They may all be off drafting the terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate us.

ENERGY REPORT

Mr. Lewis: May I, therefore, with enormous reluctance, and a total sense of futility, ask a question of the Minister of Energy. May I ask the minister, in the kindest way, when is he going to stop producing reports which simply reiterate the truths which all of us have heard 100 times over; and when will he stop producing reports that place the Ministry of Energy in the position of lackey to the thrust of Ontario Hydro? And when will the minister come in here with some specifics about what he intends to do in the way of renewable energy resources, rather than these meaningless futuristic documents?

Mr. Mackenzie: Like the Ministry of Energy—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I gather the Leader of the Opposition wants me to respond to that tirade.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Kerrio: Thirty-five years of fumbling.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Because, in my estimation, it merely manifests an infinite unconcern about Ontario's energy future.

Mr. Moffatt: Strike two.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition first take time to read this report.

Mr. Lewis: I have read the report.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: And then possibly he could come forward with some constructive—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have read the report. It takes only 15 or 20 minutes to read; I read it very quickly between 10:00 and 10:15.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a further question?

Mr. Lewis: There is nothing in it.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: His reading of it obviously hasn't involved comprehension.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we have a more meaningful question period?

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, in a very specific way: Isn't this report simply the usual apologia—as you can see from its content—on our dependence on nuclear technology for the next 25 years, which everybody understands? Isn't this report simply a repeti-

tion of recommendation 17 that prices to the consumer will have to go up—which your government, as always, grants? Isn't this report a recognition that the minister doesn't have anything specific in the field of renewable energy resources that he is prepared to talk about in concrete ways? Why does he produce such documents?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, may I explain to the Leader of the Opposition that when you are talking about electrical energy, you are probably talking about less than a third of our energy.

Mr. Lewis: Of course.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: And this report covers the whole field of energy, not just electrical energy. If the Leader of the Opposition would look at that report and picture, if he can, the position of Ontario in the energy—

Mr. Lewis: We know the position.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —the whole field of energy.

Mr. Lewis: We know that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The fact that Ontario imports 80 per cent of its energy—

Mr. Lewis: We know that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The fact that Ontario—

Mr. Lewis: What is the minister going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The fact that Ontario has been advocating and is advocating action now—let's face it—

An hon. member: Like what?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —it's essential to establish an overall policy throughout Canada that is more than paper, but implementation of a programme.

Mr. Breithaupt: What are you doing?

An hon. member: Try your friend Lougheed.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Is the Leader of the Opposition interested in a dissertation on this, because I can take him through the steps as to what should be done in Canada?

Mr. Breithaupt: The federal government is at fault, I suppose.

An hon. member: You believe in motherhood too.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I can tell him what Ontario's goal is, what Ontario has been doing and what we are urging others to do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: If the hon. member wishes, I would be delighted to take the time to lead him step by step through that so that he could have a greater appreciation and comprehension of our problems, instead of dealing with this matter in such a casual and irresponsible way.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has said it all before.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a time for a general discussion of the whole energy field or whatever it might be. This is time for questions and answers. Now, there has been a main question asked here.

Mr. Lewis: No further questions.

Mr. Reed: Supplementary: I would like to ask the minister, how does he manage, in a report of this nature, to totally discount the potential for renewable resources—he does it here, in conclusion No. 9—when even the federal energy administration in the United States is projecting a solar component as one of the renewables—as the minister knows, it's only one—a solar component of 25 per cent by the year 2020. How does the minister manage to discount renewable resources totally in this report?

Mr. S. Smith: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: You say one per cent in this report.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the area of renewable resources is not discounted.

Mr. Lewis: They are, they are.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: They certainly are not. And if one looks to the future—

Mr. Lewis: We have looked.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You can't even look to the future.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: If one looks to the future, that is the thrust. One must distinguish too what one may be considering as solar energy in terms of electrical energy, and solar energy

used for space heating or for water heating. There's no way the United States is going to substitute solar energy for 25 per cent of its energy requirements by the end of this century.

Mr. Reed: The federal energy administration has set a goal.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It is preposterous.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, this is not a debating period, I will remind the hon. members again.

Mr. Moffatt: Supplementary: In conclusion No. 16 in the report, the minister indicates it is inequitable to consumers and irrational in terms of industrial development to escalate prices in an attempt to reduce energy consumption. Yet, through the other recommendations, there's no mention of any concrete positive steps that his government will take in order to conserve energy in any form at this point. Does it not make sense to the minister that if that statement is true, then it is necessary that we conserve the resources we have at present.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, if my friend would read the report he would see that the whole area of conservation is implicit in that report.

Mr. Moffatt: I have read the report.

Mr. Laughren: Implicit, but not explicit.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The members on the other side may believe in punitive pricing in the name of conservation.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's not get into a general discussion.

Mr. Moffatt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister has just indicated that a statement contrary to the one I have just made is in the report. I'd like the minister to tell me which conclusion specifically talks about conservation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, this is beginning to be a debate.

Mr. Lewis: I have another question. It is a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, we'll go to a new question. We'll call on the Leader of the Opposition for his second question.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, could I ask you who is the acting House leader? I want to place a question.

Mr. Deans: The Minister of Energy.

Mr. Reid: Will the guilty one please stand up?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest the hon. Leader of the Opposition ask one of the ministers and if the answer is not forthcoming they can transmit it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, this is a joke.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member take his seat? The hon. Leader of the Opposition will continue.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, I have in front of me a letter addressed to the Hon. Pauline McGibbon dealing with the apparent resignation from the North Pickering royal commission of Mr. David Humphrey, one of the commissioners. It was just handed to me. It is obviously a matter of urgent importance. I would like to know which minister is acting as the acting House leader in the absence of the House leader (Mr. Welch), the Premier (Mr. Davis), the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and many others, so I can put a question.

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest we give the hon. Leader of the Opposition the opportunity to come back to that question if the House leader returns?

Mr. Lewis: No, who is the acting House leader?

Mr. S. Smith: There has to be a House leader.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can't produce bodies, I must confess.

Mr. Ferris: And the ones they sent are disgusting.

Some hon. members: Adjourn the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We don't need all that advice, either. If there is a minister here you may ask your question of him. Is there a further question now?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask—

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Cunningham: If you ring the bells you might get them.

Mr. Sweeney: This morning is a joke.

Mr. Speaker: May I just remind the hon. members that this is just a head count, not a recorded vote.

[10:50]

The House divided on Mr. Smith's motion to adjourn the House, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 20; nays 49.

Mr. Speaker: We will continue with the question period, there are about 49½ minutes left.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we are wasting time now. Order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I believe, had a final question.

NORTH PICKERING PROJECT

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion having achieved its desired effect, may I put to the Premier the following question:

Can we ask the Premier for direct and immediate attention to the resignation of David G. Humphrey as a commissioner in the North Pickering royal commission, which resignation has been tendered to the Hon. Pauline McGibbon, making the point in his letter of resignation that this hearing is not in the best interests of the participants, the public, or for that matter anyone? "It is clearly on a collision course with the proceedings at present being conducted by the Ombudsman under The Ombudsman Act," et cetera; and obviously requires from the government an earnest and speedy reconciliation. Can the Premier act on it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In that the letter was not addressed to me, I have no immediate reply. I expect I will be getting a copy of the letter, at which time I will consider it, and I or the appropriate minister will be delighted to tell the House what our view of it is. I know nothing about it; I haven't seen Mr. Humphrey's letter.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I may: Since the contents of Mr. Humphrey's letter mirror almost exactly the observations of the second report of the select committee on the Ombudsman, indicating that everything will grind to a halt, there will be undue delays and total unfairness in the way the government has structured the inquiry commission in Pickering, can the Premier use this letter as a recourse for the appointment of a single commissioner, so that some justice can be provided for the claimants and the people affected?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we're interested in seeing this matter brought to a conclusion. If the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that a single commissioner rather than—and I think there were some discussions with the Ombudsman; we make every effort to accommodate the views of everybody on these issues—if the Leader of the Opposition is saying that a single person commission is more acceptable, I find that interesting. I find it intriguing. I obviously can't give any commitment until we have a chance to assess what Mr. Humphrey has said and his obvious point of view. As I say, I have not received his letter. I don't know anything about it; he's never discussed it with me. I'm not saying he should have, but he hasn't.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary: Mr. Speaker: Would the Premier not agree that since Mr. Humphrey has resigned, that commission is functus—that commission is over—and there is no way, observing the natural course of justice, that it can continue. Having arrived at that point, would the Premier not agree it is most important to immediately reconstitute some form of inquiry with entirely new commissioners so we can get on with the important business that started this problem?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't express as immediate a legal opinion as the member for Wilson Heights that by the resignation of one member of the commission that commission then, in law, is no longer in existence. I don't have that instant legal knowledge available to me—

Mr. Singer: I said it's functus—you can't carry on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't want to get into an argument in Latin with the hon. member. I don't know whether it's functus or not functus. I think it's a question of whether it still has the legal authority to do business or not do business.

Mr. Singer: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right. In that I do not, and am not in a position to come up with an immediate legal opinion on a matter about which I knew nothing until two minutes ago; I must confess I don't have the same degree of legal knowledge available to me as the member for Wilson Heights. I bow to his great expertise. However, I will—

Mr. Breithaupt: That wouldn't stop the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: Ask McMurtry, he'll tell you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I got my QC a year or two before him; that doesn't mean anything.

Mr. MacDonald: You're right.

Mr. Reid: That's the truth.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Doesn't mean a thing. If the member for Kitchener got his it means even less.

Mr. Breithaupt: I know, but they were based on merit in my year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, they were based on merit when he got his? Well, I wouldn't argue that for a moment. Let him tell his leader the rules of the House some day and he will perform a valid function.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we ignore the interjections?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, no more interjections.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, when he is considering the letter from Mr. Humphrey and the second report of the select committee, will the Premier consider the reconstruction of the commission to appoint (a) a single commissioner; (b) that the commissioner so appointed be advised or instructed to retain counsel for the commission—which is an omission in the present commission; and (c) will the terms of reference of the Order in Council be amended to delete the phrase "of proceedings of an adversarial nature." If those three steps can be taken, perhaps the matter can be concluded.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to consider anything that is reasonable. I'm only going by memory but my best recollection is that the suggestion for more than a single commissioner really didn't emanate from us.

Mr. Renwick: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm glad you agree.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Humphrey would be excellent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well that is debatable.

Mr. Lewis: Are you besmirching him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I'm not.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary: May I have the Premier's attention? Accepting the Premier's statement, Mr. Speaker, that the government was not aware of this until this morning, would the Premier not agree that this is a matter of sufficient urgency that the government should make every effort to resolve the situation, perhaps by Monday?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government makes an effort to resolve every significant issue as expeditiously as possible. Now we're delayed from time to time by some members opposite, but we do make every effort to move as expeditiously as we can.

Mr. S. Smith: Come on, come on; at your salaries you can be here Friday morning.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order. The leader of the Liberal Party has made some suggestion that it is my responsibility to be here on Friday morning.

Mr. S. Smith: Not yours, your cabinet.

[11:00]

Hon. Mr. Davis: I acknowledge that, and I want to inform him, in case he didn't hear the statement by the House leader, that I was about 100 yards away at what I regard to be a relatively—in fact I think significantly—important meeting for the public of this province.

Mr. Lewis: Where were your colleagues?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is my responsibility to be chairing that particular meeting. I would say to the leader of the Liberal Party I was on a matter of public responsibility. I wasn't in Brampton, Hamilton or Windsor playing tennis.

Mr. Breithaupt: I hope the other 20 cabinet members were as well.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of privilege, I took the Premier's remarks to be personally insulting, Mr. Speaker. I would like to tell you the interjection to which he responded was: "At the salaries of your cabinet they could all be here in the morning." It did not suggest that the Premier was doing something other than the public business. It suggested that somebody else should have been in the House conducting the business of the House for the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this should be the end to that matter.

Mr. Lewis: Why?

Mrs. Campbell: Why?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, I would like to ask the Speaker whether he might not directly intervene to suggest the value of cabinet attending in larger numbers on a Friday morning and in the process tell the Premier that these little delays and these little moments of controversy will not an election make. He will have to work a lot harder at it than that.

Mr. S. Smith: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: I think we should get on with the business of the House.

Mr. Lewis: Just by the by, you are going to have to work a lot harder on these devices, a lot harder than that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You can vote against us Monday night.

An hon. member: We will.

Mr. Reid: I bet you will all be here Monday night.

Mr. Breithaupt: So will we.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So will you, and I know how you will vote.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

BARRIE ANNEXATION PROPOSAL

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Premier: When the government accepted, as reported by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his letter to the OMB, the Simcoe-Georgian task force report on the Barrie urban study boundaries, could the Premier tell us whether in accepting that task force report the government was accepting the actual boundaries suggested in that report, even though that report indicates that there is an excess of some 14,000 to 18,000 acres of what would normally be required, even for a population of 125,000?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure the Treasurer would be delighted to answer that question for the hon. member.

Mrs. Campbell: If he were here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I somehow sense that a question somewhat similar to that was asked yesterday. If it wasn't, I am intrigued to know why it wasn't.

Mr. S. Smith: It is a different one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Anyway the Treasurer will be delighted to answer that for the member. He might even call him a little later on. He is at the PMLC meeting at this moment. I am sure he would be quite prepared to enlighten him some time later on this morning.

Mr. Breithaupt: It should be answered in Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary—this was a different question today from the one asked the other day, and I am still waiting for answers to all of them—could the Premier, when he is speaking with the Treasurer, kindly ask him as well to explain why it is that the government would consider accepting boundaries that are 18,000 acres too large, knowing that most of that land is prime agricultural land, in direct violation of the so-called green paper?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just have a note that the substitute chairman at the meeting down the hall is doing so well that I am excused for another few minutes. I will be delighted to acquaint the Treasurer with the member's question.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Since what we have at stake is another 9,000 acres of prime agricultural land, which is clearly and absolutely unnecessary for any population expansion in the area, why is the government prepared to allow the Barrie-Innisfil amalgamation to become another symbol of the Niagara regional kind, rather than intervening now and saying that government policy and the guidelines must be conformed with?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition is anxious for another symbol that is his business. We are not interested in symbols. We are interested in practical solutions to problems that the people of this province face.

Mr. Lewis: You are letting this agricultural land go.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are interested in practical solutions to the problems we face.

Mr. Lewis: What about your own policies?

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No, the member for Hamilton West. We are getting into a debate here again.

Mrs. Campbell: We are not allowed to?

WOMEN CROWN EMPLOYEES

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of Labour, on a different topic, Mr. Speaker: In view of the recently issued second annual report on the status of women Crown employees, stating that more than half a million dollars—I gather it is more than $645,000—has been spent on the so-called affirmative action programme and that this has resulted in only 130 significant advancements achieved in the female labour force of 25,832 people, can the minister explain how the spending of $645,000 to improve the lot of about 130 people can be justified?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The expenditure is not related only to those women who have made the decision to move from the traditional jobs for females within the Crown employee situation, Mr. Speaker. It also relates to expenditures for seminars, for all women employees in the ministries, to encourage them to consider this kind of activity, to provide them with the kind of stimuli which many of the young women need to make decisions about careers which are different from those which are traditionally chosen.

I think it is money very well spent, because the women who have been involved in the programmes are enthusiastic about them and I am sure that the hon. member will see next year that there will be a very much larger number of women Crown employees who will be moving from the traditional job positions for females to others through the bridging system which has been developed in almost all ministries.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, could the minister undertake to table as soon as possible—or perhaps she already has the information and can tell us now—how many women in the whole government are currently on the list of senior appointments; that is, executive director or higher? How many women are on that list, compared to the total number of employees at that level or above?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, I can't tell the hon. member precisely at this moment, but I shall find out.

Ms. Bryden: Supplementary: May I ask the minister how much of this money is being spent on informing the members of the public service about the affirmative action programmes and the seminars?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I believe that most of this money is being spent on the information process, which is both in printed form and in verbal form, as the hon. member knows, through the women's co-ordinators in the various ministries.

Mr. S. Smith: As a final supplementary, would the minister contact her colleague, the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth), on this particular topic and ask him for an explanation as to why it is that so few women have been appointed police commissioners in the province of Ontario, despite his promise to increase that particular number?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes.

FOREST FIRES

Mr. Foulds: A new question of the Minister of Natural Resources as a result of his statement this morning.

Mr. Mancini: Welcome back, Jim. Nice to have you.

Mr. Sargent: Welcome back, Jimmy.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you. Could the minister—how does it feel to inherit his predecessor's accumulated slash as one of the problems—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we ask a question of urgent public importance?

Interjections.

Mr. Foulds: On a more serious note, Mr. Speaker, is it true—

Mr. Lewis: You will never make it in this ministry, Frank. Never.

Mr. Foulds: Is it true, as the minister's statement seems to indicate, that heavy slash is one of the major dangers that faces us with regard to forest fires, as well as being one of the major impediments to his ministry's reforestation programme? Further, could the minister indicate why he is so optimistic that minimal interference with other ministry programmes or activities will take place? And could he describe the nasty tricks of nature? Do those nasty tricks of nature include the continuation of the drought?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The hon. member is just leading with his chin on that last one. The nasty tricks of nature often sit opposite me.

(Applause.)

Mr. MacDonald: That impressed the minister's colleagues.

Mr. Speaker: Now, could we get back to business? Order.

Mr. Lewis: That is more in order than anything that has happened in the last 24 hours.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. minister answer the question?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I hope the member has received the material I sent him. I also sent a second copy—I didn't know whether he was the official critic or not—so he now has two copies of the same material, I would assume.

Mr. Reid: He has read them both.

Hon. F. S. Miller: To be sure, we sent him the material on the drought situation up north, and I think he will find it delineates three types of risk in the forest: The very sensitive small brush and material that can really change from day to day in its fire sensitivity; the first few inches of the soil, which takes several days to either dry out or recover; and of course the deeper ground. Our problem in the north is that through natural decay, wind action, previous fires—all kinds of things—there's a lot of material buried under the subsoil which traditionally would not likely burn, but this year it might so the risks are very high.

Now I go on to the next part of the question—how can I be sure that the other programmes of the ministry will go on? I think you have to realize that the key people we are asking to transfer are those who can supervise fires. Therefore, it's not the great number of people carrying out the regular programmes of the ministry, but ones already in those activities who are trained in firefighting. We've also set a pecking order for which ones go first; and the ones that go last are those involved in reforestation. That is, to me, the most important of the programmes to be maintained this summer. I hope that with that kind of explanation, I can be reasonably sure that the important programmes are carried out whilst we have people on a standby for a transfer for forest firefighting.

Mr. Foulds: One quick supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is there any co-ordination between your ministry and the Fire Marshal's office under the Solicitor General; particularly with regard to the minimal programmes that that ministry has in training of volunteer fire departments in unorganized territories? I understand they only have two people to train those volunteer fire departments which are responsible for fighting fires in unorganized territories, fires that could escalate into major forest fires which would be the responsibility of the ministry.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm sure the member knows that we have agreements with many municipalities, and I assume if they're unorganized—

Mr. Foulds: Unorganized.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The reason they are unorganized is that the land is Crown land. We charge five cents an acre to take over the forest fire responsibility for a township's private land. That's a pretty cheap fee to transfer the responsibility for firefighting to the Crown. Even if that five cents per acre isn't agreed to in advance by any form of municipal government, and a fire starts on private land, our people are available to go in and fight it, simply because it often extends quickly to our land. If that happens, we'll charge back the full, direct costs to any existing municipality. So I would suggest to municipalities which think they shouldn't spend a nickel per acre that they surely should, and thus transfer a great deal of responsibility. But, in addition, in the statement you may have noticed that we offered to train those people. Our ministry offered to train fire-fighting people for bush fires; that offer is still good.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the minister has an extra $1 million in equipment, will he provide some of that equipment to some of the townships in unorganized communities that don't have pumps, hoses and so on? And does he have

auxiliary plans for hiring university students and high school students in the upper grades in case more manpower is needed?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The loaning of equipment isn't a totally black or white issue, as I understand it. Under certain circumstances, it could be done but it's frowned upon, really, when in fact we can encourage the groups to have their own. The second part of the question: The 200 people I referred to in the statement are 200 stand-by people, to be well trained, hopefully, to act as group leaders to use people like school students should the fire risk become intense. Yes, we would be using them.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: Would the Minister of Natural Resources speak to his colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and convince him that smoke detectors are no substitute for fire-fighting equipment?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The import is lost upon me, but I'll be pleased to do so.

[11:15]

UTDC FOREIGN CONTRACTS

Mr. Cunningham: My question is for the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Given that his ministry has had some involvement in the Urban Transportation Development Corporation use of foreign sales agents, will he tell the House whether such agents are being used in deals other than the Caracas subway deal? Specifically, how many other agents is his ministry using on behalf of the UTDC; what deals they are working on; and what we're paying them?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, my ministry has not retained the services of any agents in the world market. Any agents that would have been retained would be by UTDC, and by the authority and approval of cabinet, and I know of none.

CONSUMERS ROAD INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: I raised with the minister in the House on Friday, April 1, by way of a question, a request for further involvement by his ministry in helping to resolve the severe traffic problems associated with the Consumers Road industrial subdivision, in view of the fact that the traffic congestion is adversely affecting the movement of traffic on provincial Highway 404 at the Sheppard Avenue interchange.

Would the minister, in the light of the announcement on Tuesday of this week by Marathon Realty Limited to build a $100 million office complex in the Consumers Road area, bringing thousands of more workers into the area—

Mr. Conway: Speech.

Mr. Williams: —be prepared to immediately initiate such further impact studies, discussions and action as may be necessary to ensure a final solution to the traffic congestion problem at the Don Valley Parkway-Sheppard Avenue interchange?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, my ministry officials have been working very closely with the borough of North York, the borough of Scarborough and the Metropolitan Toronto roads commission officials to try to assist them wherever possible in bringing about improvements to that particular traffic situation. The matter that the member refers to, relating to Highway 404, I was not aware of, but I will certainly have my officials look into it.

WCB CLAIMS DELAYS

Mr. Laughren: A question to the Minister of Labour: Is the minister aware that the administrative delays and bungling at the Workmen's Compensation Board have become so bad that injured workers in the Ottawa area are going to the Unemployment Insurance Commission to apply for sickness benefits rather than cope with the frustrations of dealing with the WCB?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, Mr. Speaker, and I would truly appreciate knowing how many injured workers have been so moved.

Mr. Laughren: There shouldn't be any.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I gather that there were 10 in attendance at the meeting which was held in Ottawa yesterday.

I am aware that there have been some delays and those situations for which I have been given both the name and the compensation number of the individual, I have investigated personally in order to find out the source of the delay, because in determining where delays are occurring it is possible to concentrate the efforts to ensure that, indeed, this does not happen in the future.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary merged with a point of order, I should point out to the minister that, as usual, her facts are incorrect.

Mr. Lewis: Always; she has never got it right.

Mr. Laughren: There was 50 or 60 injured workers at that meeting, not 10.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Did the member say Ottawa or Oshawa?

Mr. Lewis: Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is that a supplementary question?

Mr. Laughren: My supplementary is this, Mr. Speaker: That not only are the injured workers going to the Unemployment Insurance Commission, but is she aware that there is almost a complete lack of vocational rehabilitation services being offered to injured workers in the Ottawa area, as well as other communities I might add?

Mr. Reid: Anywhere.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there has been a dearth of vocational rehabilitation officers, and as a matter of fact, within the past four weeks the Workmen's Compensation Board of this province has accepted a recommendation from the rehabilitation services branch that there be a massive increase in the number of vocational rehabilitation officers. Recruiting has begun, the training programmes have begun and, indeed, the specific concern of the Workmen's Compensation Board for this part of its function is one to which it has recommitted itself.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary: Of this massive number, how many in fact are being hired?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'm not absolutely positive of the number but it seems to me it is somewhere in the region of 80 or 90.

Mr. Deans: That has never stopped you before.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary. The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Would the minister contact the Workmen's Compensation Board and have them send, rather than the three people who are now bird-dogging our task force, people to the meeting who can count?

Mr. Lewis: That's right. Don't say anything that is given to you by the board.

Mr. Speaker: Is there no answer? All right, the member for Renfrew North.

ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr. Conway: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, in the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources. I would ask the secretary what is the position of the government, at this point in time, with respect to implementing that portion of the Algonquin Park master plan which calls for the complete withdrawal of the use of small outboard motors in Algonquin Provincial Park? What decision has been made on that portion of the implementation of the master plan, particularly for this coming season?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, that policy will be announced very soon.

Mr. Conway: In that regard, can the secretary perhaps tell me now, or perhaps later, on what authority the government member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Rollins) has at three public meetings announced, specifically and without equivocation, that in fact that determination has been made; and that for the third year in a row, I believe, the Algonquin Park master plan to that extent will not be complied with? What authority has he had, if any, for those protestations?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I can't speak for the member for Hastings-Peterborough, Mr. Speaker, but as I just mentioned to the member that policy will be announced in the very near future.

Mr. Wildman: Could the minister indicate if there is any kind of time limit within which the government will require master plans for provincial parks to come into effect; or do they continue to go on and on and on, like the Lake Superior Park where it's been in effect since 1946 and we still don't have a master plan in effect?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It's an ongoing review, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't tell the hon. member just when it will be finalized.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary from the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Is it not true that the regulations, as indicated by my colleague in the previous question, have in fact been published in the Ontario Gazette some two years ago?

And why is it those regulations are not being followed?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The matter the hon. member has raised, about the size of the outboard motors, I believe was not one of the regulations that was published three years ago. This is a subsequent regulation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere has a question.

STRIKE CONTROL

Mr. Warner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that the Solicitor General is one of the remaining 20 people in the chamber.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; will the hon. member please state his question?

Mr. Warner: In the interests of safety, both for the policemen and those who are on strike, will the Solicitor General direct the leadership of his office toward the Metro Toronto Police Force so that mounted policemen will not be used at any strike location—in particular the present situation at Becker's milk plant in Scarborough?

Mr. Lewis: Incredible.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, it has always been my understanding that the mounted police are one of the best and safest means the police have of controlling crowds. It is their responsibility, as we all know, to keep the peace and to see that the law is enforced. If they, in their wisdom, feel that the mounted police are the best way to do it, I certainly don't intend to ask them to do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Warner: Is the Solicitor General aware that the use of the horses at the Becker's milk plant, when added to the condoning of strike breakers and the Milk Marketing Board continuing to supply milk there, has heightened the potential of violence?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: No, sir.

Mr. Riddell: Do you want the farmers to drink their milk?

Mr. Breithaupt: You should use cows not horses.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the Solicitor General: When a company like Becker's, under these circumstances, request this extra kind of police protection, is there a charge made to them so that it doesn't have to be picked up by the public purse?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I don't believe so, sir. I don't know who requested the extra policemen. I don't even know if they had been requested, because generally it is a police responsibility to move in automatically when they feel there is any kind of danger that crowds may get out of control.

Mr. Lewis: Since when is a picket line—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A final supplementary.

Mr. MacDonald: In view of the fact that one of your predecessors—that goes way back, Allan Lawrence—indicated, in a strike in my area where they were bringing police in and there were no disorders at all, that he would consider the proposition of an extra charge to discourage this use of the public law enforcement agency for strictly private purposes; would the Solicitor General, in light of that, consider the matter further?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am not so sure where the request has come from. It is a responsibility of the police to maintain law and order and to move in where they think they can keep people from being injured. The very purpose of the presence of the police is to keep the peace.

Mr. MacDonald: Sometimes they provoke it.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That may be so, but I will investigate this and see who has requested that the police be there. I assume it has been done at their own initiative, but I am not sure of that.

ST. NICHOLAS ARENA

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Culture and Recreation: Is the minister aware of a recent case involving the fraudulent use of $20,000 in Wintario grants by the St. Nicholas arena in Toronto, and would he comment on the number of charges of fraud that have been levied against recipients?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The answer to the first part of that question is yes, but the matter is now, of course, before the courts and I

don't think it would be wise to discuss it. That's the only knowledge of such charges that I have at the moment.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary: Does the minister perform any audits on lottery grants, and how many audits have been performed, if any, on the $111 million in grants in 1975?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, so there is no misunderstanding, commitments are one thing, the actual cash flow is another. I think the member would understand that.

Mr. Ferris: You are not kidding.

Mr. Riddell: We know that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Naturally people are very anxious to have the commitment in order to go to the private sector. We do have procedures for spot checks as far as audit is concerned. I don't have that detail here with me, but I would be glad to provide that for the member.

QUEBEC WORKERS

Mr. Samis: A question to the Minister of Labour: In view of the ongoing problem of Quebec workers, especially in the building trades, working in Ontario and taking away jobs from tradesmen in this province, can the minister tell us what her ministry is doing to try and solve this long standing problem?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, we have had over the past year discussions with the officials of the Ministry of Labour in the province of Quebec and, on at least one occasion, a discussion with the then Minister of Labour. The difficulty is that, of course, the province of Quebec has been less welcoming to Ontario workers than Ontario has been to Quebec workers and there is no border. One does not require a passport to cross the Ottawa river.

It is a difficult problem, one where I think a frontal attack upon at this stage of the game might, indeed, enhance the spirit of conflict and confrontation which is presently there, but we are continuing to examine it. One of our ministry officials has made a specific personal examination of the problems inherent therein. We have had preliminary discussions about that examination within the ministry and it is presently under review in our ministry.

Mr. Samis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that this problem has been with us for many years, and in view of the fact that three successive governments in Quebec have taken a pretty well identical stand—two of those governments being strongly federalist—is the minister prepared to take any action whatsoever, if the talks prove unsuccessful, to introduce parallel legislation to protect Ontario tradesmen?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am not really sure that introducing that kind of legislation would be in the best interests of Canada. However, it would hopefully, serve the purpose of improving employment opportunities for Ontario workers within the Ottawa-Hull region, which is the major problem. We have the same kind of difficulty, as I am sure the hon. member knows, on the other border, where we have at the present time approximately 900 workers from the United States working in Sarnia. There is, of course, some slightly different basis in factual reason for it, but the effect is exactly the same. They are not problems which are easy to solve. We have discussed those which we have on the Quebec-Ontario border with the Minister of Labour of Canada, and will be discussing them with him again next week, because we hope he might be able to help us to resolve at least some of the difficulties. The extra requirements which the Quebec government has instituted over the past many years are, indeed, I think not the kinds of procedures which the Ontario government should consider, particularly at this time.

[11:30]

Mr. Conway: Supplementary: Has the Minister of Labour seen, for example, the reciprocal agreement arrived at in November, 1975, I believe, with the corresponding ministers of transportation and communications for the two provinces? Is she contemplating that kind of an arrangement to redress the irritations to which my hon. friend from Cornwall has made reference?

Hon. B. Stephenson: That was exactly the kind of procedure that we were attempting to develop. It has not been a receptive group in the Ministry of Labour on the other side of the Ottawa river, and they have not looked with favour upon that kind of situation.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES

Mr. Sargent: This will be a three-part question, like the member for Oriole (Mr. Wil-

liams) had a few minutes ago. It was to have gone to the Premier, but it's hard to find anyone with any authority.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member just place his question, please?

Mr. Sargent: So I'll give it to the Minister of Industry and Tourism, who has as little authority as anybody I know.

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the statement in the Toronto Star yesterday that the current policy of the government is the same old remedy of fighting inflation on the backs of the unemployed, and since the minister is involved in industry, hopefully—

Mr. Grossman: Question.

Mr. Sargent: —in view of the fact that in 1975, when inflation was raging unchecked, this government body in two budgets just prior to the election to stimulate the economy, included $500 million in election gimmicks; in view of the fact that today—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member not build up a long case? Will he ask his question? Thank you.

Mrs. Campbell: Don't embarrass the government.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, you allowed the member for Oriole to go on for about five minutes, and I'm trying to put my question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: It's about the unemployed people of this province. Have some heart up there.

Mrs. Campbell: Exactly.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I point out to all hon. members that most of the questions are too long and many of the answers are too long as well.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please refrain from the comments he's making, if he wishes to continue? Will he continue now and ask his question?

Mr. Sargent: Today we have control over inflation for the next year or so. In this time of emergency, when 300,000 people in Ontario are in desperate need of a job and thousands of high school students are coming on stream in another few weeks and university students—

Mr. Sweeney: It's 700,000.

Mr. Sargent: —I want the Minister of Industry and Tourism, to give him a job to do for once and to prove something, to tell me why the government can't immediately put some of the $600 million it has going into parkway or other land acquisition or some of the $100 million it's going to pay to Syncrude into creating jobs? Tell us too when the government can juggle the books to find money to buy votes for an election, why it can't juggle the books to find jobs for the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am sure the member is aware of the fact that, come next Tuesday evening, there shall be a rather interesting document placed before this House. I trust at that time there will be answers to his questions.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: Can his ministry do anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Obviously the question the member raised is not one that's directed to the Ministry of Industry and Tourism but to the minister of finance or Treasurer.

DRG GLOBE ENVELOPES LIMITED

Mr. Grande: My question is to the Minister of Labour. Given the fact that the Minister of Health answered with some speed a question regarding senior citizens getting ripped off in nursing homes, will the Minister of Labour attempt to answer the question I put in this Legislature on December 6 last year concerning the appalling working conditions at DRG Globe Envelopes?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am sorry, it was my understanding that we had answered all questions which had been put to the Ministry of Labour in the last session. If we have not, I apologize. The answer will be forthcoming.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Mr. Sweeney: A question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Given the fact that the Ontario Council of University Affairs is the chief advisory body to his ministry with respect to policy direction, spending and so on, what criteria does he use in selecting the members for that advisory body?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I would reply to the member this way, Mr. Speaker, that that's a

fairly extensive process. We attempt to consider a large number of factors. I think that if the hon. member would locate their home residences, for instance, on a map, he'd find that it does an excellent job of covering all this province.

We obviously therefore try to distribute the membership throughout the province. We try to distribute the membership through a large age grouping, as we would not want everyone from a senior citizen group of our society, nor would we want them as all young members of our society.

I am trying to convey to the member that in forming a board of that importance, we make a very conscientious effort to have as broad a representation of the community at large, all things being considered, as it is possible to do.

Mr. Sweeney: That being the case, would the minister not agree that if there is going to be a student representative on that advisory body, the various student associations through this province should at least be consulted as to whether or not they have recommendations to make?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: The member makes a very basic error in that we do not appoint a representative of any specific group in society. There are young people on that council, but they do not represent a specific group.

Mr. Conway: Not even the Tories.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: There is indeed an excellent member who happens to be very knowledgeable in labour negotiations, but he does not represent the union section of society. There are people involved in management. They are not there because they happen to represent management. It is a cross-section of the people of this province that we try to reflect in those appointments and not representatives of a specific group.

DROUGHT TASK FORCE

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: On March 24, in the Thunder Bay Chronicle-Journal, there was an announcement of a task force comprised of ministry personnel to study the drought situation in northwestern Ontario. Could he indicate to the House the authority of that task force, what reports it has made to the ministry or the cabinet, and what concrete steps the five ministries involved are taking with regard to the problems, excluding the forest fire situation in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I'd be pleased to get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Presenting reports.

REPORT

Mrs. Campbell from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following application for a private Act and finds the notices as published sufficient:

Village of Port McNicoll.

Your committee further recommends that, in accordance with the order of the House of March 31, paragraph 7, the latest annual reports of all agencies, boards, and commissions be referred to the committee.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

AIRPORTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of Bill 34, An Act to amend The Airports Act.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC VEHICLES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of Bill 35, An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The amendment to The Public Vehicles Act which I've just introduced will clarify the situation regarding car pools and van pools as they relate to The Public Vehicles Act and will really exempt any requirement for car pools or van pools to be licensed under that Act.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—and I've waited until now because I didn't want to take any more time away from the question period than the division bells were already taking away—I would

like to raise a couple of matters of order, and perhaps you may want to rule on them later. They have to do with what happened this morning.

Mr. Conway: Here it comes.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I want to draw attention to standing order 31 which deals with motions to adjourn the House. I would like to suggest that the procedure followed this morning was very irregular and contrary to the rules.

Mr. Moffatt: The House leader should be here.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, there is no rule about the attendance of the House leader as there is no rule about the attendance of the member for Durham East. However, standing order 31 is fairly clear. It says: "A motion to adjourn the House or the debate is in order any time after the orders of the day or notices of motion have been entered up, but may be made prior thereto only by leave of the House."

I suggest that the procedure followed this morning was contrary to the rule and I think that the record should be quite clear on that matter so that we can avoid—

An hon. member: There were no ministers in their chairs.

Mr. Lewis: You are right.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —what I would consider today to be an irresponsible activity on the part of the third party—

Mr. Sweeney: Irresponsible on your part.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —to frustrate the carrying out of the routine proceedings of this House which are quite clearly set out in the rules.

Mr. Conway: Did the member for St. Catherines (Mr. Johnston) second that motion?

Hon. Mr. Welch: With respect to routine proceedings, it's quite clear if one looks at standing order 23, which is very specific, that routine proceedings precede the orders of the day. I don't know whether I have to make any other point except to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to rule 31 of the House with respect to what happened today.

I'm also very anxious—and I've been anxious to do this for some time but I didn't want it to be interpreted as being overly sensitive personally—to clear up some misunderstanding, particularly by the leader of the third party, with respect to the role of the House leader. In some exchange today with the Premier, he talked about nobody being here "to conduct the business of the House."

Mr. Speaker, I thought that's what you did. I thought that the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly was in fact in charge of the House and, secondly, that he, the Speaker, and all members of the House are governed by what the rules say are the routine proceedings and that we proceed with the routine proceedings.

Any discretion that is left with any minister designated as House leader takes effect only when we reach the orders of the day. I think that's quite clear with respect to the rules, that the discretion with respect to the calling of the business then comes into effect when the orders of the day are called. Prior to that time I assumed the Speaker and the House are governed by the rules which set out the order for routine proceedings. Although we're all entitled to have our fun, I would assume that in the interests of the orderly conduct of the work of this particular House we would do this.

Mr. Sweeney: We didn't consider it funny.

Mr. Sargent: There was no House leader there and no acting House leader.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The fact of there being no one here designated as the House leader at the moment was very relevant to the question put by the Leader of the Opposition, who had some difficulty at that time—which is another point—in placing a question to someone of a general nature because the specific minister wasn't here.

Mr. Conway: It was a difficulty shared by us all.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It was a reasonable question for the Leader of the Opposition to ask who was in fact designated at the moment, "so I can direct my question to that particular person." That was, as far as I'm concerned, a reasonable inquiry.

Mr. Kerrio: We are glad you are willing to listen to reason.

Hon. Mr. Welch: But the procedure that followed, that is, for the leader of the third party to stand up and move adjournment and then start talking about who's here conducting the business of the House, I assume—

Mr. Sargent: What are they going to talk about, the Blue Jays?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —we would chalk that up to lack of experience, which no doubt will not

be improved upon because he won't be here that long to have it improved upon anyway.

Mr. Sweeney: You are making a mockery of the Legislature.

[11:45]

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Does the hon. member for Kitchener wish to make a comment on this point of order?

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes, Mr. Speaker, only with respect to some of the perhaps more unfortunate remarks of the government House leader, which unfortunately became somewhat more personal than I would have hoped they might.

Mr. Sweeney: Church is Sunday.

Mr. Breithaupt: The difficulty that we faced this morning was with respect to the ability of opposition members to ask questions of the responsible ministers; and I am quite aware, of course, that Mr. Speaker has no control over the attendance of any members of the House. The points dealt with were dealt with specifically to draw attention to the fact that perhaps because of other duties in other places, there were only six ministers of the Crown present.

This is an unfortunate circumstance, but one which it was believed had to be brought clearly to the attention of the ministry, because the whole functioning of the question period, now that it has been extended to an hour, will obviously collapse if there is no one here of whom questions may be asked.

It is true, of course, that questions can be asked particularly, no doubt, of the ministers who were present, but in certain other issues of the day there was the requirement at least, and one expressed by the Leader of the Opposition, to place a certain question dealing with the recent resignation of Mr. Humphrey from a commission.

There was no one to whom that question could be put and, of course, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely out of your competence to suggest it be put to any particular other minister in the absence of having someone at least generally available to have that question put, even as notice. That has happened on occasion with the various secretaries for Resources or Social Development and questions have then been passed on to their appropriate ministers.

That opportunity wasn't available to us this morning, and as a result the procedure developed as it did. I would suggest that the problem can be avoided if there is some attempt to at least encourage government ministers to be present, particularly on days such as a Friday when other trips or other plans might have them elsewhere.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, before you say something about this I want to add a comment. First of all, the fact that the ministers weren't present isn't surprising. This has been one of the problems of this House for some considerable period of time. In fact, for as long as I have been here, Friday mornings have been unproductive because of the inability of the government to get ministers into their seats. I don't think we should have been surprised by that, although this morning was particularly bad.

I do want to raise with you the matters of order, and to suggest to you that it is inappropriate for the Speaker to accept a motion from a member who has risen on a point of order. The leader of the third party rose supposedly on a point of order. Your only function in that, if I may say so, sir, to you, was to decide whether or not he had a point of order. You should not have accepted a motion to adjourn on that pretext.

Mr. Sargent: You voted for it.

Mr. Deans: I did not.

Mr. Sargent: Your party did.

Mr. Deans: I did not. I make the point with you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be very helpful if we were to have some clear definition of what is acceptable under a point of order. A point of privilege is a different matter altogether to be heard—

Mr. Sargent: What a bunch of nonsense. What nonsense is that?

Mr. Deans: —but even on a point of privilege, I put to you that you cannot move a motion. A motion can only be moved by a speaker who has been regularly recognized for the purpose of speaking.

Mr. Sargent: You are out of order yourself.

Mr. Deans: I am not out of order. In fact I am very much in order. It is probably the only point of order that has been valid all day.

Mr. Kerrio: Why didn't you think of that earlier?

Mr. Deans: That's the reason, incidentally, why we didn't support the motion.

Mr. Kerrio: That is not the reason.

Mr. Sargent: Oh come on.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Kerrio: I bet he bets the horses after the race is over.

Mr. Deans: I can well understand that the Speaker might not be totally familiar with all of the new rules, any more than any other member would be totally familiar with all of the new rules—I can even understand that the Speaker might not be completely familiar with all of the old rules—but I do think that there are certain rules that we have to all understand, and the one rule is this, that you cannot rise on one pretext in order to raise a matter completely unrelated.

Hon. Mr. Welch: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, the two House leaders, in speaking to this question with respect to the orderly running of the House. The attendance of my colleagues is one matter; and I want to say that I thought at the beginning of this morning's session I was, in part, addressing myself to that by announcing the private meeting, involving a number of my colleagues, that was going on in the building. I thought that particular message would be clear. In fact, I was prepared, if asked, to indicate the members of the executive council who were at that meeting, along with others who were there. I had the list right here.

I am not speaking to the question of attendance; the members opposite are quite entitled to make whatever comments they want with respect to that matter. And that really isn't the reason I rose today on this particular point. I felt I had to make the comment. Unfortunately, it has been interpreted as being overly personal, but I felt that some of the comments made by the leader of the third party with respect to the conduct of the business of the House had to be clarified—once again, in the spirit of the orderly running of the House. It is not unrelated to some other matters with respect to the committee structure, which is all in place now because of a great deal of co-operation. I would hope that would continue.

The important thing is that there are, perhaps, other ways to address this question of attendance, rather than trying to find some way to bend a rule or to follow the procedure that was done today. I simply repeat that I think it would be wise to clarify rule standing order 31, and to clarify the position of the person designated as House leader, being very clear, as far as I am concerned, what rule 24 confers on that particular cabinet minister. Any discretion applies only after the routine proceedings have been dealt with in the House.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, if I could comment on this very briefly, I don't want to prolong this because it could get into a debate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we should get on—

Mr. Cunningham: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Are you rising on a point of order now?

Mr. Cunningham: Yes, I am.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we should just get on with the business of the House. And I think the points—

Mr. Cunningham: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: This is the gist of the conversation. I'll hear the member briefly.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, the hon. House leader in his remarks implied—partially in error, I would think—our party was possibly raising this matter with fun in mind. I just wanted—for purpose of the record—to correct that, as sincerely as I can. I am correcting the record, if I might.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is the gist of many of the remarks. People rise on points of order and they really want to debate some matter; that is really not a point of order. I think the points that the member for Wentworth made were well made. The House leader's comment about the policing of the order: my preliminary examination of that order would tend to give credence to that interpretation of it; and, in my opinion, the motion should not have been accepted, at the present. I take responsibility for that. We will study all the comments that have been made and will undoubtedly have further comments to make at the first of the week.

Orders of the day.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Mancini: I am pleased to rise and resume the debate. But before I do, I surely must take the opportunity to comment on what happened this morning. And, surely, the issue in question is the fact that members of the opposition, who are in a majority in this House, did not have the opportunity to question the government ministers. If, on Friday mornings, the best turnout they are going to have is five or six cabinet ministers out of 26, I sincerely hope that they will talk among each other so that they will be able to give the opposition members a better opportunity to find out what is going on in this province. That way, we can report to our constituents, as is our job.

Mr. Conway: One of these days they'll learn something about the supremacy of Parliament.

Mr. Mancini: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I left off I was on the topic of farm gasoline. I was mentioning that it was very unfortunate that the farmers of Essex county and many farmers across the province of Ontario are paying more for gasoline while they're purchasing in bulk than when they buy at the retail level.

I also mentioned it was very unfortunate that every time we put a question to the Ontario Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) it seemed to me his only response is a direct attack on the federal Minister of Agriculture. Surely he can be like the present Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. F. S. Miller); I think maybe the Minister of Agriculture and Food should stop and listen to some of that minister's answers.

I would just like to say that the Minister of Natural Resources' answers are direct, straightforward and honest and really that's all the members on the opposite side of the House here are asking for. All we want is a direct, straight and honest answer. If the Minister of Agriculture and Food for Ontario can't do anything about the problem which I raised on April 6—if he can't do anything about the fact that farmers are paying more for bulk gasoline than they do at the retail level—then he should just stand up and say so and give the reasons why.

While I'm on the topic of agriculture I would just like to point out that in the riding of Essex South we have possibly 75 per cent of all the greenhouse operations in Canada. This is a multi-million dollar industry in my riding; it provides a tremendous amount of jobs. There's tremendous investment and it surely is the cornerstone of the farming in my particular riding. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I've raised the question in the House that the greenhouse industry is under severe pressure due to increases in energy. I would just like to point this out here to the members of the assembly and especially to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Even though he's not here today, I'm sure that he'll take interest and read my remarks in Hansard.

I just want to point out that if something is not done soon, either by way of some kind of subsidy for their energy costs, or possibly by finding a new source of energy, such as solar heating, the greenhouse industry is not going to survive much longer. Last year they were under terrible pressure, not only from the high cost of energy but from the tremendous amount of cheap imports that were on the market that they had to compete with.

Here in Ontario the farmers must pay a higher minimum wage than they do in many parts of the world. That is coupled with the initial cost of construction for the greenhouses and further coupled with the tremendous cost of energy. I just don't know how the greenhouse industry is going to be able to take it much longer. I know that some of the people in that industry have branched out and have gone into flowers, such as roses and lilies and that type of thing, but the bulk of the people in the industry have stuck with their regular crops of tomatoes and cucumbers. I just want to really emphasize the point that the industry is in trouble and we'd better take a good look at it soon.

I would like to speak to the new reform on property taxation which has been kicked around a great deal by the Treasurer of our province. I would like to read from the background report that the Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs committee sends out. This one is dated April 1, 1977. One page nine, section 6, where the heading is "Property Tax Reform," it states: "The Treasurer said the report was well written"—and he is referring to the Blair commission report—"The Treasurer states that the report was well-written, with local recommendations, and he had hoped that the municipalities would read the full report and be willing to accept the challenge."

[12:00]

I think that very clearly states the intentions of the Treasurer of this province. I'm sorry to say that if the present government receives another majority, this programme will be implemented in the same fashion as regional government was implemented some

time ago, against local wishes and against much, much opposition.

I would just like to speak to some of the sections which cause me a great concern and which cause many of my constituents a great concern. Mr. Speaker, regarding proposal four dealing with farm land: presently the farmers receive 50 per cent of their property tax in a rebate form. They seem to be satisfied with this type of rebate and there appears to me to be no overwhelming cry from the farmers in my area that they need more as far is a property tax rebate.

However, the Treasurer feels that it's the responsibility of his government, as stated in budget paper E, that they should pay a full 100 per cent of the property tax. I believe that this is wrong. I believe that it will some day take the farms away from the farmers, and I also believe that the farmers want to feel as if they're paying their fair share in this great province.

It was quite interesting that the Blair commission found out that this is exactly how the farmers feel—that they do want to pay their taxes. Their recommendation was that the province pay 90 per cent in a tax rebate form and that the farmers pay the other 10 per cent. I personally—and I'm sure we all on this side of the House—find this a ridiculous answer to the problems that we are facing today.

I'd like to move on to proposal seven dealing with exempt property. Today, as we know, people like the Girl Guides and the Boy Scouts and the YMCA and other very good institutions such as that are now exempt from property tax—places like private schools. In my own riding we have a private school which is run by the Mennonite community. This school has been built from donations from this community and they pay the whole cost themselves. They've expanded their institution just recently. I believe it was last year that they opened up a $500,000 gymnasium and auditorium and there wasn't one penny from outside their community—there wasn't one penny from the Ontario government. This is a group of industrious people who are trying to take care of themselves. And what does this government propose? It proposes to tax them.

Surely we cannot accept this. I sincerely hope that many of the people in my riding understand this issue and that many people across the province understand it. In the Blair commission report, they also acknowledge some of this. It was their recommendation to the Treasurer that local boards be set up to hear these charitable institutions and private schools like the Mennonite schools which I've just mentioned in order that they may apply for an exemption in order to get a grant so that they can pay their taxes with this grant.

How much bureaucracy do we need? First, we have a system which is going to be set up to tax charitable institutions and private schools and take their money away. Then we're going to set up another level of bureaucracy which is going to meet with his people to see if they're going to have their money back, and they may get it back and they may not. That's truly a bureaucrat's dream and a people's nightmare.

I would now like to comment on proposal, 5 which is of real concern to me and which is of real concern to the small business community of Essex South. As you know, Mr. Speaker, presently there are different rates under the business assessment. I would just like to mention that car parks pay 25 per cent; retail stores pay 30 per cent; industry pays 60 per cent; financial institutions such as banks pay 75 per cent, and distilleries pay 140 per cent. Under this proposal, the business assessment would be changed so that everyone would pay 50 per cent.

Imagine, today, under all the pressure that small business feels, the government is going to raise the business assessment tax and the institutions which are making the most money, and the institutions which can afford to pay, such as banks—and I would just like to mention that I'm very happy to see that in some parts of Canada we're going to have unions in banks so that the workers there can, once and for all, get a fair wage—these institutions, industries, banks and distilleries, their business assessment taxes are going to go down. Surely we're going to have to realize that someone else is going to pay that, and I really abhor the thought that this extra payment is going to come from a segment of society which is already under severe pressure, a segment of society which is a dying species. If we want to see a prosperous Ontario in the future, we must preserve our small business, and this new business assessment tax is certainly not a measure which is going in that direction.

I would just like to leave the reform on property taxation now and I would like to say a couple of things about the Ministry of Culture and Recreation, especially Wintario. I personally feel that with the $60 million per year we're collecting now, not all of that money should go toward the projects that it has been going out to. Not all of that money should go to send hockey teams across the country. Not all of that should be directed

in the culture and recreation area. Some of that money should be directed into other areas.

I would just like to mention that many of the older people in our society today want to stay in their homes and do not want to go into institutions. I personally would like to see some of this money possibly go to fund nursing for these older people who want to stay in their homes but can't quite take care of themselves the way they used to. Surely our old people are as important as many of our Wintario projects?

I would like to say that I've seen just about every Wintario application, or I've known just about every Wintario application that has come from my riding. I know that just about every single one is worthy of some financial help. Also, I feel there are many other sectors of our society that are also worthy of our help, so maybe we can take $10 million or $15 million a year, or possibly even a little more, out of the $60 million or so that we are collecting and put it in other areas which may be of assistance to older people.

I would like to mention, concerning industry and tourism, that Essex county is very unique. We are right across the river from the sixth largest metropolitan area in the United States. We are right across the river from Detroit, Michigan, and all of its suburbs, and I believe that we have one of the greatest opportunities to draw from that area in terms of tourism, and I personally believe that this government here in Ontario has not done enough as far as advertising the county of Essex.

As I mentioned earlier, we have a lot for the people to see. We have historical museums, historical parks. We have Boblo Island. We have Heinz in Leamington. We have many things that the people on the other side of the border would wish to see. I only wish that the Minister of Industry and Tourism would face up to this and would allow us more money to advertise our county and in that way generate much much more money in tourist dollar expenditures from people who I am sure are very willing to come and visit the county of Essex if only they knew what we had to offer.

I would just like to mention, while I am on this subject, that in the township of Sandwich West, in the riding of my good friend from Essex North (Mr. Ruston), there is a new business opening up. It is in its second year of operation and it is called The Farm. I have been there to visit it and I believe so has the member and so has the Minister of Industry and Tourism. This enterprise is being undertaken by two industrious Canadians whom I believe deserve and need some help from the Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

Already these men have thousands and thousands of people booked, especially schools which come over in busloads to visit this farm, and one really has to see this place to appreciate it. They have all kinds of mechanical devices which are covered with real calfskin or calf fur and other things like that, which open up and show what the inside of a calf is like so the students can better appreciate where milk really comes from.

They have applied, I am sure, to the Ministry of Industry and Tourism for a grant so they could help promote agriculture, so that they could help promote Essex county. The minister was there to see this operation, and I am sure that he was very impressed, but still we get no help. It seems that Minaki Lodge got all the assistance that they needed, but two industrious Canadians trying to advertise Essex county, trying to create a viable small business, cannot get assistance.

I really think that the minister should go over the regulations for assistance and for loans to small business—because I find them almost incomprehensible and so do many of my constituents who are trying to apply—and he should come out with a very specific programme as to who will receive help and who will not and why. Also, his programme should be open to change, so that people like those I just mentioned in Sandwich West who start operations such as The Farm, may also have the opportunity and chance since it is such a unique operation, and if they don't fit into the criteria the criteria should always be open to change.

I would now like to mention that we suffered probably one of the worst winters in the history of Ontario, and I would like to say that Essex county was hard hit by the snow. Most municipalities had exhausted their budgets well before the end of winter and I was very pleased to be one of the first members to call for snow removal assistance from the ministry. I would just like to take the opportunity to congratulate the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the cabinet for their statement on February 1, 1977, that they had made a decision to make extra funds available to these municipalities whose funds had been depleted. All the municipalities in my riding were very grateful for the cabinet action, and we certainly would like to thank them for that.

[12:15]

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned senior citizens and how many of them would like to stay in their own homes. As we know, today approximately one out of every 12 people is over 65. In the year 2001 one out of every five people will be over 65. Personally, I find the institutionalizing of old people to run against the way I feel people should be cared for.

As you know, in Toronto the Italian community undertook a vigorous programme and built the Villa Columbo. I really wasn't sure whether it was going to work or not because I know how most Europeans feel about the institutionalizing of their parents. I don't find it at all surprising that the Villa Colombo is only half full—I find that a matter of course. I really think that steps must be taken now so that a system can be set up so that the old people can be cared for in their homes. They want to remain independent, and they want to live in the environment that they have for so long and that they find so comfortable. I think we would all be remiss here in the Legislature if we don't take steps to ensure that these old people have the opportunity to stay in their homes if they wish.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the problem of vandalism that seems to be on the increase in my riding, and I'm sure that my riding is no different in this regard from any other riding in the province. Almost on a regular basis we read where vandals tear off mail boxes and are breaking store windows and are breaking expensive signs, stealing bicycles and so on.

If we don't put a stop to this, if the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the judges of this province are not going to take strong measures to prevent this from continuing to grow, we are all in for a very great shock in the future. Our young people must be taught to respect goods which are owned by someone else. They should know the value of property, they should be aware that when they cause damage they are hurting someone personally.

I would just like to mention that the Ministry of Correctional Services has a programme in which, when a young person under the legal age is caught causing damage to someone else, such as breaking glass and stealing bicycles and so on, when they are apprehended they are taken to the person whom they have harmed so that they can see first-hand the real damage that they have done to this person.

I sincerely hope that this programme will be expanded. I hope it's working. I know in one particular situation in my riding where I was not pleased at the way in which it was carried out. But, generally, I hope that the programme is working and I hope it is expanded because our young people, if they are not taught from a young age to respect the goods of other people, I just would once again say that we are sincerely in for a great shock in the future.

Also, I cannot rise in the Legislature without mentioning the Workmen's Compensation Board. Over the last 18 months a great deal of my time has been taken up helping my constituents with the Workmen's Compensation Board—I hesitate to say against the Workmen's Compensation Board, because I really want to believe that the board wants to help people. However, in its process of wanting to help people, I think it has erred in many, many areas.

I sincerely urge the board to change the way in which the appeal system operates. The workers do not understand it. I know that we have only two workmen's advisers. That's not enough. We should at least have 30, or 40, or 50 workmen's advisers.

Every time one of my constituents who is an injured worker goes before the appeals board, I always make certain that he has a workmen's adviser with him. I know that if he does not, no matter if he has a lawyer or any of these other people, he stands very little chance of winning his case. I know of just about every one of my constituents who has gone before the board with a workmen's adviser, I would say 90 per cent have won their cases. I do not think that would be true if he did not have the workmen's adviser with him. I think it is a very good system to provide the injured worker with an adviser who will go and defend him, a person who is independent from the board. I think that we have to expand that greatly.

While I'm on the subject of the board, I have to say my experience through my constituents has been that the board moves too slowly. On many occasions I have had constituents wait literally months for the board just to gather information. I have had to help these people get on general welfare assistance. I think that's wrong. If the board realizes at the time that the case is complicated and that it is going to take months, it should have someone go into the area and collect all the facts in two or three days. In that way the injured worker knows where he stands.

I had a particular case where an injured worker's case was caught up in all this bureaucracy. It took literally four and a half months before the board received all the

information to enable it to make a decision. In the meantime, I helped this man get on general welfare assistance. After four and a half months, his claim was denied by the board. I'm not saying that the board was wrong in denying the man his claim but surely it was wrong in having this man wait four and a half months. I don't believe for one minute that it takes four and a half months to accumulate all the information concerning an injury.

Recently we have had a very interesting affair concerning the Ontario Federation of Labour. This is an institution I have a great deal of respect for. I know it does a lot of good for the workers of Ontario. But when I read that the president of the OFL takes a trip to Florida while his staff members are on strike and the whole institution is paralysed and no longer during the duration of this strike is able to help the workers of this province who are members of the OFL, I really have to find that disappointing.

I am sure if any executive-type person from any company had done that he would have been labelled a person who does not care for the interests of the working people. I am not saying that the president of the OFL does not deserve a vacation; I am sure he deserves one. I am sure he deserves more time off than he presently gets. But this particular point in time—when his staff members are on strike and his institution is paralysed and therefore not doing any good for the union members of this province—is no time to take a vacation. He should be home straightening out the problem so that people like my father, who's a union member, can get all of their union dues handled in a proper fashion and can get all of the benefits that they deserve from this organization.

I was really sorry to see this, and I would sincerely hope that it doesn't happen again. I know a couple of the members who work on the staff and I'm not so sure that they're on strike without any good reason. I'm sure they're out on strike for a good reason. I think the president should be there to try and straighten out the problems that he's facing right now.

Basically that concludes what I have to say. I would just like to mention to the members that every year we have the famous Pelee Island pheasant hunt, and I took the liberty of inviting all the members over to this wonderful place during the hunt, where pheasants abound by the thousands, and where the good people of Pelee Island would surely be glad to see some of the members of the assembly other than myself. So if the members do have time this fall, you're all invited.

Mr. McCague: Earlier in this debate the leader of the third party had some comments to make on the application of the city of Barrie to annex certain parts of surrounding townships. I want to review the events which preceded this application being made and to reiterate the government's position in this matter.

In the original TCR concept it was envisaged that the major growth in the Simcoe-Georgian area would take place in and around Barrie. At that time no studies had been made of the whole area of Simcoe county.

Mr. Conway: Reading speeches is quite improper.

Mr. McCague: It is quite proper for me, thank you. I didn't criticize you when you were making yours.

Mr. Conway: Standing order.

Mr. McCague: In the original — sorry, you've gotten me all disturbed now.

Mr. Conway: You're not going to get the same treatment.

Mr. McCague: In order to do this and to develop a strategy for the development of the area, the government set up a provincial-municipal task force charged with the responsibility of recommending a development strategy to the government. This task force was set up in 1972 and consisted of four elected representatives from the urban communities of Barrie, Orillia, Collingwood, and Midland, and four members representing Simcoe county council and the rural townships.

It was chaired by the then Minister without Portfolio, the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Irvine) and later the member for Brantford.

Mr. Conway: What happened to the member for Brantford?

Mr. McCague: The task force was in existence for over three years and submitted its recommendations to the government in the fall of 1975. These recommendations were based on studies carried out by a team of consultants under the direction of the task force.

Let me be explicit about this—the local representatives of the people of Simcoe county chose the team of consultants, set out their terms of reference, directed their work

and received their report and recommendations. These recommendations were considered by the task force, which recommended to the government a development strategy. This was the document which the government announced it accepted in principle in April of 1976.

During the study period every effort was made to involve each municipality and to ensure that special interest groups and the public were kept informed and had an opportunity to provide input. Some 140 meetings were held, about half with the municipalities. The remaining 70 were either public meetings or meetings with the specific groups.

In addition, the proposed strategy was the subject of two conferences. The result was a strategy that has met with general acceptance throughout the county. Indeed, the county council is on record as supporting the four growth centres strategy. However, no one has ever claimed that everyone in the area agreed with every recommendation. The major dispute was the conflict between the city of Barrie and the township of Innisfil. No resolution of this problem has been achieved. All parties agreed, however, the city ought to be allowed to expand. What was in dispute, and still is, was the acreage.

In this connection the leader of the third party made reference to a letter to the Treasurer from the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman). I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to read this letter into the record. It demonstrates that the strategy of the task force is compatible with farm land preservation policies of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, although understandably he would have gone further. It should be noted that the letter does not relate specifically to the Barrie annexation. It recognizes that some land will be converted to urban use and expresses concern about the method of retaining this land in production as long as possible. The text of the letter is as follows:

"Further to your request my staff and I reviewed the above noted report. I would offer the following comments for your consideration. In general the report is to be commended for the attention paid to the concerns of agriculture, particularly the concepts of preserving prime agricultural land for continued agriculture production and separating potentially conflicting urban and rural land uses. Although we have no objections to the overall development concepts chosen by the task force we would like to express the following.

"As part of the implementation programme the task force recommends the reservation for food production of all existing and potential class 1 and 2 agricultural land as well as class 3 lands currently in production, as classified by the Canada land inventory. In addition the report calls for the reservation of all specialized land suitable for fruit, vegetables and tobacco. Although such retention policies are praiseworthy, I have noted that they fall slightly short of the objectives utilized by my staff in the review of the planning document. These objectives specify that class 1, 2, 3, and 4 agricultural land, as well as areas of special and unique crops or soil, should be retained for food production.

"Although I recognize that it is the final responsibility of the task force to delineate those lands to be reserved for agricultural use I am unable to find any underlying rationale within the report for not reserving more arable lands than presently suggested. For example, the report indicates that class 1 and 2 agricultural land comprise one-third of the Simcoe-Georgian area. If all existing potential class 3 lands were included for preservation the total reserve land area still contains only 53 per cent of the study area. This would seem to leave ample areas in which other growth could occur.

"I have noted that the report designates generous urban land areas to meet the future needs of the projected populations embodied in the development concept. Yet, because of the long time-frame involved in the strategy, many of these designated urban lands will not be required for 25 or 30 years. In the interim, it is desirable that these areas remain in agricultural use and further that detailed staging for the development of these areas be required to enable farmers to make a logical and orderly retreat. In this regard five years advance notice might be appropriate as a minimum. I trust that this important concern will be adequately provided for when the time comes for implementing the development strategy at the local level.

"The report also makes reference to the use of land banking policies modelled after the Saskatchewan and British Columbia schemes as possible implementation measures. Although not without merit, as you are no doubt aware land banking presently does not constitute part of the government strategy for Ontario farmland as outlined in the recent statement entitled A Strategy for Ontario Farmland.

"An important goal of the report suggests the removal of pressure from agricultural and rural areas by providing adequate lands

for urban development around existing centres. Although it is implicit in the report it is my concern that before such lands, which may include valuable farmland, are needed for urban expansion, ideally all land within existing urban boundaries will have been efficiently used through infilling and other similar local planning policies.

"Finally I commend the task force for its recommendation that bona fide farmers be permitted to build additional residences on their land to accommodate farm labour without the need of a land severance. This completes our comments in this regard to the report.

"[Signed] William G. Newman,

"May 11, 1976."

At a series of meetings with the representatives of the municipalities involved, the Treasurer encouraged them to seek agreement in order that they might avoid divisive and expensive hearings before the Ontario Municipal Board. Unfortunately, this was not possible and the city of Barrie proceeded with its application for annexation.

I think hon. members are aware of the subsequent events. However, since there appears to be a certain lack of clarity in some quarters about the government's position, let me read into the record a letter which the Treasurer addressed to the chairman of the OMB approximately one month before the hearings began:

I am given to understand that there is still some confusion about the government's position in relation to the application of the city of Barrie to annex parts of the adjacent municipalities. In the interest of clarification, I thought I should expand on my comments in my previous letter.

"The report of the Simcoe-Georgian task force, which recommended that the population of Barrie should grow to 125,000, was accepted by the government on April 8, 1976. It is desirable that future urban development in the province be concentrated in urban areas in order to preserve as much valuable agricultural land and in order to secure the most efficient and economical delivery system as possible for municipal services.

"I confirm my previous statement that it is necessary for Barrie to expand its boundaries in order to accommodate the population envisaged. I have also stated and reaffirm that the amount of land to be annexed is a matter for the board to determine.

"To ensure that adequate facilities will be available to service the expected influx of population, the government will make funds available over and above normal levels from its regional priority budget as and when necessary. This will require in the future a series of agreements with local government.

"It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to negotiate such agreements with at least five different jurisdictions, the city, the county and three townships. If the board determines that compensation ought to be paid in accordance with section 14 of The Municipal Act, the government is prepared to look favourably on the provision of a portion of the funds for this purpose.

"I hope that this letter will serve to clarify some of the concerns that appear to have arisen and be of some assistance to you in your deliberations.

"[Signed] W. Darcy McKeough,

"September 30, 1976."

This remains the position of the government. It was with some regret that, despite having sent copies of the first letter to the municipalities concerned and the wide publicity the letter received, the Treasurer found it necessary to send a second letter in similar terms six weeks later. The second letter was in the following terms:

"Dear Mr. Chairman:

"I refer to my previous letter regarding the matter of the city of Barrie application to annex part of the neighbouring townships. At that time I indicated that the report of the Simcoe-Georgian task force had been accepted in principle by the government.

"I understand from my staff who are attending the hearing that the board is uncertain about the degree to which the government has accepted the report as government policy in view of the statement that it has been accepted in principle.

"I confirm that in particular the population allocations contained in the report have been approved by the government. In the case of the Barrie urban area, this is 125,000. The government noted the recommendation that a joint planning group should be set up to study the Barrie urban area. Inevitably, some years would lapse before such a group could be in a position to make recommendations. These would then require agreement and approval before further action could be taken.

"In the meantime, a number of decisions relating to the servicing of the area must be taken. These may be related to municipal services such as water and sewers, or provincial functions such as highways. These cannot, nor should they, wait until a detailed land-use plan has been developed.

"If the objectives of the government are to be achieved it is essential that the province can deal with the jurisdiction that will ultimately be responsible for housing those 125,000 people.

"Where expenditures are incurred by a municipality in support of developmental objectives of the government, it is the practice of the government to make financial assistance available in order that no undue burden falls on existing residents.

"Funds for these purposes are made available through the regional priority budget and are over and above all existing grant programmes. Examples of projects which have received provincial funds are: Pollution abatement projects in Thunder Bay and Ignace, and the development of an industrial park in the Parry Sound area. The regional priority budget is also used to fund provincial programmes such as the upgrading of Highway 599 from Savant Lake to Pickle Lake in advance of normal requirements.

"The government is prepared to make funds available for similar projects in the Barrie area, but I am unable at this time to indicate the magnitude of this support for projects in the Barrie area. This would have to be determined on receipt of specific proposals, but it is essential that the maximum benefit be obtained from the expenditures of public funds. Any project to be considered for assistance would be required to satisfy the requirements of the projected population.

"It is, therefore, essential that the government be able to deal with the jurisdiction that will be responsible for making decisions relating to capital expenditures on infrastructure to cater to 125,000 people.

"This jurisdiction must also have the responsibility of proposing taxes to meet the local share of costs. I understand that my previous letters have not been placed on the records and that the board would prefer that a witness be available to present such letters and to testify. In this regard I have instructed Mr. Eric Flemming to deliver this letter.

"[Signed] W. Darcy McKeough,

"December 15, 1976."

At no time has the government indicated how much land Barrie should have. Certainly, it should be sufficient to accommodate a population of 125,000. Ideally, the local people should sort it out themselves. Should they be able to do so, the Treasurer would be pleased to do anything possible to avoid further expense to these municipalities. If this cannot be done, the OMB can take into account all the relevant considerations, including those relating to agricultural land. It is unfortunate that the annexation issue has overshadowed the recommendations in the report of the Simcoe-Georgian task force. The government is anxious to get on with the implementation of the other parts of the report, particularly those relating to growth in the four urban centres of Barrie, Orillia, Midland and Collingwood—so are the municipalities. Indeed the Treasury has received specific requests for assistance in the provision of infra-structure from the cities of Barrie and Orillia and the town of Midland.

The city of Barrie proposal is most advanced. At this time, the city is ready to spend approximately $250,000 to serve an industrial park of 65 acres. We expect, shortly, to be in a position to announce government assistance to this project. In this way, the government and the municipalities are moving very positively to support the work that was done by the task force, and to implement their recommendations.

It gives me pleasure to clarify this position on behalf of the government.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to have this opportunity of joining in this Throne Speech debate. To begin with I'd like to commend you for your very important work as Speaker of this House, and on the way that you conduct the business here. Sometimes it's rather difficult to keep everyone in order and sometimes the business is rather controversial, but I'd like to commend you for the way you've conducted the affairs of this House.

The major concern of most people today is the whole question of unemployment. People in my area are certainly being hit as hard as in many other areas of the province and the country. In mid-March there were almost 5,000 people—as my leader pointed out when he gave his speech—registered as unemployed at Canada Manpower in the northeast office out of the Timmins area. It has been a particular concern of mine and of the people in the area. So many people who want to work do not have jobs available. There have been a number of things over the years that have exacerbated this particular situation and made it very difficult in our area. A number of jobs were lost when the federal government closed the radar base at Ramore and put the communities of Holtyre, Ramore and Matheson in some jeopardy when a number of air force personnel moved out.

[12:45]

Then we were hit, I suppose, by the slump in the lumber industry, and pulp and paper setbacks didn't help too much. Jobs were lost there. Then a year ago last December the government, in a very infamous act as far as I'm concerned, decided to close down the northeastern regional mental health centre. We have lost over 100 jobs in that facility. Even though it is being partially used as the resource centre for the mentally retarded, there have still been over 100 jobs lost there. It seems to me that maybe one of the things the government should be considering when they're setting up their regional offices for this Northern Affairs department, since they did exacerbate the situation very much in regard to employment when they closed down northeastern, is that the Northern Affairs office should be in Timmins.

Another thing that really has hurt us was the sagging price in gold. We lost about 735 jobs there. Granted that the price has come up to the range of $150 and a little per ounce of gold and that stabilizing the price means the mines are able to operate at a slight profit and perhaps might be engaging in some more development of their operations. Nonetheless it's a time of uncertainty. The gold mines had tried to get the federal and provincial governments to come up with a policy as far as gold mining is concerned so that they might be able to plan ahead with some certainty that the governments wanted that industry to carry on.

As I pointed out in my budget speech last December, there is quite an opportunity for expansion of this industry if it can be sustained over the valleys in the economic curve. As yet to my knowledge, neither the federal nor the provincial governments have come up with a policy that would make sure these mines continue in operation and provide employment and economic stability to the gold mining communities that exist in this province.

I think it would be most valuable and essential for the government to make a commitment that we really do want those gold mines to continue. I know the Minister of Natural Resources at the time made a very favourable speech to the mine ministers' conference down in Newfoundland, and we thought he was really pushing it. But when he was pressed in this House, he kind of hedged and the Treasurer did as well. They just wouldn't make that kind of a commitment.

As I say, if the north is going to develop and continue to grow with the resources we have there in gold in the Timmins area, Kirkland Lake area and Red Lake area, we should make sure to let them know we want the industry there, we want them to expand and we will support them.

Another thing that caused unemployment is the shutdown of Timmins Auto Springs Limited putting between 100 and 125 people out of work. It was a manufacturer of trailers for transporting lumber, pulp and forest products. It had expanded quite rapidly and was most important to the economy of the area. I think the pulp and paper strike and the slack in the lumber industry had afflicted them in such a way that they were not able to keep going. I hope the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, along with others, will get involved. While that same industry may not be able to revive, some others might be encouraged to use the facilities and we will have that secondary industry in our area. It was the only major secondary industry that we did have, and we were most concerned that it continue.

The whole leaving of the development of the north to the private sector and to free enterprise has not brought prosperity to many of the communities in my riding, nor to the north as a whole. I think that we have to have more government planning and involvement in our economy. After all, if we're prepared to spend $100 million to develop Syncrude in Alberta then we should be prepared to put some significant capital into the development of northern Ontario.

My leader has stated that one-half of the mines profit tax should be earmarked specifically for northern development and this money could be used by local bodies to provide secondary industry throughout the north and, over a significant time, public and private involvement in such a way where there was equity taken by the province in areas where there was some jeopardy in business and public capital could help stabilize it, or keep an operation going, that this money could be used for that. That's something that could be done in the Matachewan area right now, and regarding the Minister of Northern Affairs and his speech last night as to what he was going to do for the north, there's an area right now where he could do something.

Mr. Martel: Do you know where the offices are going?

Mr. Ferrier: No.

Mr. Martel: Kenora and Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Ferrier: Kenora and Sault Ste Marie?

Mr. Martel: I didn't realize Rhodes and Bernier were in such troubles.

Mr. Ferrier: That's crass political manoeuvring and I'm afraid that's what the ministry is, but we'll have to deal with that one when the bill comes in.

With the unemployment in the north and the difficulties that are there, one would hope this kind of economic planning and economic commitment would at least provide development and stability to the industry that we have. We're not seeing it under Conservative government. We don't hear them singing in the north now "Keep on going the way you've been going" as they did in 1971, because we've had 34 years of Conservative government to do the kind of things that should have been done, and the reason we have a crisis is that political philosophy and economic philosophy that we have had.

I suggest we need to have a provincial agency such as SOQUEM in Quebec, where there is public involvement in the exploration and development of the mining sector. I notice Levesque has designated certain areas of Quebec as areas where SOQUEM alone has the right to do the exploration and development and the mining companies are squealing. It's nice to hear them squeal. They don't get their own way in every province. Sometimes the public interest is taken into account and protected by a government, rather than a complete sellout to the private sector. We think that if we had this kind of operation in Ontario we could have the extra work being done. If the private sector is pulling up and trying its blackmailing tactics we could provide the extra exploration and we would have the ore bodies located and the economic benefits coming to the people.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Don't bite the hand, Bill.

Mr. Ferrier: By the way, since the minister interjects, we hope that in areas like mine, where there has been mercury found in a number of the fish in the lakes, he is going to see that the fish are caught this summer and the tests are carried out this summer and not left, and that if there are ways of coping with that situation he is going to do it, because there is a lot of concern in my area about that. It was pretty shocking when we found there was in fact mercury in the fish in that area where there were no industries for miles around. So I hope the rather ambiguous statement that was made that maybe it wouldn't be done this year—well I hope it will be done this year. It is a must as far as I am concerned.

There are two or three other things I want to deal with in the time remaining. I want to say that I thoroughly support the efforts of my party, of most members, to get that Workmen's Compensation Board revised and working properly. The delays in the adjudicating of claims, the dissatisfactions that are felt by workers, particularly as far as chest conditions are concerned; they wait six months before the decision is reached and unless you have a clearcut case of silicosis—there is bronchitis and emphysema but not clearly a lot of silicosis—they are turned down.

That board needs a complete revamping. Members have hammered at that board in the nine and a half years that I have been in this House. It's a complete political embarrassment for the government and it loses one a lot of support year after year. People will not trust anything the board does, it seems. I think it's incumbent on the government to clean that thing up and to make it work properly. I think the plan outlined by my party, that it be a comprehensive insurance scheme whether you are injured on the job or off, would over the years do a lot more justice to people in this province and meet their needs and do away with a lot of anguish and mental suffering that results from things now.

The Timmins board of education has authority from the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) to proceed to build a new secondary school. In conjunction with this, they wish to build an auditorium in this school for their own use and also for community use. The Ministry of Education will not provide capital funds for auditoriums in high schools, I am told, so what the board of education has done is make application to Wintario for a grant. It has received approval for a grant but it has to raise about $200,000 itself. They have requested that the minister waive the usual provision of having to raise it locally so that they could put it on the tax base.

The minister hasn't made a decision yet but it seems to me it is quite a thing for school boards to be running around selling tickets on cars and conducting lotteries and having bazaars and all this kind of thing when there is more important work that they should be doing. When it's a major project and when it's an essential thing that will help the school and help the community, I think it's more than just that it should be on the tax base. While we met with the deputy minister and put the case to him, he was kind of noncommittal. I would like to hope the

minister himself would give consideration to the Timmins board of education's request.

We still are worried about chronic care and that the home for the aged be able to expand and change itself drastically. We met with the ministers and hope for some response there.

There is one problem I will mention and then conclude my remarks. Highway 144 is still too narrow. There are a lot of accidents there. It's a treacherous road to drive. It's a secondary road, by government thinking, linking two major communities—Timmins and Sudbury. Only a community in the north would get that kind of treatment when a road was built. My friend from Sudbury East hammered away at it when it was first being constructed, called it the "Santa Fe Trail" and wanted it built up to standard. That road has got to be built to a first-class road and it has got to be widened to the standard 24 feet. The government hedged on that and wouldn't make that commitment. I say that's a must. The people insist on it and the government has got to start that kind of reconstruction programme.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence and I would conclude my remarks.

On motion by Mr. B. Newman, the debate was adjourned.

ANSWER TO WRITTEN QUESTION

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment I would ask consent of the House to table the answer to question 21 standing on the notice paper. (See appendix, page 520.)

On motion by Hon. Mr. MacBeth, the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 519.)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

21. Mr. Gaunt—Inquiry of the ministry: How much does it cost to produce heavy water? How much does Ontario Hydro pay for heavy water? Is its production being subsidized by the federal government; and if so by what extent? Is its production being subsidized by the provincial government; and if so by what extent? What are the province's plans for the decommissioning of provincial nuclear reactors?

Answer by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor):

A. The cost of producing heavy water is measured in units of dollars per kilogram ($/kg). The cost has three major components: (i) The cost of interest and depreciation on capital invested in the plant; (ii) Operations and maintenance costs for people and materials to operate the plant; (iii) The costs of electrical and steam energy.

The cost of heavy water is extremely sensitive to the quantity of heavy water the plant actually produces.

The capital cost of the heavy water plant, the operations and maintenance costs and the energy costs are all subject to escalation. Therefore, the cost of heavy water depends on plant performance, when the plant was built and what year the heavy water was produced.

The current USA published selling price of 226 $/kg in Canadian funds is a typical cost for 1977.

B. Ontario Hydro has been acquiring heavy water for the Pickering and Bruce generating stations during the past 10 years with a typical cost of 100 $/kg—typical current costs are 200 $/kg.

C. No, the federal government does not subsidize its production.

D. No, the provincial government does not subsidize its production.

E. There are no detailed plans at present in Ontario Hydro to decommission any of Ontario Hydro reactors that are operating, under construction, or planned. However, general studies prepared by the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited have been made to establish the feasibility of decommissioning Candu reactors. Detailed procedures will probably not be required for Ontario reactors until after the year 2000.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 15, 1977

Partnership for Prosperity, statement by Mr. Welch 489
Energy report, statement by Mr. Taylor 489
Northern airports, statement by Mr. Snow 490
Forest fires, statement by Mr. F. S. Miller 491
Energy report, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reed, Mr. Moffatt 492
Point of order re absence of House leader, Mr. Lewis 494
Motion to adjourn, Mr. S. Smith, negatived 495
North Pickering project, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Renwick 495
Point of order re statement by Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Davis 496
Point of privilege re statement, Mr. S. Smith 497
Point of order re attendance of cabinet members, Mr. Lewis 497
Barrie annexation proposal, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Lewis 497
Women crown employees, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. S. Smith, Ms. Bryden 498
Forest fires, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Foulds, Mr. Reid, Mr. Laughren 498
UTDC foreign contracts, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Cunningham 500
Consumers Road industrial subdivision, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Williams 500
WCB claims delays, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Breithaupt 500
Algonquin Park, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Conway, Mr. Wildman, Mr. Foulds 501
Strike control, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Warner, Mr. MacDonald 502
St. Nicholas arena, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Kerrio 502
Quebec workers, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Samis, Mr. Conway 503
Employment programmes, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Sargent 503
DRG Globe Envelopes Limited, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Grande 504
Advisory council on university affairs, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Sweeney 504
Drought task force, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Foulds 505
Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mrs. Campbell 505
Airports Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading 505
Public Vehicles Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading 505
Point of order re question period, Mr. Welch 505
Re point of order, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Deans, Mr. Cunningham 507
Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. Mancini, Mr. McCague, Mr. Ferrier 508
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. B. Newman, agreed to 519
Answer to written question No. 21, Mr. MacBeth 519
Motion to adjourn, Mr. MacBeth, agreed to 519
Appendix, answer to written question 520

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Brunelle, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
Bryden, B. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Surbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of Colleges and Universities (Oxford PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)



No. 14

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Monday, April 18, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

RENTAL HOUSING

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As mentioned in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, my ministry is initiating a programme to stimulate the construction of rental units, and I would like now to outline the programme to the hon. members.

We propose linking the programme to the very successful assisted rental programme of the federal government, and it is designed to further stimulate the production of moderately priced rental housing across Ontario.

In the years prior to the introduction of the federal programme in 1975, the construction of rental housing had dropped significantly. A combination of land and construction costs, high mortgage rates and, later, the introduction of rent review, affected rental starts. Builders were reluctant to build units at costs that would force rents above the current market. The federally assisted rental programme, commonly called ARP, was designed to provide builders with the financial help required to cover the difference between the rents they would have to charge to cover costs and the rental income they could expect to receive in the market.

The federal programme utilizes funds from private lending institutions, which provide the first-mortgage loans. The federal assistance to builders consists of additional loans of up to $1,200 per unit annually and are interest-free for at least 10 years.

As I mentioned, this has been successful in most areas of Ontario, and the federal government expects to commit more than 5,000 units in 1977. However, this federal funding has not proved to be adequate in some areas, such as Toronto. To make the ARP programme more effective, my ministry will provide an Ontario rental construction grant of up to $600 per unit per year in those areas where the federal programme requires such additional support in order to be operational.

We see this providing starts for more than 3,000 additional units this year in areas where they are most needed. The combined federal and provincial programme is expected to provide the stimulus required for both badly needed rental units and new employment opportunities. Construction workers in Metropolitan Toronto, for example, have been hard hit by construction cutbacks. Thirty-six per cent are out of work, and I am sure they will welcome this initiative.

We intend, in co-operation with the federal government, to meet with private lenders and builders to explain this programme and to get commitments from them on housing starts this year. As well, we will be explaining the programme to municipal councils and seeking their commitment to facilitate local approvals so that construction can be initiated in the current building season.

Here's how the programme will work. The federal assistance is available to builders as interest-free loans of up to $1,200 per unit annually. The total amount of assistance loan is determined by the number of units in the project, the cost of construction, the mortgage interest rate, operating costs and the average rent for similar accommodation in the area where the builder proposes to construct the new units.

The $1,200 loan in year one decreases as market rents increase with the intent that the assistance will enable the owner to offer the units at market rents. The series of interest-free loans which are used to close the gap between prevailing rental rates and what the builder would otherwise have to charge are repayable. As I mentioned, the gap has been too large in some communities. Therefore, my ministry will provide a series of grants of up to $600 per unit in the first year, and reducing in a manner similar to the federal formula.

Under the 10-year disbursement period the federal loan is interest-free. At the end of this period it is repayable at the prevailing NHA interest rate. Our grant, being a grant, is not repayable. We are negotiating with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to have the programme administered by them so as to avoid the need for additional

provincial staff and thereby eliminating the duplication of effort.

Mr. Lewis: That is a cop-out. That is a ridiculous statement.

MANAGEMENT CONSULTING SERVICES DIVISION

Hon. Mr. Auld: As the hon. members are undoubtedly aware, the Ministry of Government Services has discontinued and is in the process of disbanding its management consulting services division. This action, taken as a result of the government's intent to eliminate government operations where they can be equally well provided by the private sector, has resulted in 19 employees being declared surplus to the government's human resources requirement in this area. As the minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, I would like to advise the House on how we are working to reassign the employees so affected.

As a first step, we restricted all staffing into positions in the same and related classifications as the individuals affected. This was done on March 21, and was done after an analysis of the skills and experience of the 19 employees. The surplus employees were contacted to determine whether or not they were interested in any position prior to any internal advertising of a vacancy. If they demonstrate an interest, they are given the benefit of prior consideration and interviewed and, if acceptable, are placed in the position. Thus far, this procedure has enabled the reassignment of six people.

For the members' information, this process is applied on a service-wide basis, and all staffing into positions which might prove suitable has been restricted for all ministries. The Ministry of Government Services personnel branch, and the staffing control branch of the Civil Service Commission are maintaining a daily watch on the situation, and the restrictions will remain in effect until no longer necessary. As far as the affected employees are concerned, they are entitled to salary protection should their reassignment be to a position with a lower salary maximum.

WOMEN CROWN EMPLOYEES

Hon. Mr. Auld: Earlier today, I deposited with the Clerk of the House a copy of the 1975-76 report of the executive co-ordinator of women's programmes on the status of women Crown employees.

Once hon. members have reviewed the document, I believe they will concur that the staff of the women Crown employees office and the women's advisers in ministries, agencies and Crown corporations are to be congratulated for preparing a thorough, comprehensive and incisive report. The hon. members will note that the report contains a report on the status of women in the public service as a whole and on each ministry, agency and Crown corporation.

Mr. S. Smith: And it doesn't say much for you.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Hon. members have also been provided with a brief summary of this report. Additional copies of the summary are available for distribution to constituents and other interested parties.

During 1975-76 the emphasis was on planning, research, setting priorities and identifying problems, as well as extending the affirmative action programme throughout the public service. This stage in the programme's development has been completed.

I am very encouraged to note that women are taking advantage of staff training and development programmes. During 1974-1975, only 23 per cent of participants were women; during 1975-1976, the percentage increased to 53 per cent. To date, there has not been a major change in the occupational distribution of female employees or in the ratio between male and female salaries. However, the stage is now set for substantial progress in the future. Therefore, my cabinet colleagues have directed that the affirmative action programme be continued for the next three years.

The purpose of this programme has been clarified as the raising and diversification of the occupational distribution of women Crown employees. Individual managers are now responsible for developing a specification plan and timetable to achieve this goal. Women may receive accelerated training and development.

In order to stimulate a better balance, a new hiring policy has been established. In all management areas and levels in which women are under-represented and where the qualifications of applicants are equal, preference will be given to women.

A copy of the Management Board's directive in connection with this new policy has also been circulated to the hon. members.

These policy directions indicate our renewed commitment to provide Ontario government employees of both sexes with the

maximum opportunity for career development and personal and professional growth.

FRENCH-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Hon. Mr. Wells: In the Speech from the Throne it was indicated that the government would bring forward programmes and new initiatives to assist young people in the learning of French as a second language and provide for greater opportunities in this field. I am pleased today, Mr. Speaker, to inform members that we have released a major new programme introduced by the Ministry of Education to improve and expand the teaching and learning of French as a second language in Ontario schools. Details of the programme have been compiled in a convenient booklet, and rather than reiterate all the details here, this afternoon I am tabling the booklet itself and copies are being provided to all members.

This morning we held a comprehensive briefing session for school board representatives from across the province, and we shall be distributing the booklet I just mentioned very widely, in order to fully communicate the intent and the details of the programme to all concerned.

In June 1973 I announced in the Legislature the establishment of a ministerial committee on the teaching of French. The committee's report, which came to be known as the Gillin report, was presented to me in September 1974. It was generally acknowledged to be an excellent document reflecting a high degree of wisdom and foresight. It contained a total of 67 recommendations, and indeed, it has formed the basis of the new programme we are announcing today.

The new programme is designed to encourage school boards, by means of significant and identifiable grants and other incentives, to increase the availability and depth of programmes in French for pupils in elementary and secondary schools. Our goals are:

1. To increase the basic level of knowledge of French among all or most English-speaking pupils;

2. To provide increased opportunities for those students who have the desire and the capability to achieve a meaningful level of bilingualism;

3. To develop in our young people an increased appreciation for the presence of French as a major cultural element in Canadian life.

We recognize there is agreement among educators, parents and students that not all young people can be or should be expected to achieve equal levels of fluency. It is not the aim of Ontario's schools to make every pupil fully bilingual. Obviously not all pupils who begin the study of French will continue long enough to achieve any recognized degree of bilingualism. Thus, the new programme is based upon a large degree of flexibility as it applies to local school boards.

While the government will provide significant grants and other incentives to encourage school boards to expand and improve French instruction in their schools, the nature and extent of the programme will continue to be school board prerogatives, based upon the needs and wishes of their constituent citizens. However, in this connection I think two comments should be made.

[2:15]

First, where a school board offers a core programme in French at the elementary school level, it should include all pupils enrolled in the grade or grades involved—except, of course, those in immersion programmes—rather than a select group of such pupils. In other words, where core programmes are offered, they will continue to be considered an integral part of the curriculum and consequently not optional for individual pupils.

Second, it is our strong and sincere desire and expectation that every school board in the province of Ontario will offer optional French immersion programmes for those students wishing to strive for high levels of fluency in French.

Of all the aspects of the programme which we are announcing today, it may be said that the most important is the totally new and greatly expanded funding which is incorporated into it. The new grants will be clearly identified as being for the supportive programmes in French as a second language at both the elementary and secondary school levels. They will be conditional upon ministry approval of the school board's plans for teaching French as a second language.

The aim is to use provincial grants as major financial incentives to encourage school boards:

1. To improve and expand their core programmes in elementary schools with a view to getting pupils started early on daily 40-minute French instruction periods—recognizing, of course, that there is still a place for 20-minute periods, especially in primary grades;

2. To improve and expand their secondary school programmes in French in order to

motivate more students to continue with French; and

3. To improve and expand the opportunities for pupils who wish to pursue higher levels of achievement in French by taking extended or immersion programmes.

The new grant plan is based on the idea that the more instructional time a pupil receives in French, the higher the level of achievement is likely to be. Thus, under the new plan the more hours of French instruction accumulated by a pupil through his or her school career, the larger the grant from the province to the school board. The new grant plan has a basic emphasis on the elementary school level, but significant incentives are to be provided that lead logically to the retention of more students in French programmes for greater lengths of time in secondary school.

It should be noted that we have been continuing our discussion and negotiations with the federal government regarding funding of French instructional programmes. We do, of course, recognize the assistance that has been forthcoming from Ottawa under the existing bilingual grant programme. However, because of the increased grants which we will henceforth be providing to school boards for the express purpose of teaching French as a second language, it is our hope that the federal government will agree to our strong suggestions that additional funds be provided to the province to assist in this endeavour. But I want to stress most definitely that our new programme is not contingent upon increased federal funding. We are proceeding, in any case. In fact, our new funding begins to take effect this September.

The overall new programme which we are announcing today has several important components representing strong initiatives which are being undertaken in vital areas that will tangibly effect the expansion and improvement of programmes of French as a second language. Without going into all the details here this afternoon, these include in addition to the increased grants, immediate action to prepare new curriculum materials and instructional aids for teachers of French, major steps to increase the number of teachers qualified and competent to teach French, and special grants to transform vacant classrooms in elementary schools into French learning centres.

In the context of Canada 1977, one paragraph from the Gillin report, written nearly three years ago, is worth particular note; and I am quoting from the report:

"In Ontario there is now happily a much wider understanding of the fact that Confederation is a partnership of two language communities and that Canada's choice of a mosaic rather than a melting pot offers a rich heritage and source of pride. There is a growing feeling that Ontario, as Quebec's nearest neighbour, should take the lead in promoting French rights and the French language. This province has the educational system, the wealth and the good will to ease some of the strains in the fabric of Confederation."

Of course, Ontario has some very important and practical reasons of its own to promote a higher level of knowledge and understanding of French among many more of its young people. It often comes as a revelation to people to learn that the number of French-speaking Ontario citizens is close to half a million. In fact, there are more citizens of Ontario whose first language is French than there are French-speaking citizens in all the other provinces of Canada combined, with the exception, of course, of the province of Quebec.

In other words, even if we look no farther than our own provincial borders, there is ample reason on human and educational grounds to promote a higher degree of understanding and appreciation between our two founding peoples. Quite simply it is an excellent way to promote the continued strength and vitality of our total population.

The province's commitment to our French-speaking citizens has been stated strongly many times. The programme we are announcing today, the teaching of French as a second language, is related to this commitment because of its potential as a binding force among our people. But there is much more to this commitment, particularly our recognition of the right of our French-speaking young people to receive their education in their own language. Major improvements have been achieved in this area during recent years and we will soon be announcing some more new initiatives that will further strengthen educational programmes for our francophone students and our French-language educational system.

Meanwhile the new plans for improving the teaching and learning of French as a second language in Ontario schools, I feel, are nothing less than exciting. I'm convinced this can be a significant milestone in the continuing improvement of the province's educational system. I'm also equally convinced that the anticipated co-operation of all school boards and all citizens will contribute significantly to making the programme work for the maxi-

mum benefit of all the young people of this province.

ORAL QUESTIONS

FRENCH-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, maybe today I can initiate questions relating to these important statements. May I ask the Minister of Education, does he have a specific programme, in addition to the financial and other particulars he has announced today to the House, which will be undertaken by his ministry, specifically to persuade school boards all across the province in a concerted way to expand their existing French-language programmes or to initiate the new programmes for which the new funding is provided?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker as with all our programmes we have an implementation programme. That implementation programme began this morning over in the Ontario Room of the Macdonald Block at a meeting of over 200 people from school boards. Although I wasn't there myself, I'm told that practically every French-language co-ordinator from every board in Ontario was there. The implementation process began then and it will continue.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask by way of supplementary, where does it go from there? How will the minister monitor it? How will he pursue it? How will he personally, as minister, attempt to see that it happens?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, we have a regional office structure of the Ministry of Education which assists in these endeavours. These offices will be carrying on implementation work, explaining the programme, and urging boards to take those actions that are necessary for them to get on stream with the programme. One of them is to amass the accumulated hours for all the pupils in their system. They will be beginning that right away so the programme can start, as far as the funding incentives are concerned, in September 1977. From there on in, our people will be assisting boards.

It might be of interest to the hon. member to know that there are only two boards in Ontario at the present time that do not have any French-language programme in the elementary school system.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary to the minister, if he could clarify this for me: The figures in the booklet indicate amounts recognized for grants under the new plan, rather than outright grants made by the government. Do I take it that it is required that the school board increase its own expenditure accordingly in order to receive the extra grant from the province? Does it have to increase its own level of expenditure in order to get the extra money from the province?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as with all educational grants that we give, and the kind of grants the federal government gives us, it's a partnership arrangement. The commitment to the programme necessitates each person honouring that commitment by financing part of it. We will finance in the elementary school at the rate of 60 per cent on the average in this province of the amount that a board is eligible for under those new eligible grant figures.

Mr. S. Smith: Might I just follow that up with another supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: If it's a supplementary to your own question, perhaps we'll allow it.

Mr. S. Smith: It is supplementary to my own. What I would like to ask is, why has the minister chosen that particular method at a time when the boards themselves are having great difficulty finding financial resources and at a time when the minister would want to give an incentive to boards to go into more French, rather than simply match their further spending in a way that's really not much of an incentive at all?

Hon. Mr. Wells: As I said, this is a partnership arrangement. The incentive is there. The amount of grants that will be available over the next three years is significant. It's going to go from $5 million to $17 million to something over $20 million in increased grants. That's the share that we pay.

Mr. S. Smith: That's if they pay more themselves.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As my friend knows, we have just as much difficulty arranging financing and striking a budget as the school boards do. I think we're making a very significant show of support for this programme in our funding.

Mr. Mancini: Cosmetic.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Another very important thing that must be borne in mind is that through this method of funding we establish a degree of equalization across the province.

Mr. Lewis: On the financing, may I ask the minister, if he does receive additional

federal money, does he intend to add that money on to the proposed grant formula he's set out in his leaflet, or does he intend to deduct the additional federal money from the total provincial commitment?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We intend to deduct it from the total provincial commitment.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: So that's what it's all about.

Mr. Ruston: You're paying lip service.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me just say to my friend that—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me just say that I didn't hide that fact. If he will recall, I said very clearly in my statement that this programme is not conditional upon increased federal assistance.

Mr. Lewis: Right. But you didn't say you'd take away the federal money.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have devised what we think is a proper programme and we've achieved the level of support that we can provide to the boards. Let me tell my friend that the federal government at this time is supplying $6.8 million, a pittance compared to the amount of increased money we're talking about putting into this programme. Any increased money that they give, while it will be very welcome, will certainly not come significantly near the amount of money the programme's going to cost.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary, the member for Kitchener.

Mr. Lewis: This is an important question.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary: With respect to the ongoing involvement of the regional offices the minister has referred to, is the minister therefore announcing to the House that these regional offices will continue in spite of the views of the Henderson-Kennedy committee and others that those offices should be closed and moneys thereby saved? Perhaps those moneys could be used to make the programme work.

An hon. member: Announce that tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The regional offices of the Ministry of Education are continuing in existence and are serving a useful purpose. I might just say to my friend, in talking about federal involvement, our Throne Speech came in on March 29 and we have presented the complete details of our programme here with financing and a solid commitment to this programme. The federal government nearly a year ago said it was going to put more money into the educational system for the teaching of French as a second language. We haven't seen one extra red cent.

Mr. Lewis: I wouldn't be too self-hypnotized by that. It's been almost three years since the Gillin report.

Mr. Speaker: A new question from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: Surely that rejoinder of the minister's would allow me one tiny brief supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Breithaupt: I think it would.

Mr. Lewis: Simple justice.

Mr. Speaker: Since it's been the feeling that it's a very important topic, I'll allow a supplementary here and I have one over there.

Mr. Lewis: Since the minister has decreed that the provincial budget can in fact stand this amount of money without additional federal funding, if he persuades the federal government to take part—

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is not contingent on federal funding.

Mr. Lewis: Well, that's what the minister has said—that he will do it. It is not contingent on federal funding. I'll start again. Since the minister has therefore set out and decreed that he can do it without federal funding, if the federal money comes through, why doesn't he add it on in order to be able to pay more than the 60 per cent, as the leader of the Liberal Party asked, and thereby provide an incentive which will create an even greater enthusiasm throughout the province of Ontario?

Interjections.

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Wells: I wouldn't consider doing that because we've worked this programme out on what we think is an equitable basis; the financial components are as they should be. If that federal money comes through, we

would, perhaps, like to use it for special education, or something. It would free up money for other schools.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Now you have said it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: And you can't be opposed to supplementary education.

Mr. S. Smith: One final supplementary, in case I misunderstood the minister. He is insisting, of course, that the school board basically spend a dollar and he'll match it on a 60-40 basis. Is he suggesting that the federal grants for this province for French education also require that he spend a dollar of his budget and they'll match that one in addition? Is that a similar arrangement? Did he suggest that to the House?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No.

Mr. S. Smith: Then why are you doing it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's not. The federal arrangement is based upon the cost per pupil of teaching French as a second language. It's based upon that. Out of the programme, we now get about a little over $6 million; we're spending well over $20 million, which we're now passing out to school boards, under the federal bilingualism programme for French as a second language. Now, there's another component—French as a minority language, which also has to fit into that.

Mr. S. Smith: Make it an incentive.

RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Housing about these 3,000 new units of rental accommodation which he is attempting to stimulate through this Ontario rental construction grant? Can he indicate in more than general terms where he expects them to be located? I take it the figure 3,000 comes from some specific estimate. Can he tell us which community?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think it's fair to say the majority of the starts would be in the Metropolitan Toronto area. This is where we are experiencing the greatest problem in having new construction starts, following through with the present federal programme of the $1,200 loan. However, as I've indicated, the programme will be on a provincial-wide basis if there are other areas where our grant would fit in and would assist to bring them on stream. But I do expect most of the new starts in the Toronto area.

Mr. Lewis: Since you have got your sights so low, relatively speaking—merely an additional 3,000 units for all of Ontario in the next year, involving a fairly small amount of money compared to the housing market generally—I take it that you've pretty well given up on the possibility that the supply of rental accommodation will be adequate in this province for the free market forces to reassert themselves? You've accepted rent review in perpetuity by a programme of this paucity.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think the hon. member is aware that the 3,000 units are, as he has correctly described it, an estimate. Over and above that, under the existing federal programme, we anticipate there will be another 5,000 starts—

Mr. Lewis: That's still very little.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —over and above the 3,000 we're referring to—that can be brought on market; they might not have been, without this extra assistance. If we can get—and perhaps I'm being optimistic; I think I have to be—an increase of 8,000 rental units in this province each year, I think we shall find such a good market situation that eventually we might not have rent review, which is the desire of all of us in this Legislature.

Mr. Renwick: One of the elements that the minister indicated was a problem with respect to the construction of rental housing was the mortgage interest rate and the availability of mortgage funds. Has the minister seen the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough's) report, from the statistical bank branch, which indicates that something less than two per cent of the available assets for investments of insurance companies in Ontario are used in mortgage lending?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm aware of those statistics but I'm also aware that when we were discussing with the lenders of this province the types of incentives and programmes that we should, perhaps, be considering in an effort to stimulate the housing market in Ontario, we were advised that the lending institutions—including insurance companies trust companies as well as banks—would be very interested in having their money go into housing in this province. With regard to the numbers you're looking at: I think it's fair to say—it's been our experience in the past—that we have every reason to believe the situation will turn around significantly.

Mr. Breaugh: Supplementary: Since the minister seems to have targeted this programme on Metro, given that the previous programme didn't work in Toronto for various reasons, what makes the minister believe the additional $600 per unit will make this programme go? Secondly, what possible indication does he have that he would get approvals to build such rental units that wouldn't have been built this year anyway?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I trust the hon. member is aware that one of the reasons the federal programme was not working in Metropolitan Toronto was because of the current market rent situation and the fact there was not the sort of return that the investors were prepared to consider. Our evaluation, and taking a look at what we think the market can handle, was able to show us that with the extra $600 per unit we would in fact be able to make it—

An hon. member: More encouraging.

Mr. Angus: More profitable.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —of interest to the developers to build in the Toronto market and we are hoping that they will in—

Mr. Angus: More profit.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —fact do that.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the interjection of "more profit."

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister ignore the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I will ignore the interjection but not the person who did it. He's the one who really should be ignored.

Interjections.

Mr. Hall: Supplementary, to the minister: Would the minister please outline in a little more detail for those who are interested what would happen in specific numbers—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The original question had to do with where these rental housing units should be built. It is not the whole field of rental housing, so we should confine ourselves to the original question and the answer to that.

Mr. Hall: I was going to touch on that.

Mr. Speaker: May I just remind the hon. members that supplementary questions are supposed to be related to the answer to the original question, not the whole broad field of rental housing. It gets very broad and we could carry on all day at this rate. As I say, the original question had to do with where these 3,000 or so units were going to be built. Is your supplementary related to that?

Mr. Hall: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My concern is that the units won't be built unless the minister delineates more information as to the succeeding years of the programme. I would like to draw that out so that these units can get started this year.

Mr. Speaker: Does that relate to where it is going to be built?

Mr. Nixon: Right on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may relate it to that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Martel: It is a Liberal policy statement.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Did the hon. member indicate what the past experience has been with the programme, the federal programme alone? Well, I am sorry then. I didn't understand the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that that's far away from the general question, the area of the question, in the first place. Now I say it's not the whole broad field of housing which we are questioning about right at the present time, so perhaps you can work your question in later.

Is there a question related to this question —the original question? Does the hon. member for Sarnia have a supplementary to this question?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, I have a supplementary that's actually supplementary to the question of the member for Riverdale, which I consider—

Mr. Speaker: I think it was a bit broad too, I agree.

Mrs. Campbell: But you allowed it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Maybe you don't want me to go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member—

Mr. Bullbrook: His question was obviously out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I think so too. Well, we will get back to these extra questions later then. The hon. member for Hamilton West with his new question.

If you give people an inch, they will take a mile. We try to be as lenient and generous as possible but really we should confine ourselves to the original question and the answer thereto if possible, and then we can come back to other questions later, I am sure. If we do that, there will be more time for questions and I will hear the hon. member for Hamilton West now.

LAKE POLLUTION

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister say whether the report in today's Toronto Star concerning a list of polluted lakes is correct? Is he now prepared to release this information, when he considers that I first asked for a list of such lakes on November 1 and was assured at that time by the then Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) that he would be glad to table a list of the lakes he had in his possession, and that it would take a little time but he would be glad to table it. That was November 1. Can the minister confirm this story?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the story is inaccurate. It is full of inaccuracies and distortions. Very briefly—

Mr. Breithaupt: Did you want to make a statement?

Mr. Singer: My goodness.

Mr. Peterson: Will you be suing?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Very briefly, what I assume the reporter is referring to is a document called Vacation Fishing in Ontario. It's a layman's guide to fishing in Ontario, and indicates, in the various lakes that have been analysed, where there are high levels of mercury or PCBs, and whether or not the fish in certain lakes will be safe to eat. It generally gives information on the lakes that have been analysed. The lakes will be listed in this booklet.

It's really a compilation of all the information we've had for some time, going back for two or three years of testing. It involves the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Health. The heading of it is, as a matter of fact, A Modern Guide to Eating Sport Fish. It indicates the lakes that may be contaminated, what the safe levels are and information of that kind for sport fishermen, particularly those from outside Ontario.

There's been no sharp debate in cabinet about this. It has not been to cabinet. It's not been rewritten to make it look rosy, and I was never called by this reporter to comment on the book or to indicate when it will be released.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Let's put the matter in its simplest terms: Is it or is it not a fact that the fish from almost 180 Ontario lakes are felt to be inedible for reasons of pollution? Can the minister explain why it has taken over six months and I still have not received the list that I was promised?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I don't know anything about the list the member asked of the Minister of Natural Resources. All I'm saying is that this is a fisherman's guide. It is information that we have now in three ministries—that we've had for some time. It's a matter of putting this all together, getting it to the printers, and getting it out for circulation.

Mr. Singer: Is it true?

Mr. S. Smith: Is it true or not?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Is what true?

Mr. S. Smith: That 180 lakes have fish that are inedible due to pollution.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, not necessarily. No.

Mr. S. Smith: What is true?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It says that the booklet will deal with 180 lakes where there is popular sport fishing going on. It will indicate whether the fish in those lakes are contaminated or not—

Mr. Breithaupt: How many lakes are there?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and if they are, to what level. It doesn't necessarily mean all 180 lakes contain contaminated fish. As a matter of fact, that figure is wrong. It's over 200 lakes that will be dealt with.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Since it has been within the Ministry of the Environment and other ministries for some considerable time, would the minister like to confide to the House how many lakes are in fact polluted in terms of fishing for edible purposes?

Mr. Singer: Or how many one shouldn't eat the fish from?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, we have tested fish in over 200 lakes. At the present time

this testing and analysis is going on. I don't want to give figures, when we're involving four or five different species of fish, for example.

Mr. Lewis: But it will be out; the book will be published.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes. I would suggest that the member wait for the book—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, thank you.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —and then he will get an accurate, detailed statement of just what the situation is in Ontario—

Mr. Singer: Don't eat the fish.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —rather than my giving him general information at this point, without having it at my fingertips.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Do I take it that while we are waiting for this list, it would be a wise precaution for no one to eat any fish from any lake in Ontario—that we should wait for this precise point to come up?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nonsense.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some of your friends believe the fishing season hasn't opened.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If the member has some information he wants about a specific area or a specific lake he might ask me for it.

Mr. S. Smith: How are we supposed to know, if the minister won't tell us?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I have said over and over again that the information that's going into this layman's guide is available now. It's being compiled into one booklet for tourist information, and it's not new information.

Mr. Cassidy: It wasn't available when we asked about it.

Mr. S. Smith: Freedom of information is one thing, but holding back hazardous information is quite another.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Second question? Order.

Mr. S. Smith: At least there is a good turnout today.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are the hazard in this place.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Premier: In keeping with the statement on the gloomy side of the energy picture as was presented by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) in this House on Friday, and the expected announcements by President Carter in the United States, will the Premier consider, by way of an example to people of this province to help change attitudes and bring home the realities, giving up his full-size government car and asking his cabinet colleagues also to—

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Drive a Datsun like you? Great supporter of Canadian cars.

Mr. S. Smith: —take on mid-size Canadian-built cars instead, as an example to the population?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: He has asked us to give up our tennis racquets.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General says I've asked my cabinet colleagues to give up their tennis racquets. I really haven't. I'm a great believer in physical fitness.

Mr. Breithaupt: They haven't got the energy to use them. That is an entirely different thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm in favour of all of us trying to set something of an example. I attempt to do this, and perhaps not so well. I'm concerned about the energy situation, and I recognize that some authorities consume more gas than others.

Mr. Peterson: How profound. Such penetrating insight into the obvious.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are other offsetting features, too, because some automobiles—and I think this would apply to most of those that are owned by the government of the province of Ontario—at least have some economic impact in terms of their

manufacture and employment of people within this province, which to me is also very relevant. It may not be as relevant to the member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: Mid-size cars are also made in this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member's car made in this province?

Mr. S. Smith: The mid-size car that I'm driving now is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now? How's the Datsun? Listen, that made a great hit with American Motors. The fellows there were delighted with the member's Datsun.

Mr. S. Smith: We are talking about the government. The Premier will say anything not to give up his big car, won't he?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I can't comment on the actual size or the mileage. In the popular lexicon of describing the size of cars it certainly is not by any means the largest car. At the time it was purchased it was not the largest car made by that manufacturer, nor is it as large as a lot of other cars—

Mr. Good: Nor was it made in Canada, so don't kid us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —being driven by heads of government. I am always prepared to reassess anything, because an automobile is about the last thing that I'm interested in, very frankly, in terms of personal comfort. I am interested in safety; I am interested in getting somewhere—

Mr. Breithaupt: With your belt on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with my belt on. Certainly, I would be quite prepared to consider any reasonable suggestion. However, I would say to the member for Hamilton West—

Mr. Mancini: How about those two-minute answers the Speaker was talking about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am trying not to pay any attention to the interjections—

Mr. MacDonald: Then don't.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but some of them are provocative. What did the member really ask, whether I was going to change cars?

Mr. Stokes: You just remember that tonight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have to say that under the restraints imposed by the Treasurer, my turn for a new automobile doesn't come up for a period of time yet. When that period of time comes up—which may be after another date, some time down the path—if the hon. member is still here, which is doubtful, I would be quite prepared to have that question asked again.

Mr. Conway: Where is your condominium, Bill? Where is your condominium?

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, since the matter has not been adequately dealt with, let me ask whether in fact the Premier is willing to have other cabinet ministers follow the example of the former Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) and drive mid-size cars as an example to the population that we have to be cost conscious?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, here I am not an expert. I must say to the hon. member for Hamilton West that I am not sure that it's a question of mid-size or not-so-mid-size or smaller; I think it's a question of the amount of gasoline consumed per mile. I am told by some that it does relate to weight. Weight isn't always necessarily relevant to whether we describe it as a large or small car, and it also doesn't relate to the number of dollars that are spent on that particular vehicle.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Please all return at 9 o'clock and you will have all your questions answered then.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Premier will answer the question.

Mr. Warner: Lorne is listening.

Mr. Lewis: Is this your windup? Is this the preamble?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Is this getting ready for tonight?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What are you driving?

Mr. Lewis: I don't know what I'm driving.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Is there a supplementary on this? Order, please. We are wasting valuable time here. A final supplementary from the member for London Centre.

Mr. Peterson: Since the Premier revealed that he understands energy efficiency has something to do with weight of automobiles, is he considering any taxing measures or

licensing fee differentials in order to encourage—

Mr. Hodgson: Such nonsense.

Mr. Peterson: —the use of efficient vehicles and discourage the use of less efficient vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't want, ever, to usurp your prerogatives and suggest that wasn't really a proper supplementary question. In that I've been asked, I will try to answer it. That would be a matter, obviously, for the Treasurer or the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) to deal with.

I should also point out that the former Minister of Energy, who is always so helpful to me, just didn't whisper to me, he told me that his middle-size car, smaller car, probably is taking more gallons per mile to run than the car I happen to drive.

Mr. B. Newman: But the minister's weight is different.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What are you driving?

An hon. member: Resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: It's unbelievable.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Chairman of Management Board.

Mr. Lewis: Ah, sanity returns.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there is a question. The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine has the floor.

WOMEN CROWN EMPLOYEES

Ms. Bryden: I have a question of the Chairman of Management Board, relating to his statement on the report of the executive co-ordinator of women's programmes: Since he admits that no progress has been made in the last year to change the occupational distribution of female Crown employees, could he indicate to us whether he is planning to move up to full-time status the 14 women's advisers, who are only part-time at the present, and whether he is also going to accept the recommendation in the report that the monitoring of recruitment should be given high priority?

Hon. Mr. Auld: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say no progress has been made. I said progress had been made, that it was slow, that it was sort of the start, the kick-off. There is no intention to require ministries to have full-time women's advisers, because the ministries have worked out, according to their own needs and their own problems, the staff they assume they require.

I think the really significant step is the fact that the ministries are required, on the MBR programme, to set out a programme of the aims and objectives in that ministry to rectify imbalances. That will have to be submitted to Management Board and will be reviewed halfway through the year. As with other programmes, we will be able to monitor the progress and we will require objectives to be set out before the programme begins its second stage.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York. Centre.

Mr. Stong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Was there a supplementary?

Ms. Bryden: What about the second part of my question.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Ms. Bryden: No; part of my initial question was the monitoring of recruitment.

Mr. Speaker: Right. You have opportunity for a question, which you have asked, and you may have a supplementary on the—oh, I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I didn't deal directly with recruitment. In the management by results programme there is a target; that target has to be achieved and it will be done partially by recruitment, partially by promotion. If the hon. member will read the copy of the directive that was circulated with the report, what we are saying is that "in the management-excluded areas and levels where women are now under-represented and where the qualifications of applicants are equal, preferenre shall be given to women."

RADIAL TIRES

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial relations: In terms of automobile safety, with which the Premier is concerned, is this minister aware of complaints registered by consumers with respect to manufacture and sale of steel-belted radial tires, particularly by the Firestone Company, which tires break down under any conditions and become road

hazards? And does this minister have any knowledge about these tires being withdrawn from the market in the United States? If so—or if not—would he consider the matter urgent enough to issue the appropriate directives removing these tires from our market?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, one of the things we have always tried to determine is whether or not a product safety problem is one of national or provincial importance. I would certainly assume that one involving tires is one of national importance. I have not received any information—

Mr. Davidson: Trying to get off the hook.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have not received any information concerning their withdrawal from the market in the United States.

Mr. Moffatt: Besides, it's federal.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have had some complaints which we normally forward to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs because they have the testing facilities, they have the responsibility and they have an Act called The Hazardous Products Act. Therefore, in order to reduce the amount of entanglement—

Mr. Peterson: Sydney, why don't you ever study? What is the matter with you?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: In order to reduce the amount of entanglement between levels of government I feel it should be dealt with in Ottawa. However, if the hon. member has specific instances of cases involving Ontario residents, we would be glad to take them up.

Mr. S. Smith: You will mail them to Ottawa for him.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: The matter of safety on the highways in Ontario is my concern as well as that of other users of the highways—

Mr. Speaker: Your supplementary question?

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, I would ask this minister if he does not consider safety on provincial highways in Ontario of concern to this government, and would he not act rather than wait for another level?

Hon. W. Newman: Of course he does, you idiot.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Of course, Mr. Speaker, we have not received as far as I know any complaints which would indicate to us that there is a serious hazard. We have received about five complaints in the past year. That doesn't indicate to me that it is a widespread safety problem. But if the hon. member has cases, we will be glad to look into them and see what we can do.

Mr. Renwick: He just gave you one.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Labour: In late February, the president of Sudbury and District Labour Council wrote to the minister requesting a meeting with her and Michael Starr in Sudbury to discuss the Workmen's Compensation Board. To date, she hasn't responded. Can she tell the House why she hasn't and if she is coming to Sudbury to discuss the problems surrounding the board there?

Mr. Angus: She is coming next week.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I would apologize if I have not responded within that length of time because we make a valiant effort to respond within a reasonable period of time to all requests. I do not recall that letter, but I shall check and make sure about it and respond as rapidly as possible.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. Can the minister advise us as to when the legislation will be introduced into this House transferring all of the youth residential facilities into his ministry, pursuant to the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the target date for such transfer is July 1 of this year. The legislation, although I cannot give her a specific day on which it will be introduced in the House, will clearly be introduced during this session.

Mr. McClellan: Are you sure about that? Have you checked with Bill?

Mr. Nixon: Better bring it in this afternoon.

NORTH PICKERING PROJECT

Mr. Godfrey: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact the royal commission into the North Pickering land

acquisition was formed in early October and has to date heard less than three hours' testimony, and in view of the recent resignation of one of the commissioners which will necessitate further delays, what steps is the government taking to reassure former land owners that there will ever be a decision in this matter?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the former land owners right now there will be.

Mr. Martel: You might not be around.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Godfrey: Is the Premier aware that two of the former land owners are now deceased, since the action began, and that there is every likelihood that this may occur to several more before an answer is received?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I just hope for the sake of the hon. member that they were not patients of his that he refers to.

Mr. Deans: No, but they were probably supporters of yours.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, you mean they weren't supporters of his?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well certainly they are supporters of his, they're deceased.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. member, part of the delay—and I am sure the hon. member is aware of this—was because of commission counsel. It hasn't been because of the government. We are as anxious to have this move ahead as anyone else. But we cannot control the functioning of the commission itself. I was asked by his leader, I think Friday morning, during certain discussions here in the House about a letter from one of the members of the commission which I now have seen and which we are taking a look at. My hope is that the commission can start moving ahead again. We will be dealing with it very shortly. But I can say to the hon. member, to assure his constituents, that they will in fact be dealt with.

[3:00]

Mr. Singer: Supplementary: I wonder if the Premier can tell us the form in which this inquiry is likely to proceed, because it seems obvious that it can't proceed in the form in which it was originally contemplated.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We were talking about the delay in proceedings.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no.

Mr. Speaker: That's a good question and the hon. member may get to it later. The member for Windsor-Walkerville with a new question.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the question was how it was going to proceed. The Premier said it was going to proceed, surely it is a proper supplementary to ask how.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, As I understood it, the question he was asking was about the delay in the proceedings. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Singer: It is fascinating how you find time to call us to order but you don't find time to call them to order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: All the time.

ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Labour; it deals with the Rockwell International of Canada Limited, a stamping and plating plant in the city of Windsor. Is the minister aware that as a result of this plant closing 109 employees will lose their jobs, and that 75 of the 109 are in an age category where it will be extremely difficult for them to get employment? Will the minister look into this situation? Will she confer with her colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), contact Rockwell International and attempt to convince them to remain in the city of Windsor? If they do not intend to remain in the city, will she ask them to definitely prove to her that they are leaving because of having excess manufacturing capacity in the province of Ontario, and prove that they do have excess manufacturing capacity?

Hon. B. Stephenson: That's a fair list of requests, which I shall attempt to follow through with. I am aware of the situation. I was not aware that 75 per cent of the staff members in that institution were of an age where it would be difficult for them to relocate. We had some activity planned, in

terms of the development of a conjoint action group on the MAIA base with the Department of Manpower, in the hope that we would be able to assist these workers. I shall attempt to find out all of the answers to the questions which have been asked me.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: Will the minister assure the employees that their pension rights and benefits are protected and that there is no chance they will lose any of these benefits?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Under certain conditions it is possible to do that, based upon the compliance with employment standards; but under some other conditions it is not always possible to do so. I shall certainly investigate all of these problems and attempt to do what we can for them.

CANDIDATE'S CONDUCT

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Premier: Does the Premier consider it a misrepresentation for a person who has not been elected to this Legislature to use the term MPP after his name?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Ottawa Centre sent me a copy of a letter that he had sent, I believe, to the chief electoral officer, raising one or two matters which indicated—

Mr. Mancini: The NDP do it in my riding.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that the Progressive Conservative candidate in that riding was somewhat anticipatory, I guess, and enthusiastic, in that he was describing himself as a member of this House somewhat in advance of the fact taking place.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's called wishful thinking.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand that this may or may not be proper. I don't know. If it isn't I can assure the hon. member it will cease.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: I appreciate the Premier's reply. May I send to him a copy of a letter which has gone to Mr. Cameron from the Clerk of the House in which in fact he finds that it is a serious misrepresentation and asks that it does cease?

Interjections.

NIAGARA CENTRE FOR YOUTH CARE

Mr. Kerrio: My question is to the Minister of Health. Will he tell the House whether he or his staff has had any recent discussions with the Niagara centre for youth care, especially in light of the government's reorganization of children's services; and will he tell the House when he intends to give the centre permanent and continued support for the work they are doing after the fact of seed money being given to the youth care centre?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: So far as I know, the last meetings of which I am aware—and there may have been others since—were about six weeks ago with the people in the Niagara youth centre, confirming that we have been able to free up from other programmes $50,000 of seed money for 1977-1978 for that programme. Now I doubt very much that my staff in the children's mental health branch would have had any more definitive discussions with them than that. Inasmuch as the branch will be going to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, with the legislation and programmes under the capable direction of my colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton), and the associate deputy minister, they wouldn't want to make any commitments which perhaps they couldn't later meet. But as the member knows, through some judicious pruning of other programmes we were able to find that $50,000 for them.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary: In view of the answer, Mr. Speaker, in my supplementary I was going to ask the minister—because this portfolio has changed—is he prepared to recommend to his colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services that the request for aid for this centre be given immediate consideration by the new branch, if the Minister of Health can't consider it in his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's ever been any doubt in the minds of Mr. Finlay, the director of my branch, and our ministry that this eventually is a programme we would like to support. The difficulty has been to find the money to get it started in a time of restraint; that we've been able to do.

Certainly the decisions as to which programmes will be begun, enhanced, whatever, after July 1 will be those of my colleague; certainly come July 1 we will turn over to that ministry our programmes with whatever

comments and recommendations we might have to make at the time. Obviously we in the Ministry of Health—those of the staff who don't go with the branch to that ministry—would be prepared to advise them in any way we can to assist after the transfer.

ALGONQUIN PARK

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, on Friday the hon. member for Renfrew North asked me a question on Algonquin Park.

According to the regulations under The Provincial Parks Act the use of outboard motors is permitted on 26 lakes. The ministry has continued to permit the use of outboard motors on the remaining lakes, since it was felt that a reasonable period of time was necessary in order for park users to adjust to the proposed ban, and to permit the development of ways and means of introducing it with the least destruction of traditional use of the park interior.

The Ministry of Natural Resources expects to be in a position to announce in the near future how the ban on outboard motors will be implemented. It is appreciated that by working in this manner the implementation of the plan takes longer. However, it does take into consideration the feelings and the needs of the various types of park users and recognizes the hardships that any regulation change creates.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Algoma, I believe, asked me a question on the Lake Superior Provincial Park. Again the Ministry of Natural Resources informs me that the master plan will be completed in the early part of June and will be released to the public at that time.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary: I might thank the minister for his speedy reply and I just wanted to clarify a point. Am I to assume, then, for this coming season, there will not be the blanket ban that is suggested in the Algonquin Park master plan, and that in fact for the summer season, 1977, the regulations will be as they were in 1976?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eakins: Supplementary: I'd just like to ask the minister if in his view, outboard motors also includes electric motors?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This would be my understanding. Again, Mr. Speaker, I must confess I will have to find out that whether electric motors are also included as outboards. I agree they are very silent motors and maybe they're not, but I'll find out.

Mr. Nixon: Did you say you were running again?

DRUG PUBLICATIONS

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. Pursuant to the drug-promoting book High Times being refused entry into Canada in January, what monitoring is his ministry doing of similar publications appearing on the bookshelves in Ontario; and what is the Attorney General doing in his own ministry, or in co-operation with the federal authorities, to stop the widespread bookstore distribution, which has taken place largely in the last two years, of the slick, sophisticated magazines which glamorize and promote the use of all kinds of drugs?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, it's not the responsibility of our ministry to monitor publications on the bookstands. We're not in the business of censorship—

Mr. Breithaupt: You've got a lot of headlines out of it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —I can assure the members of this Legislature. On the other hand, I have a concern—

Mr. S. Smith: The federal Minister of National Revenue does it for you.

Mr. Conway: Judy LaMarsh will do your job.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Maybe you'll learn something if you listen for a moment, Sean.

An hon. member: What about freedom of information?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: The bureaucrats in Revenue will do it for you.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: At a meeting here in Toronto in February, all of my colleagues, namely the other Attorneys General of Canada, joined with me in an expression of concern to the federal government in relation to the responsibilities to be exercised at the border. We simply indicated that we felt there was a certain responsibility that obviously should be exercised under The Customs and Excise Tax Act and we asked the federal government to exercise its responsibilities at the border, rather than leaving this whole problem to the prosecutorial authorities.

The Ministry of the Attorney General is not an investigative branch. We are legal advisers to the Crown. We are available to our police departments, who are doing the best they can, when they come to us for advice. That, in our view, with respect to this particular problem, is the extent of our responsibility.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware of the publication called Head, which bills itself, and I quote, as "a magazine for people who enjoy getting high and mellowing out," and contains an article in the current publication which says, "Ten Ways Not to Smuggle Your Dope"? Will the minister look into this magazine and take it up with the federal authorities to see if this and similar magazines can be stopped?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on the basis that one of the hon. members of the Legislature has drawn this to our attention, we'll of course look at the magazine.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary: Having regard to the Attorney General's clear disavowal this afternoon as to his function and that of his ministry in the area of censorship and monitoring of the print media, I wonder if he would briefly outline to us the role he sees for his ministry in that regard, because we've all been impressed by his statements of some months ago in a related regard?

Mr. S. Smith: Exactly: You're dumping it all on Revenue Canada.

Mr. Cunningham: It's called sucking and blowing.

An hon. member: No, that's Bob Ruston's line.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't know what I can add to my previous answer, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: You want the press, but you don't want to do the work.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —except to say this, that there are obviously—

Mr. S. Smith: You get the headlines, they do the work.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —provisions of The Criminal Code of Canada about which we have certain specific responsibilities in respect to prosecutions. The point that has been made by all the Attorneys General across the country is that a very large amount of public resources can be directed toward prosecuting breaches of The Criminal Code in this particular area because of the problems—and it is a real problem—with respect to the enormous amount of objectional material that is coming across the border. So we indicated that in our view—

An hon. member: Come on; enough is enough.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —as I mentioned a moment ago, the federal government did have a responsibility, in relation to their specific responsibilities under The Customs and Excise Tax Act.

Mr. S. Smith: Save money and avoid the law.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did you ever hear an Attorney General garble like that? Goodness gracious.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're wasting time here.

Mr. Breithaupt: You'd just rather not do it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Notwithstanding that fact, Mr. Speaker, we still intend to carry out our responsibilities in prosecuting the charges that are laid by the police officers in this province, and we will continue to do that. As I've said on other occasions, and I will repeat today, I think this is a very difficult issue. Obviously, I suspect, there are very few people in this House who are comfortable with the concept of censorship—

Mr. S. Smith: Yes, that's right.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —but the truth of the matter is that there are—and even the member for Sarnia should wake up to this fact on occasion—occasions when someone has to draw a line.

Mr. Bullbrook: You are pathetic on your feet.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: You know you're only here once every three weeks.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a further answer to this question?

Mr. Bullbrook: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Despite the grave difficulties that are inherent in this problem, I say, on behalf of myself and the other Attorneys General in this country, that we will continue to exercise our responsibilities.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk with his question.

Mr. Nixon: Do you mean there are no more supplementaries, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Right.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Health. I wonder if he can assure the House that the ambulance service for the people in the Prescott, Winchester and Morrisburg areas will be continued, since the drivers have indicated they will not work past this Friday because their cheques have been bouncing? Doesn't the minister have some responsibility to supervise the ambulance services across the province under The Ambulance Act?

An hon. member: Otherwise the patients bounce.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The particular service in question is a privately-owned, privately-operated ambulance service serving Prescott, Morrisburg and Winchester. We've made it clear that if, for whatever reason, the service is suspended, we would move in and ensure that it's maintained.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Under The Ambulance Act, can the minister see that the drivers who have not been paid, or the other service people who have not been paid, have some protection under the responsibilities of the Ministry of Health?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think the particular employees are in fact protected through the normal labour laws. Inasmuch as they are a private company from whom we are buying a service, then we do not have any authority to take them over unless they either surrender the licence or the strike, which has apparently been threatened, does come about; then we could step in and take over and make sure that the service to the people of that part of the province is maintained.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary.

Mr. Nixon: Is there a situation down there where the ministry has called for tenders for another ambulance service and there is some delay in making a decision as to the award of the tender?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I don't believe so. I'll check on that but I'm not aware of the call for tenders in that area.

HIGHWAY EXTENSION

Mr. Wildman: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Could the minister report to the House on his progress, or lack of it, in negotiations with the Garden River Band of Ojibways regarding the four-lane highway, in light of the letter he wrote to the chief indicating that the MTC did not see a completion of the four-lane for several years? If that is the case, how many years does he anticipate it will take, and what measures does the ministry intend to take, to deal with the problems faced by residents of Macdonald township whose properties were optioned at least two years ago?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The letter that the hon. member refers to: I wrote to Chief Boissoneau of the Garden River Band following a very late night meeting we had with the band at which the hon. member was in attendance. Following that meeting, following the presentation of the preliminary plans that the band had prepared of their reserve, I sent that letter to Chief Boissoneau. To my knowledge, I've had no reply or response from the chief; and we've also been awaiting a copy of the final plans.

As I understand it, the plan we were shown that evening was their draft plan and they would be giving us what they would call their final land-use plan.

First of all, I asked the band to give permission to take some soil tests on reserve land on the opposite side of the river from the Macdonald township area, which the hon. member is referring to, so that we could firmly establish the location of the river crossing at the new bridge and determine whether it would be possible to put the bridge exactly where the reserve wanted it. This was, I believe, 200 or 300 feet from where we had shown it. That location would be acceptable to us if the soil will allow it to be built.

Again, I am not aware that we have had that permission, but our regional manager in Thunder Bay was going to follow that up with the chief. As soon as we can get answers on a couple of those things and carry out the soil tests, we will be in a position to make a firm decision regarding the right of way east of the reserve.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that the regional office has indicated that it may be three to four years before completion of negotiations; and if that is the case, is there any way that the minister could clear up the confusion, be-

cause there have been some reports in the Sault Star regarding this? What does he foresee that could be done for the people in Macdonald township; that is, could MTC purchase that property immediately?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I have some problem in authorizing the purchase of that property immediately when we do not know whether the proposed alignment that we would be purchasing would line up with the proposed crossing of the river. I don't think we want two roads coming together at a river and not meeting—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I have some difficulty in agreeing to purchase that property immediately. I have assured the chief of the Garden River band that we are agreeing in principle to the proposed routing that the band have suggested. I have asked for this permission to do some adjustments at the east end of the reserve. I have said that at the west end of the reserve I will have to have discussions with the Rankin reserve and with the city of Sault Ste. Marie, which I intend to do. I have also said that we will be prepared to start negotiations immediately for the purchase of the right of way through the reserve.

The hon. member knows as well as I do, I am sure, that we cannot put a time limit on those negotiations. It is somewhat different negotiating with the reserve for the purchase of that right of way than it would be for non-reserve lands, as we would have the power to expropriate after the normal hearings and so on. We do not have that back-up authority on the reserve, so I can't tell the hon. member whether it will be one year, two years or five years to negotiate that and I don't know for sure when I will be able to tell the people of Macdonald, until I know some of those answers or at least have some indication of agreement of the river crossing location.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports

Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

WATERLOO ELECTRICAL SERVICE AREAS ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 36, An Act to establish Electrical Service Areas in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is the first, Mr. Speaker, of what I expect will be a series of bills to restructure municipal hydro-electric utilities to correspond with municipal boundaries in regional municipalities and restructured counties and to permit the selection of new Hydro commissioners. This bill, and those which will follow, is based upon the report of a local study team guided by the Hogg committee recommendations which were accepted by the government on February 11, 1975. I am providing a compendium with the first of these electrical services area Acts, which includes the Hogg committee report as revised, as well as the report of the Waterloo local study team, with Ontario Hydro's comments and the review of the provincial steering committee on municipal hydro restructuring.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 37, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to prevent discrimination on the basis of a physical handicap where the handicap does not interfere with the performance of the services required. I specifically only use the term "physically handicapped" so as not to clutter up the bill at this time and to expedite its acceptance by government.

GUELPH SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. Worton: Before the orders of the day and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to bring to the attention of the House the fact that 1977 marks the 150th anniversary of the city of Guelph. Our fair city was actually founded on St. George's Day, April 23, in 1827.

Already this year a number of colourful celebrations have taken place to recognize this important anniversary. One of the most important highlights will take place this coming Saturday, when Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario will participate in commemorative events.

Mr. McIlwraith, chairman of the sesquicentennial committee, has asked me to ex-

tend an invitation to all members of the Legislature to visit Guelph during this anniversary year and to share in our celebrations.

I would like to take this opportunity to present to the Premier, and to the leaders of the opposition parties, a pictorial history of Guelph prepared by Robert Alan Maclean Stewart. I think it most appropriate that Mr. Stewart has chosen blue for the cover of the book.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is a limited edition.

Mr. Bullbrook: They should change the name to Wortonville.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the very distinguished member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton), who has made this presentation, to convey my best wishes to the constituents in that municipality. I understand certain celebrations are taking place this Saturday, and perhaps the hon. member would convey my best wishes on that occasion; he needn't go beyond that, because I know he would be reluctant to go beyond that. But certainly I do appreciate his presentation of this pictorial history of that great municipality on this occasion. Knowing something of the history of the city of Guelph, I understand why they selected blue.

Mr. Bullbrook: And why they selected the member for Wellington South.

Mr. Deans: I know that my leader would have wanted to have said some words were he here at the moment but, unfortunately, he's tied up outside of the House. However, Mr. Speaker, on his behalf and on behalf of this caucus, I do want to thank the hon. member for the very fine pictorial history of Guelph and, on behalf of the NDP, to extend the very best wishes of our caucus and the party to the citizens and the council of Guelph, and to wish them many happy years under a different regime, I hope.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's whistling in the dark.

Mr. S. Smith: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my thanks. In particular, I notice that this edition has been signed by the author and has a very fine presentation page. I want to thank the member. I was recently in Guelph and spent a little time in the offices where they're preparing the celebrations, and I think it's going to be one of the finest celebrations, very tastefully organized, and one which I'm looking forward to attending more than once.

I should note in passing how well served the people of Guelph have been for the past 22 years and will be, I trust, for many more years to come.

[3:30]

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch: Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answers to questions 22, 23 and 24 standing on the order paper. (See appendix page 573.)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville had the floor when we last rose on this matter. He may continue with his remarks.

Mr. B. Newman: It's a real honour for me to have the opportunity once again to take part in the Throne debate and to bring to the attention of members present and the members of the cabinet some of the problems and some of the areas in which my own community, as well as the province of Ontario, could stand some improving.

One of the things that does concern me substantially is the fact of communication. Today, with the price of a stamp being 12 cents and people hesitating to come along and communicate with their member, especially writing to Queen's Park and using a 12-cent stamp, it being quite a price to pay for a letter, I thought it would be significant if the province of Ontario would implement the use of a one-cent stamp whose sole use would be for the communication between a constituent and the member in the Legislature.

Federally, no stamps are required to be placed on letters when they are addressed to a member in the federal Parliament while the House is in session. I think a constituent should have exactly that same privilege on the provincial level; but rather than give it to him free I would charge him that one cent so that we could at the same time ask

Ottawa to co-operate with us and use one-cent stamps with pictures of previous Premiers of the province. In that way, we could also pictorially familiarize our students, as well as our elderly people, with the historical significance and the contribution many Premiers have made in previous days. The idea of the one-cent stamp is a fairly good idea. I would hope the government would look into it, and if possible implement it as quickly as possible.

The first item of real concern is the item of unemployment. I sent out a questionnaire in my riding in which I asked the following question: "Which of the two problems do you consider the more serious, unemployment or inflation?" I anticipated the answer because there are more people employed than there are unemployed; so the individual who is employed naturally is going to say inflation is the more serious, he has a job. However, those who considered unemployment extremely serious amounted to one-third or 32.9 per cent of the respondents. It is extremely important, and it does disappoint me that the Throne Speech did not include some concrete proposals for the remedying of the problem.

In Windsor and Essex county, excluding the towns of Leamington and Kingsville, the statistics for the unemployed, and the unemployment index as one would say, has risen and fallen in the last three months. It started with 8.69 per cent, went down to 8.53 in February and then in March went up to 8.65 per cent. This is based on a work force of 129,717.

The unemployed were in two categories, and included 5,602 men and 6,166 women. The significance of that is the fact that approximately the same number of men and women are unemployed. It disturbs me that we do not have the concern among the citizenry that we should have when we have such high levels of unemployment, but I would assume the concern isn't as great as it should be because of the following facts:

In 1961, 46 per cent of the unemployed were heads of families. In 1974, the 46 per cent dropped down to 33 per cent; and just last month, in the month of February, it was only 30.3 per cent. So that you can see that less than one out of three of the unemployed are heads of families. Were they all heads of families then I would assume—and probably rightly so—that the concern would have been substantially greater.

Increase of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is the result not of layoffs, but of the economy not producing enough new jobs for would-be new entrants into the labour force, be they graduating students or spouses of persons who are already employed.

When people are involuntarily cut from the job market, they lose their self-esteem, or it substantially diminishes. The sense of alienation from society increases, and at a certain point they simply stop trying, stop creating; and it creates in them a lasting pattern of non-productivity and dependence. The economics and cost of rampant unemployment go far beyond the value of Unemployment Insurance Commission payouts.

It is said that a Canadian worker produces approximately $19,000 worth of goods and services in the course of a year. So if we assume at the present moment that we have one million unemployed you can see the tremendous cost, a cost of approximately $19 billion in loss of gross national product.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this point, to present a plan that the state of Massachusetts is using in an attempt to—not remedy but lessen the index of unemployment. I don't say that we should copy what another jurisdiction uses, but I think we should look at them, and if they're applicable to ourselves, adopt the better points and improve on the weaker points.

In Massachusetts they are setting up non-profit corporations in such fields as building renovation, lead paint removal, energy saving by insulating old housing, harvesting of state forests, provision of day-care facilities to free welfare mothers for productive jobs and rehabilitating old railroad lines. I think what Massachusetts is attempting to do should be looked at, and if applicable let's try to improve upon it.

Mr. Speaker, there are other ways in which employment could be provided. I would assume that government should and would always consider public works projects to be programmed in periods of high unemployment, rather than in periods of boom. There is a need for substantial amounts of housing throughout the province. There are lots of unserviced properties, unserviced lands, and I think we should go into the servicing of land at the present moment so that we can at least alleviate unemployment to a small degree and at the same time have lands available for housing development. I think we should go into the production of substantial numbers of homes—especially for low income and fixed income individuals.

Even in my own community, government has finally built a provincial public building in 1977. I can recall the first time I ran,

in 1959, it was promised; it's taken 18 years to do that.

Mr. Kerrio: That's not bad for the Tories, Bernie.

Mr. Mancini: That's not bad, that's a good accomplishment.

Mr. B. Newman: I would think there are other things that they could do.

Mr. Cunningham: Bernie, are there only three of them over there now?

Mr. Samis: Where have all the Tories gone?

Mr. B. Newman: I imagine the cream of the crop is here.

Mr. Ruston: All three of them.

Mr. Eakins: John, you listen.

Mr. B. Newman: I am very disappointed that the junior ranger programmes, a programme which I heartily endorse, has not been expanded in the last several years. There are substantial numbers of our students who could use this as summertime employment. From what I understand there are only going to be 1,600 taken on force this year, whereas we should be multiplying that number substantially. I would think that is one area in which government could have stepped out and done something. Youth unemployment is extremely grave, and we are certainly anticipating the budget coming down tomorrow with some substantial programmes that would alleviate that problem.

I did mention the use of housing. I specifically mention housing because of the continuing need for senior citizens' housing in the city of Windsor. We have received substantial amounts of housing in the past. But when you see waiting lists running into approximately 400—and they have been running at the 400 scale for a fairly long period of time—it means that we are not providing an opportunity for those who have helped make our country to live in some decent type of accommodation. I am referring in this in stance to the senior citizen accommodation, the geared-to-income accommodation. I know that not all senior citizens would prefer to live in that type of accommodation; they would prefer to remain exactly where they are at the present. But because of age catching up with them, and their not being able to take care of their premises, they sometimes have no choice but to move into rental accommodation.

I can recall in 1960 making mention to the government that they should adopt a baby bonus in reverse. In other words, pay to the son and/or daughter or relative of an aged or a senior couple some specific amount of money per month for the senior couple's keep rather than have the government provide accommodation for them in some type of housing project. I hope the government will still consider that, but I would also like to see sufficient senior citizen accommodation built in my community to take care of the needs of the 397 senior citizens who need accommodation today. Of the 397, 319—or 80 per cent of them—require bachelor or would prefer bachelor accommodation. So you can see, one way government can assist in alleviating unemployment is by going back into housing; and the housing that I am mentioning at this moment is senior citizen housing.

When the senior citizen lives in government geared-to-income housing, his rental generally includes his energy bill. So we have subsidized that senior citizen by providing him with geared-to-income housing; we do not recover sufficient from the rental to pay for the cost of running the accommodation; and I think we should continue to subsidize him.

But I am looking at the other senior citizen who lives in his own accommodation and who has substantial fuel bills. The fuel bills are sometimes more per month than the accommodation. I think that the government should follow some of the schemes that are used in the United States, that is by providing an energy supplement, X amount of dollars if the income of the individual goes below a set level. In other words, if it were below the poverty line, I think there should be some income supplement to that individual. Remember that individual is taking care of his own accommodation. He is paying taxes, including education taxes which he strongly objects to because his children have grown up and gone. But he also has to pay the substantial increases in energy costs. He is not being subsidized at all.

[3:45]

We have to treat both alike. Since we provide a subsidy through geared-to-income accommodation, taking care of the person's energy costs, we should look at the other senior citizen living in his own accommodation. If his income is below that given level that I made mention of, then we should provide him with assistance on an ongoing basis. I hope the Ministry of Community and Social Services does look into that aspect, that is to

provide an energy supplement to people who are on fixed incomes, people on social services benefits and people on other categories of assistance programmes.

I take advantage of the opportunity of doing a lot of house-calling. When constituents have problems and can't come to me, I go to visit them. As a result, I get into a lot of senior citizens' accommodations. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is extremely heart-rending when you knock on the door of a senior citizen and you find that no one has come around to see him. He can't shop; he can do practically nothing; he is extremely handicapped.

I think that we've got to—and we can—develop a social worker of a type who would, like a paper boy, have a route. Just as a paper boy would go around delivering papers to various customers, this social worker could likewise have a route of seniors he would visit on a sort of a regular basis. This would not be with the intent of prying because we know that senior citizens are strong individuals who believe in their own rights and don't want others looking into their own personal business, but this would be simply out of concern for the health and safety of that senior citizen.

One of the members of the planning board in the community, the board that has recommended the development of senior citizens' housing, made a suggestion I think does merit attention, that is a two-colour card so that each day as the senior citizen would get up he would turn a knob which would flash the card. In other words, on even days the red portion of the card should be visible. Anyone going down that hall would know that the man is up or the lady is up and everything is well with them. If the card has not been changed in colour, then they know there may be something wrong on the inside and could attempt to overcome the problem either by personally visiting or via a telephone call.

It's a real concern, these senior citizens who don't have anyone to look after them. Even though in many of the high-rise projects they do have a buddy system built in and do have individuals on various floors who are responsible for checking inhabitants of the residences of that floor, there still has to be some standard method developed by government so that by walking down the aisle we could know that the senior citizen is there and everything is well. You will say that if the thing hadn't been turned it's an invitation for someone to break in. The management of the apartment certainly could take care of that, or the senior citizen could have a neighbour take care of it in case he is not going to be there for the time.

The other topic I wanted to touch on was the high cost of energy and how it affects many in our society today. The city of Windsor presented a very good brief to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and asked for its endorsement. They go into the whole cost of energy and show how the city of Windsor over the period of one year has had its energy costs increased to the extent of $1.4 million. In other words, the increase in energy cost from 1975 to 1976 meant that great additional burden on the taxpayers. And that, as we know, is always reflected in substantial property taxes.

I think there has to be some resolution to the increasingly high costs of energy. It doesn't disturb me so much for those who can afford it but there are many in our society who cannot afford the extremely high costs in energy. Time and time again everyone in the House gets complaints from citizens of all age levels concerning these high costs.

One of the areas in which it does disturb me is the fact that Union Gas in my own community have gone on a basis of reading the meter every second month. There is nothing wrong with that theoretically, the only thing is it just doesn't work. Because if you've had a very cold month, Mr. Speaker, and you've turned your thermostat up, you will not find out for two months actually how much energy you have consumed. You would have maybe turned the thermostat down a bit had you known you were using more energy than you normally used.

With the added cost of energy and the added use of energy by the individual, the bill becomes astronomical. Then how does the citizen pay for it? Those on a fixed income—even those not on a fixed income; those who are in lower wage categories—have an extremely hard time paying some of these energy bills. The responsible ministry in government here should see that gas meters especially are read on a monthly basis and not every second month, so that the consumer of the gas can help save gas and at the same time save dollars.

Some governments use the stamp idea. Just as you have food stamps, they have energy stamps, where the individual on a welfare programme or below a set level of income receives energy stamps. He would buy $100 worth of stamps for maybe $50 or $25. They're solely for his use, they're non-trans-

ferable and he can use them in an attempt to pay off his energy bills. It does sound like a good idea. There may be some difficulties with it, but I would think the government, in co-operation with the energy industry, could find a resolution to that difficulty.

Two years ago and again this year I introduced An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act. The purpose for its introduction was to set up uniform procedures for the terminating of services, be the services water, hydro, gas, oil, propane or telephone. The reason I introduced that bill, Mr. Speaker, is because at times the utilities companies in my estimation don't use good reason in dealing with their public. I don't for one minute try to defend those who are chiselling and so forth, but there are so many who cannot meet a high energy bill on a monthly basis. They could meet the bill stretched over a period of time, but they couldn't be paying the $150 and $200 a month when they are only getting the one cheque every month. What do you use for sustenance after you've paid a substantial amount for energy?

The need for the amendment that I have suggested has been underlined here in Toronto in the case of a Mrs. McNeil of North York, a diabetic with high blood pressure, whose electricity was turned off because she was $34.10 behind in her hydro payments. My bill would set up a review board consisting of not fewer than three people appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, who would come along and take into consideration the increased cost of energy and arrive at some accommodation to the individual in the paying off of any bills.

Some jurisdictions look at this quite favourably—for example in some of the states. In Maryland they have a customer's bill of rights that will overlook two delinquent payments and will forgive one overdue payment bill per year. They don't cut off the utility immediately. New York has a 15-day notice of intent before you can terminate service. New York will not allow them to terminate the service on weekends, holidays or the day before holidays, and the company must notify the welfare officials before they shut off any one of the utilities.

In Michigan, utilities are required to give customers 21 days in which to pay bills and eliminate late payment charges. They've abandoned the practice of requiring deposits unless a customer has earned a bad credit record. The established procedure is to give customers the right of a hearing before service is cut off, and to continue service if a customer agrees to pay bills in instalments when he finds himself in a financial bind. They also have grievance procedures to ensure quick and courteous resolution of complaints and questions, and publish a book outlining in simple language the customer's rights and responsibilities.

I hope the government would look into that a little more seriously than did the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough), because I think something has to be done for these many people.

One of the other topics I wanted to make slight mention of is Hydro. We would think that a big organization like that could have planned well in advance. Remember how they were selling all-electric homes? They sold them on the idea that they were going to get preferred rates. Many people built homes like that. All of a sudden they find it's more expensive than other forms of energy, they no longer get the preferred rates, but because they are burning more, they pay a lot more. So government was lax in not fulfilling its responsibility when it was selling electric homes. I happen to have a letter from a constituent who makes mention of all of this and is very much disturbed. To convert to another form of energy would be extremely costly for her.

I think I have seven or eight minutes left and I would like to bring other small topics to the attention of the government. One is a resolution passed by the city of Windsor—which I understand asked for support of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario—that requests that the Ontario government turn over to municipalities on a per capita basis 50 per cent of Wintario revenue in the form of unconditional grants. This would help municipalities develop the projects they wish—allowing them to spend that money in the fashion they wish—by providing them with unconditional grants, the moneys coming out of Wintario funds.

I hope the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) will join with the utilities commission in the city of Windsor in suing the polluters from the United States, whose pollution is costing the utilities approximately $96,000 a year in cleaning the insulators on high-tension wires—insulators shorted out because of pollutants coming across the river from Detroit.

I hope the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) would reconsider any decision she has made and have the committee that was looking into workers' health and safety hold meetings in the city of Windsor, so that representation can be made by interested

employers and employees concerning that legislation. The chamber of commerce and other interested parties—including the unions—have all expressed concern that Windsor has been bypassed, yet Windsor is third in overall production in the province of Ontario and fifth in Canada. Surely a city that contributes that amount to the economy of the province and the country should be given consideration when hearings are held concerning legislation that is that important.

[4:00]

Another item that is of concern, and has been shown to be of concern to many, is the new system of coded pricing. I would hope the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) would pass legislation that would insist every item that is for sale has an actual price on it and not a coded price. This way, at least one can comparison-shop. The shopper will know that what she is buying is costing, say, 46 cents as opposed to another article costing 48 cents. She would not be able to comparison-shop using the coding only. The only time she would find out the price was when she was checking the cash register tape or watching the code being put through the scanner and the price being put up on the cash register. Legislation has to come in on that. I have a recommendation from the United Church of Canada, the London conference, suggesting that that be implemented by government.

I would also ask the Minister of the Environment to keep a very close look and monitor what the US government is doing in relation to the disposing of atomic wastes, since it wishes to dispose of them in the salt beds in the state of Michigan. The state has no opportunity to veto anything that may be done by the federal government and, as a result, we don't know whether they're going to bury their atomic wastes in the city of Detroit or not. Burying them there, with us on the same salt bed area, could have some extremely harmful effects. I know the city of Detroit is as concerned as we, but I think the minister has an obligation to monitor all of that so that at least we can assume the citizens in the city of Windsor are going to be safe because he is going to take care of them.

I would like the Minister of Labour, while she is here, to look into the situation of CKLW and the strike that is going on there. I think she should have her officials look into it and see whether it can't be resolved.

One of the final items I do want to raise is the one concerning the utter disregard of the interests of the citizen by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Back in 1975 I mentioned in the House, and I spoke at some length, how Canadian Pacific, simply because it owned and had a right-of-way in the city that was wide enough to triple-track, had the idea it could triple-track and do as it pleased with its property. Environment has nothing to do with them. They have the money and they can do as they please.

The citizens in the Remington Park and Walkerville area fought tooth and nail against them showing how the Canadian Pacific did not consult with the residents. These are nicely built-up areas, with one that is going to be built up fairly shortly. The railway did not consult with the citizens, but just put up two additional tracks and then used the tracks for storage areas. In some instances, some of the cars that were stored there were refrigerated and they would have the motors providing refrigeration to these cars running at all hours of the day and night. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, living within 200 or 300 feet of that, with the fumes from the gasoline or diesel motors or whatever they used, the noise, and all of the pollution involved.

Let me tell the House that the citizens were not going to accept the CPR telling them what to do. As a result, the citizens have strongly objected. The CPR was prevented from using the tracks that it did develop in there. After a while, the CPR decided that it had the money and it would keep pressing the people. It attempted to get permission to use the trackage once again. The residents of the area made strong presentations to the commission—

Mr. Makarchuk: On a point of order.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Your point of order?

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There has been a previous arrangement among the House leaders that the member for Windsor-Walkerville would terminate his speech at five minutes after four. In other words, he would have 35 minutes. He started at 3:30 and he's still continuing. I'm just wondering if he would be brought to order.

Mr. B. Newman: If I did, I apologize. I don't think I did. I thought I had started at 25 to the hour and it is five minutes after the hour. I was told I had 36 minutes in which to speak and I'm trying my darnedest to complete it within the 36 minutes. If the member doesn't mind, I will take another five minutes. If he wants, I'll complete my re-

marks right now. But I'm not intentionally trying to take up any time at all.

To continue on the subject of the CPR hearings, the citizens did have a hearing before the Canadian Transport Commission in the city of Windsor and, at the last meeting, were successful in preventing CPR from using this triple-track—the two additional sidings or the Powell siding, as it is known.

I know this isn't the end of the story, because CPR has the money and can carry on and on and harass the people to no end. But the citizenry in the area will not accept that; they will continue the fight. Just as they have to obey rules and regulations—they can't do with their property what they wish—CPR should not be allowed to come along and do what it wishes with its property, regardless of what it wishes to do, without consultation with the people.

I had intended to go on to discuss the recent meeting of the Windsor and Essex county health council and the presentation they made to the citizens of Windsor concerning the rationalization of health services. What I have to say on that is fairly lengthy, so I will not talk about it now. I will try to save my remarks until we have the estimates of the Ministry of Health—if we ever do have them.

At this time I will simply mention that one of the things they wish to do is phase out Riverview Hospital immediately. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that will not be accepted by the community. They will let the government build a new chronic care hospital, as it had promised, or take over one facility that will be solely for chronic care, but not phase out a hospital that is providing the type of service that is satisfactory to the community and is praised to no end by both the patients and the families.

Thank you very much for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and to the member who made a comment concerning the length of my remarks—if I am over at this time—I apologize.

Mr. Moffatt: I gather, Mr. Speaker, that a number of comments have been made about a number of things which probably are unrelated to the contents of Her Honour's Speech from the Throne. In the 20 minutes allowed to me I am going to try to make some comments specifically about some of the things that were in the Speech from the Throne and some things that I think should have been in and were not.

Over the past several years it has been the role of the opposition parties, no matter which one was the official opposition, to criticize the government sharply and severely for its management or mismanagement of the resources of this province, both in physical and human terms. There have been numerous criticisms, significantly borne out by subsequent public inquiries, select committees and reports of various kinds, which prove that to some extent—and in other cases to a great extent—the forest resources, the mineral resources, the natural resources of our waters and air, have not been managed properly by the government and there have been moves at subsequent dates to make some kinds of correction. The previous speaker mentioned the problem of suing polluters and so on, which bears testimony to this kind of mismanagement that was allowed to go on.

The mismanagement of human resources has been a subject that has been dealt with by a great many people and from time to time we have had some government action in areas which were criticized. The whole business of schools and our education system was criticized—in some areas properly and in some areas quite improperly—and I notice there have been changes rumoured at least; nothing really tangible has emerged at this point. Those kinds of resource management ideals have been ones for which the government has been criticized and on which it has acted subsequently to some extent.

The Minister of Labour has been criticized sharply at various times for the Workmen's Compensation Board, and responses have been forthcoming—not always as quickly as we would wish, but there have been some responses and more obviously will take place as ensuing events take their toll of government members and of people who are the victims of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

In all of the discussion of the management of all those resources, it has always been a sort of Tory boast in Ontario that the finances of the province were, in fact, managed well. They have always prided themselves on that. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) debated for years with the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) the credit rating of this province as opposed to somebody else's credit rating, and there was great argument about triple-A or double-A and what all of those things meant.

Over the past year and a half to two years I think a lot of people in this province, myself included, have come to the conclusion that we have all been misled, because the management of the resources of this province have been most seriously handicapped by the mismanagement of the finances of this province by the present government. That prevents us

from correcting those problems in other resource areas.

I heard a speaker the other night talk about the problems of mental health in Canada. This person said the most serious mental health problem in Canada right now is unemployment. That's a pretty significant statement, if one thinks about it. What that means is that all of these problems associated with what have been referred to as social causes really go back to mismanagement of our economy which has led to so many unemployed people. It is time that somebody at least started to talk seriously about how our economy might be more properly managed.

In the Throne Speech, the reference to employment and job creation really does nothing to present specific solutions to those areas which all persons now recognize as being significant. The one area in which jobs are kind of mentioned and hinted at is in a commitment by the government to the proliferation of nuclear generating stations in this province. I think it's time we started to look carefully at what is really going on. I have a copy of Short Circuit, a publication by Ontario Hydro, dated April 1. In this publication there's a brief quote I wanted to make. It's a copy of a story from the Kitchener-Waterloo Record of March 24, 1977, quoting the director of design and development for Ontario Hydro, Mr. W. G. Morison, as saying that in the next 20 years Hydro employment opportunities will quadruple. He makes the point that 120,000 workers will be employed in nuclear power plants. He says: "In these days of unemployment it is encouraging to project a potential growth in industries utilizing high technology and highly skilled personnel."

I wonder what that person is talking about. He is a highly placed person in Ontario Hydro and he's misleading the workers of this province. What he is saying is that a number of people are going to have jobs that last for three or four or five or 10 years in a short-term basis in constructing nuclear plants and then they move from plant to plant to plant. They aren't new jobs, they aren't different people, they're the same people working in a number of jobs. He comes up with that 120,000 figure.

We did some work on this and found that Ontario Hydro's own record show that to create one permanent job in Ontario Hydro requires between $600,000 and $800,000 capital. The ordinary resource industries of this province require in the neighbourhood of $200,000 capital expenditure to create one permanent job. I wonder what is going on. What does he mean when he says we're going to quadruple the employment? We're not going to at all. All that's happening is that people are being told that jobs are going to be created in nuclear plants, but what they're not being told is that those are short-term jobs leading to further unemployment down the road. The only people employed in nuclear plants when they're finally in operation are a very small staff of highly trained technicians.

It seems to me the kind of expenditure that would be required, if you work it out, Mr. Speaker, to create 120,000 jobs at about, say, $600,000 per job in capital expenditure, means we're going to have to spend $84 billion, if Hydro's past record is any indication. That's utterly stupid. We don't have the capital resources to do that. It seems to me that what we need to do very seriously is, first of all, to look for some alternate ways of creating energy in this province. There are a number of ways in which energy can be created that the government apparently doesn't seem to be interested in.

[4:15]

The first thing I think we can do to create energy is, number one, to save the energy, or some portion of it, that we are presently wasting. It makes no sense at all, as far as I am concerned, to boost the number of Btu of energy that we produce when we could in fact save that which we already have by a proper insulation programme.

If the government is serious about the energy shortage, as outlined in this report by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) last Friday—which says nothing about what is going to be done: it simply says we'll run out of oil and gas in 2025, and in the meantime we are going to use nuclear power. Well, that really doesn't answer that problem, because what happens when we run out of that?

What I think we need to do is, first of all, set new building guides which will give much stiffer insulation standards for not only residential but commercial and industrial buildings as well. We need to create a major alternative to some of the oil and gas which we are presently using in our transportation industries. One of the ways in which that might be done is by the production of methane and methanol.

There are two ways in which methanol can be produced in significant quantities. One of those ways is by the whole-tree farming method; the other way is by using the waste from present pulp mills, which only use 50

per cent of the tree which is cut anyway—50 per cent is left either in chips or in the bush or in branches, the other 50 per cent is used in the pulp. You can check that, if you'd like, Mr. Speaker, and from your riding I think that you might find that if you consider the total cut by the pulp companies today, in the end result we only get 50 per cent of the volume out in the pulp. The rest is wasted.

What we might better do, it seems to me, is first of all, approach the problem of using all of the trees we cut. If we're going to cut them for pulp, we might as well use all of the trees that we presently cut.

It seems to me there are two areas where we would suggest a programme. We might suggest the Kimberly-Clark mill at Kapuskasing, under Spruce Falls Power and Paper, which uses 940 tons a day of ground wood. It would generate 620 tons per day of useless surplus now. What we would say is that 430 tons a day of that chemical pulp capacity would generate 516 tons of usable surplus; we would turn that into methanol with the co-operation of that company, if they wished to do it. If they don't wish to do it, then the government should do it for them. That should be done. It's a product that can be produced by small public investment, and it's a labour-intensive industry. The number of jobs which can be produced is immense, compared to the number of jobs produced in that highly capitalized nuclear field.

If we went to Espanola, there are 660 tons per day of chemical pulp capacity, which generates 790 tons of usable surplus. That 790 tons could be turned into methane, which would produce 20 million to 25 million gallons per year. This could result from this method of harvesting the whole tree. I won't go into details, Mr. Speaker, because I know you know full tree harvesting as opposed to what is presently being done. Those plants would be small, but those plants would also be pilot projects which would demonstrate the viability of a methanol industry.

A plant based on a tree farm could be used in eastern Ontario, an area which really does have high unemployment. If we go to the Cornwall area, or anywhere approaching the Ottawa Valley, there are areas of farm land which cannot be used for food production at this time. Those areas of the province where the soil is not being used for food production should be at this point reforested. We can't sit around and wait until there's an oil shortage; we should be planning ahead for this.

It seems the Ministry of Natural Resources has achieved wood production rates of 320 cubic foot per acre per year—13 times the present growth rate in Ontario's producing areas. They are using a poplar-based crop. A plant large enough to supply roughly one per cent of the 1985 gasoline and diesel needs of this province on an energy basis would require a 320-square-mile tree farm. But that would be a producing farm; it wouldn't leave the area denuded; it wouldn't desecrate the whole area; it would be a use of that part of the province that is not being made use of now. That's the kind of thinking this government should have gone towards in its Throne Speech.

A third area where methanol can be produced is in the waste disposal area in the region of Durham where right now the council is contemplating the expenditure of $14 million to build a sanitary landfill site. That's an absolutely ludicrous thing to be happening in this day and age, when that landfill, the material that goes into it—the garbage, if you wish—from the region of Durham and the suburbs of Toronto, is in fact a resource which can be turned into usable energy, either in a "watts from waste" programme, as is being experimented with in Etobicoke, or in the production of methanol which can be used in the transportation industries and, indeed, can power some of those high-priced cars we were hearing about this afternoon.

The problem of making this kind of statement to this government is that they really can't adjust their thinking to the idea that going into that sort of long-range investment on behalf of the future of this province is really sensible. There's no point in talking to some of the ministers about making an investment of public funds because they say, "That's socialism." That may well be socialism—it also happens to make sense. The technology exists for these methanol projects that I've been talking about briefly, because of the time constraints. It can be done. But if we wait for the private sector, as we have been doing, it's not going to be done, because the private sector is waiting for us to run out of oil and gasoline, and then when it gets down to the point where there's none left, it'll be very, very important for Shell and Exxon and the rest of the multi-nationals to move into the methanol business. All of a sudden we'll be forced to go in to some kind of import process for methanol.

This province cannot depend on energy supplies from foreign nations. It can't really depend on energy supplies from outside this

province. We need to become as self-sufficient as is humanly possible, and at the same time we need to invest our capital very wisely in projects that are not only going to guarantee the energy of this province, but are, to some extent, also going to guarantee jobs to the workers of this province.

I just don't know what one can do with the energy minister's statement of last Friday in which he documents 20 problems and no solutions—other than that the consumer will have to pay more. Well, I think the consumer may well wind up paying more, but the consumer will not wind up paying more because he wishes to or because that's going to solve the energy crisis. He will wind up paying more because this government has refused to act in an area where, in fact, it can act.

If we don't begin now to reforest and revegetate every single acre of land, not presently being used for food production, we're going to wind up as the television programme the other night said—freezing in the dark. It's an investment in Ontario's future. It's time we began.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, you will realize that I am following my colleague from Durham East because the NDP has some time still coming to it in this debate. It could, perhaps, be considered that we talk less than the other parties, but I think the correct interpretation would be that we say more in less time.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Neither is true.

Mr. Swart: There are a number of items I would like to cover—

Mr. Ferris: How many—three, two?

Mr. Swart: —in the time allotted to me, I'd certainly like to speak on the subject of unemployment, because the latest figures show that of the 18 regions in this province, the Niagara region has the third highest rate of unemployment. I'd also like to deal with the matter of the severe storm which we had in the peninsula at the end of January, and the inadequate assistance that the Ontario government has provided to the municipalities for dealing with that situation. But because we're coming to the end of the Throne Speech debate and are short of time and because I am greatly concerned about municipal affairs, I want to spend the time that I have dealing primarily with the matter of the Blair commission report, more commonly known in this province as property tax reform.

It is significant to point out that in the 50 or 60 items dealt with in the Throne Speech there was no mention made of tax reform. I suggest that is significant because the government of this province has apparently abandoned any attempt to reform this property tax system. I suggest that the proposals which it had before it—

Mr. Cunningham: It needs six or seven more studies before it will do anything. You need 25 more seats.

Mr. Swart: —and the proposals of the Blair commission, do not in fact constitute any real reform.

I think the people of this province, though, now have the right to ask the government what it is going to do with the 15 proposals it had in last year's budget, entitled Reform of Property Taxation in Ontario, and the Blair commission report on those proposals.

It is interesting to recall the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough's) statement last year. He said: "The commission will be asked to report to the government by the fall of 1976 so that legislation can be prepared for the spring of 1977." I go on to quote: "Assessment notices for 1978 taxation will be sent to property taxpayers in the early summer of 1977." End of quote of the Treasurer last year.

Let me provide some further background to this 1976 statement, Mr. Speaker. Since the provincial government took over the assessment function in 1970 it has repeatedly stated its intent to introduce market value assessment. The government has said that it is "essential" to do so. The Treasurer described the present system as "so unfair as to be rotten." The member for York East (Mr. Meen) as Minister of Revenue, speaking to the Golden Mile Kiwanis Club, October 20, 1976, on the subject of why we need market value assessment said: "Of course, with the introduction of market value assessment all the inequities will be ironed out."

Those are the same kind of statements as have been made for at least eighty years but nothing ever happens. Mr. Allan Grossman, the then Minister of Revenue, said in 1973: "When the government assumed the assessment responsibility in 1970 the objective was to reassess all properties at their market value. The reassessment work has now been completed"—in 1973.

Taxes were to be paid on the market value assessment in 1975, but it wasn't ready so it was postponed when the same minister said that as the new data would be available by the fall of the next year, the government's

tax reform programme could be finalized by early 1976. But, of course, in 1976 it has been postponed again.

It would be interesting to know the cost to this government of the proposed reassessment programme over the years—what they have done to this date. The present Treasurer in 1969 estimated the number of assessors would be increased by 50 per cent to "bring assessment to what we consider the proper level and maintain it." As municipalities then were spending $15 million when he took it over, it is not unrealistic to say that the extra cost over the eight years is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $50 million to $100 million on the property tax reassessment—and nothing has happened.

So far making these kinds of statements, and showing the tremendous need for market value assessment, the absoluate fairness of it after spending tens of million dollars on reassessment, after last year's budget statement, after year by year postponements since 1973, and after the $500,000 report of the Blair commission, the Treasurer now states that the whole thing is being postponed for an indefinite period.

Mr. Davidson: For another study.

Mr. Swart: I suggest that that kind of handling of the assessment programme has to match or even exceed this Tory government's general mismanagement of the province's business as mentioned by my colleague from Durham East.

[4:30]

On November 12, 1969, the then leader of our party, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), when debating a market value assessment bill, said: "We therefore recommend that the implementation of these recommendations"—provincial market value assessment—"be delayed until thorough statistical analysis has been made on their effect." That was in 1969. That is almost eight years ago. But when the Treasurer made his proposals a year ago to this House that statistical analysis had not been done. For instance, he didn't know what the cost would be to the prov nce of paying all farm land taxes. It was in August of last year before the report on that matter was made to him. That sort of thing simply verified that budget paper E, the 15 tax reform proposals, was hastily thrown together for political purposes and was not the product of long-term and extensive analysis.

I say to the government that its credibility and its sincerity among municipal people on this issue finally have been destroyed by its latest manoeuvre. Its assessment staff is appalled at its actions and their morale is at an all-time low. I know this to be the case. Both groups are disgusted because they know the government is simply stalling until after the next election and if it gets its majority it will shove it down the people's throat.

The government wants to de-emphasize it now and to not even talk about it over there. Since the Blair report was brought down six weeks ago government members haven't even talked about a programme of further input for all of the concerned groups.

When the government introduced the proposals a year ago it dressed them up in a very attractive political package. Niagara was used as an example to portray a reduction in residential taxes of 24 per cent, of commercial and industrial of 20 per cent and the elimination of all taxes on farm land.

But it didn't sell. People were sceptical. They asked if all these reductions were going to be made, where was the additional money going to come from? They finally found out that it was supposed to come from the Ontario government. Then they rightly asked if the Ontario government was going to pay all those additional taxes, was it going to keep up its level of grants and subsidies to the municipalities? On May 20, 1976, the Treasurer refused to give that commitment to me when I asked him here in the House. Then on May 26 he told the PMLC that in the first year at least he wouldn't keep up the level of the Edmonton commitment.

So the projected saving that they had in their proposals really became all meaningless. The charitable and the non-profit organizations strenuously objected to the proposals to load them with taxes and the famers didn't join in a chorus of applause, as the Treasurer had expected, for the removal of land taxes. Small business too was rightly up in arms. In short, the attractive political package has turned sour and the Blair commission couldn't rescue it.

So what the government wants to do now is quietly let it rest and maybe die until after the next provincial election. And after all, it has covered its tracks pretty well. It has widely circulated reports that residential taxation will decrease and implied other benefits. When groups or individuals raise the unpopular and unfair recommendations it simply says those are only recommendations—not policy. The Treasurer put it, I think, in a classic form in his release on the day Blair reported. He said: "I emphasize that the government has not accept-

ed, rejected or modified any part of the Blair report recommendations." That's about as indefinite as you can possibly be.

I say to the government it may think it is good politics to do this postponement, but it is not good government. It has an obligation to face up to its own recommendations and to the Blair report and to tell the people of this province what it intends to do and what its views are now on this issue.

What about the injustices which government members so frequently spoke about, such as the great over-assessment of apartments and the resultant excess tax being extracted from the tenants? Is it going to bring in an interim amending legislation to relieve that injustice? The people of Ontario do deserve a response from the government on this issue. And that response should deal with the major faults in its original 15 proposals and some that have been added by the Blair commission in their report.

I briefly want to mention some of them here. I want to say that farm land taxation as the government proposed and Blair amended, is unfair and unacceptable. The government should really heed what the farmers and their organizations have told it. They don't want a lien on their property of thousands of dollars an acre. They want their land to be assessed at agricultural value so their taxes are, in fact, related to their ability to produce and they're quite happy to carry on paying 50 per cent of the land assessment.

If the government followed the suggestions of the farmers and the farm organizations it would save the Treasury something like $150 million or $135 million, whether it follows its own recommendations or those of the Blair commission. What's so unjust about this is that a large part of that $150 million or $135 million will go to the developers, and I say they should pay their own taxes. Once land is bought by developers it should be assessed and should be taxed at full market value. Why should the people of this province kick in $50 million to $75 million annually, perhaps more, to pay for the taxes of developers?

I want to mention also the exemption on charitable non-profit organizations. It's our view in this party that non-profit and charitable organizations ought not to be burdened by property tax and there should be uniform exemptions. The government's proposal No. 7 would tax them at their full value; Blair would leave the decision up to unworkable committees at the local level. Even then they wouldn't allow them to continue exemptions, there would be no exemption permitted for Legions or corps or other veteran's organizations.

I say the local committees would simply not work fairly because, first of all, the ones that get it would be the ones that had the political clout, there is overlapping of jurisdictions, which makes it very difficult for municipalities to provide exemptions, and thirdly, the grant system proposed by the Blair commission would deter municipalities from giving the tax exemptions. The government proposes that not only would the municipality lose those taxes, but the grants and subsidies that would be given by the province would be given the municipalities as if they collected those taxes, and therefore they would lose the taxes plus a fairly substantial amount of subsidy as well.

I think the government should have the courage to determine those organizations that should have exemption. I suggest it would not be too difficult. It's done now by the federal government for income tax purposes and it can be done for assessment. Preferably the government should pay the taxes to the municipalities on those properties where exemptions are given.

I don't know how much it would cost. Here in Toronto, the United Way estimated that its organizations would have to pay something like $2 million if they lost their exemptions. That's out of United Way receipts of about $15 million, and that's a fairly substantial sum. Multiply that across the province. I don't know what the government would have to pay—$10 million or $40 million—but I want to say that it wouldn't be as much as the taxes the government proposes to pay for the developers. It wouldn't reach that level.

Mr. Warner: They put the developers before the Children's Aid Societies.

Mr. Swart: The government has a responsibility to see that these non-profit volunteer organizations do remain viable. It knows the volunteer sector's concern—of course, that's one reason it has not decided not to proceed with the proposals at this time. I have here with me—and I wonder if I could leave it with the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. MacBeth) if I may, because they're aren't many other members of the cabinet present—a petition from the YMCA in the city of Welland, signed by 260 people in the city of Welland, expressing their concern about the government's proposal to take away the exemption.

Proposal No. 1 of the government stated that residents of Ontario collectively will bear a reduced share of the property taxes. This,

of course, was to be the political centrepiece of the reform programme. After all, most voters live in residences. But when citizens' groups and others dug into the details, they found it wasn't going to turn out that way for many of them, perhaps the majority. And now the Blair commission's recommendations would cause further drastic increases to many homeowners and remove the possible benefits to many other classifications.

They say the apartment dwellers will have great benefits. Blair says they will pass on that reduction in taxes to the tenants, but there's this rather significant statement in that report: "They shall pass that on for a period of five years or the period of the lease, whichever is the less." Of course, we know that most leases only go for one year or two years at a maximum and now, because of The Landlord and Tenant Act, many of them don't have leases at all. So any benefits that the tenants might get now can be withdrawn very quickly.

There's another aspect of this too. It also proposes that the apartment dwellers' tax credit, which has been 20 per cent of the rent they have been paying, be reduced to 10 per cent. Whether or not they get the benefit of the lower tax payments on apartments, their tax credit is going to be reduced from 20 per cent of their rent to 10 per cent.

There are two other Blair proposals of tremendous significance. One is that they recommend a substantial change in the property tax credit. It provides that for those in the gross income range of $7,500 to $13,500, the property tax credit will be cut by more than half, resulting in an average net tax increase of more than 20 per cent.

They also propose the removal of the pensioner tax credit of $110; and I want to provide some figures on what this really means, in net taxes, to certain income classes of pensioners. A senior citizen who is single, who has an income of $3,500 and who has, according to the Blair commission's own tables, an average gross tax now of $281, pays a net of $73. Under the new system, he would pay a net of $36, but he loses his $110 senior citizens' tax credit, so the real net goes to $146 from $73, or an increase of 86 per cent.

Mr. Shore: You should have been a magician.

Mr. Cunningham: Marvin, that will be the end of you.

Interjections.

Mr. Swart: That's a great place to bring in a criticism—to the old-age pensioner.

A couple with an income of $5,500 pays an average tax of $353 and pays a net of $187 after the tax credit. That will go down to $64. But in losing the $110, his saving is only $13 for a decrease in net taxes of seven per cent.

Let's go up to the next bracket. A couple with an income of $7,500 has average taxes of $359 and pays a net tax now of $225. That would go up to $287, but they would lose the $110 tax credit; so their net taxes would increase by $172 or 77 per cent, under the proposal of the Blair commission.

Right on up to the $11,000 income bracket, this kind of net increase in property taxes to pensioners will take place.

One other point should be about the Blair recommendations on residential taxation, and I think I'll just have time to make it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You've got one minute to make it. You're already into one of the two minutes that the hon. member for Durham East didn't use.

Mr. Swart: The commission recommends that the $500 tax credit limit be removed. This, in fact, may help some people with moderate incomes, but the greatest benefit will go to the homeowners with higher incomes and extremely valuable houses. To offset this situation, the income-reducing factor should be raised to three per cent for the portion of taxable income over $10,000 and four per cent over $15,000.

[4:45]

Let me conclude by saying that I think the concern of the different parties can be shown in the number of briefs that were presented to the Blair commission.

In our NDP caucus, there was a 21-page brief from our caucus. Some of our members presented briefs. The member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) presented a brief, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) presented a brief and I did myself. According to the report, there was one brief from the Liberal caucus, one-third in length, and the member for Wentworth North also presented a brief. The Conservative members presented no brief whatsoever.

Mr. Cunningham: Call the election.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I just say to you that we in this party would introduce changes in assessment at the same time as we introduce some real property tax reports.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Humber has the floor for up to 15 minutes.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped on this occasion that I would have a little time to deal with the various aspects of one of my ministries—that of the Solicitor General— but because of the 15 minutes you have suggested I'm going to pass over quickly to the matter of policing and not deal with some of the other things I had hoped to do.

In any event, just before I pass, in Thunder Bay on Saturday last I was referring to the manner in which you conducted the business of this House. I was groping for the right words. I think I have now come up with them. I say your voice has the sharp business-like command of a steam locomotive whistle as it echoes across the Precambrian Shield. With that in mind, I want to commend both the job that you are doing as Deputy Speaker and Speaker in a most difficult task.

As I said, I want to pass right away on to the matter of policing, and I may encroach on three or four minutes that my colleague, the Minister of Labour, expected to use, but if I'm over 18 let me know, sir. I'm going to keep to my notes because of the time factor.

As Solicitor General it is personally fulfilling to be associated with many of the programmes that help make Ontario one of the safest areas in which to live. But a source of greater pride and assurance to me is the fact that Ontario police officers, who carry out a difficult and dangerous part of public safety work, are performing splendidly.

Our high-calibre provincial, regional and municipal police forces are doing an excellent job of keeping order and peace. Relentless scrutiny of our police officers by government and the public has resulted in correcting some weaknesses within the system and this benefits all of us, yet there is often misinformed and unobjective criticism by some members of society which only hampers the police. They are criticized for allegedly acting too zealously or for wanting the authority to carry out certain duties more effectively. Yet they are chastized for supposedly not doing enough.

Mr. Lawlor: This is the best of all possible worlds.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: As part of my responsibility, my ministry has been continually alert to the problem of organized crime in Ontario and has erected effective efforts to contain this type of activity. An excellent example is the joint forces operation where two or more police forces aid each other in a concerted effort to deal with a particular organized crime problem that has been identified. The success of the RCMP, the OPP and the local police forces, through joint force operations, and with continued assistance from the Ontario Police Commission, demonstrate the ability of various police units to co-operate. The JFOs have been going on since 1966, with an intensified effort since 1973.

Organized crime encompasses so many different types of criminal activity involving widely varying numbers of people that our methods to contain it must be kept at maximum efficiency. To be effective, our intelligence methods must be carried on quietly.

Only three months ago a meeting was held by senior officials of my ministry, the Ministry of the Attorney General, the OPP, the RCMP and the Metropolitan Toronto police. Their unanimous opinion was that a public inquiry into organized crime would not be in the public interest. Such an inquiry would certainly impair the effectiveness of police investigations which rely on undercover and surveillance activities that cannot be made public.

Mr. Cunningham: You sure fixed that poor boy in Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: As these knowledgeable people pointed out, they have not had great difficulty in identifying major criminal figures. The problem is in gathering appropriate evidence to arrest and convict such individuals. I am therefore not prepared to recommend that a public inquiry into organized crime in Ontario be held at this time. What is more urgently required are the people and the advanced systems to tackle the growing sophistication of modern criminals, especially those in organized crime.

On December 15 last, in response to a question on organized crime, from the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid), I quoted police as suggesting to me: "If you have an extra $1 million for police, don't spend it on investigations which will do very little. Let us have more men and equipment." To this end, my ministry will provide additional funding of $1¼ million to be employed specifically in combatting organized crime.

The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) has been a strong advocate of this action, and we believe this is the most effective way to contain the problem. Such funding will help police forces to obtain the personnel and equipment needed to improve their efforts. We are confident that this additional funding will bring about even more tangible and meaningful results in combating organized

crime. These funds will be applied immediately to the development, within the special services division of the OPP, of substantially increased criminal intelligence and investigation and investigative operations, thereby expanding the joint-force operations.

The term "organized crime" is bandied about freely. This is a vague term which means different things to different people. It may be appropriate at this time to define what the term "organized crime" should mean.

Organized crime means two or more persons concerting together over a period of time to participate in illegal activities. Organized crime activities known in Ontario are dealing in fraudulent securities, counterfeit money, arson, extortion, loan sharking, alien smuggling, the smuggling of stolen cars and stolen jewellery, narcotics, trafficking, gambling, prostitution and pornography.

We all know that loan sharking is one of the major money-making schemes of the criminal element. Spinoff crimes from loan sharking have been, and still are, responsible for other crimes such as bombings, beatings, business takeovers, bankruptcies, thefts, drugs and murders.

Many types of fraud have been exposed recently. These could include welfare, unemployment insurance, OHIP, large-scale real estate and so on. Frauds on elderly people, whether it be the so-called bank-inspector fraud or aluminum-siding fraud, are of concern. The distribution of pornographic material, books and films is on the increase. This is probably due to the permissive society we live in, whereby many things from books and advertising to movies at the local theatre are sex oriented.

Mr. Makarchuk: It also makes money.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Most of this material is manufactured in the United States and brought into Ontario. Criminal gangs have been with us in Ontario for a long time. We have known about them for a long time and our police have been effectively fighting them for a long time. The province of Ontario has pioneered in many areas in a concerted effort to contain and suppress organized crime. Let me itemize the forces and agencies we employ to contain organized crime in Ontario.

The local police forces which maintain general law and order in cities, townships and regions are also involved in battling more sophisticated criminality. Many of these local forces work very closely with provincial and federal officers in co-operating investigations.

The Ontario Provincial Police, within its overall responsibility for policing the remainder of the province and highway traffic control, also maintain a criminal investigation branch. The OPP is at the forefront of this province's effort to contain organized crime. Particularly useful in this regard is the OPP special services division which includes among others the anti-rackets branch, anti-gambling branch, criminal intelligence, criminal investigation branch and the drug enforcement section.

All the OPP units have gained increasing success against organized crime. For instance, the criminal intelligence branch has been able to provide a high level of effectiveness to assist many investigations.

The provincial forces work closely with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. As part of its responsibility for the internal security of our country and of federal law enforcement, the RCMP is involved in many aspects of organized crime. Co-operative efforts are continually made in this area by the RCMP, the OPP and the local forces.

To be fully effective, police forces must link their activities in united effort. Accordingly, since 1970, intelligence units of all major Canadian police forces have been joined together in a single system for the common purpose of fighting any attempts to establish organized crime in our country.

The Criminal Intelligence Service of Ontario is an association of intelligence officers in Ontario's police forces. CISO is the first organization of its kind on the continent. It provides a central collection agency for all criminal and intelligence information submitted by members. This material is analysed and disseminated to those with a need to know. Members of CISO meet regularly to keep up to date on the current developments of organized crime in the province.

The CISO concept was adopted in 1971 on a nation-wide basis known as the Criminal Intelligence Service of Canada. This organization involves all the major police forces in the country with a central bureau in Ottawa staffed by the RCMP. There are also provincial offices across the country.

Ontario's municipal police departments and the OPP were the first in Canada to be officially linked to the Canadian police information centre in Ottawa. This rapid access data bank of computerized information is maintained by the RCMP. It is a valuable extra tool in providing additional criminal records to our investigators.

The free exchange of intelligence between police organizations has done much to identify major figures involved in organized crime in Ontario. It has helped to identify their illegal activities and prevent some of their planned operations. In some cases it provided evidence which led to criminal convictions. I would point out that a considerable degree of success has been achieved by the entire police intelligence organization in making the province of Ontario an unhealthy place for organized crime.

A recent review of existing procedures and resources has made it clear that largely because of the 1974 amendments to The Criminal Code relating to wiretapping and other forms of electronic surveillance substantially increased resources are required if law enforcement officials in Ontario are to maintain the high level of efficiency in the detection and prosecution of organized crime that the public of Ontario has enjoyed in the past. The wiretap legislation of 1974 created a number of problems for the police, especially in their attempts to combat organized crime. Some of these problems have been lessened by judicial decisions and have been the subject of representations made to the governments of Canada by the police and by the Ministry of the Attorney General of Ontario.

The recent review has, however, established beyond doubt that the additional workload that this legislation has imposed upon the police and Crown counsel with respect to such matters as the preparation and service upon the accused of transcripts and summaries of recorded conversations, together with all the other documents that must be compared in compliance with the legislation, makes this increase in resources necessary. The proper execution of these functions is essential to the realization of the rationale of this legislation, for it is only when meticulous care is taken in following the procedures laid down in the legislation that the privacy of the individual will be properly respected and protected.

Law enforcement officials in this province have achieved considerable success in their efforts to follow the legislative standards and requirements to ensure that the rights of citizens in this province under this law are properly protected, but in doing so it has been necessary to divert personnel and other resources from regular criminal, intelligence and investigative work, especially in the area or organized crime. It is hoped that this substantial increase in the OPP budget will permit the intelligence branch of the OPP not to only participate fully in expanded joint force operations relating to organized crime, but at the same time maintain a high level of service to municipal police forces throughout Ontario in the criminal intelligence field.

Counsel in the special prosecutions branch of the Ministry of the Attorney General will be available to assist police officers involved in this expansion of the joint force operation as their legal and other prosecutorial advice is needed. In addition, the officers in charge of the special service division of the OPP, the officers in charge of criminal operations of the RCMP of Toronto and the inspector in charge of the intelligence bureau of the Metropolitan Toronto police, together with other senior police officers, will continue to meet regularly with the director of the special prosecutions branch to ensure that the fullest possible legal and prosecutorial assistance is provided. These officials, together with the commissioner of the OPP, the assistant commissioner of the RCMP in charge of O division in Toronto, the chief of the Metropolitan Toronto police and other representatives from municipal and regional police forces in Ontario will in turn be able to keep the Attorney General and the Solicitor General fully briefed on the progress of these increased efforts to investigate and prosecute organized crime.

I've dealt quickly with a very important subject. I believe I've taken my 15 minutes.

Mr. MacDonald: Because of the time restrictions, I intend to devote my comments this afternoon to one topic only, the Barrie annexation issue, and the comment that it makes on this government's policies for the preservation of agricultural land.

The fruit lands of the Niagara Peninsula have long been cited as the classic example of conflict between, on the one hand, professed government policy to preserve unique resources and, on the other hand, the toleration and even promotion of policies which gradually destroy them. But the current effort of the city of Barrie to annex 20,000 acres of neighbouring townships, some 13,600 of which are class 1 to 3 land, and to do so in direct response to provincial government policies and pressures threatens to make an even greater mockery of our objective of protecting prime agricultural land for future generations.

Every time this issue is raised the province's chief planner, the provincial Treasurer loudly interjects that his government is in favour of growth—and presumably nobody else is—that Barrie has been chosen as a

major growth centre and that objectors are simply standing in the way of progress. So let's, at the outset, clear away this specious argument with which the provincial Treasurer is now confusing the public debate.

[5:00]

Nobody is seeking to frustrate the reasonable growth of the city of Barrie. On the contrary, all parties involved, including the neighbouring townships, have expressed support for annexing enough land to meet Barrie's foreseeable industrial expansion. But there is widespread and growing objection to such a massive annexation of prime agricultural land for urban development, when Barrie's own official plan indicates that the existing boundaries can accommodate a residential population of 57,000 people and the present population is approximately 33,000, and the Ontario government's own projections envisage a population of 50,600 by the year 2001.

In true developer fashion, our provincial chief planner is attempting to bulldoze the public into acceptance of a concept of expansion for which there is no reasonable statistical basis. Moreover, he is doing so at the unnecessary sacrifice of thousands of acres of prime agricultural land, which presumably this government is committed to protect and preserve.

The development of the Barrie annexation question is yet another graphic example of the provincial government's failure to plan in any reasonable fashion. The so-called planning process was initiated in 1970 through Design for Development. A year later, in a status report on the Toronto-centred region, Barrie was singled out as an area in which growth is to be stimulated, because it is within easy access of Metropolitan Toronto but outside the normal range of commuting. That report also called for the establishment of what later came to be known as the Simcoe-Georgian Bay area task force, set up in 1972.

The provincial government retained a strong role in the planning process of the SGATF, and provincial bureaucrats chaired both the political and technical committees. Thus it was able to have a significant input into the development of the plan which emerged. The annexation move itself is a direct local initiative of the city of Barrie, but it is based on the conclusions of the SGATF, which reflected provincial government planning policies.

The real issue is the assumptions on which Barrie based its actions, and thus the kind of leadership and policies provided by the provincial government. At the heart of that issue are the population projections for the area. In the SGATF report, the Barrie urban area is projected to grow from 35,900 people in 1974, to 75,000 in 1991, to 125,000 in the year 2011. At the same time as the government tabled the SGATF report, in April of 1976, the government also tabled a two-volume report entitled Ontario's Changing Population, which is by far the most comprehensive and thorough population projection done for the province. It projects Barrie's population to be between 38,900 and 39,100 by 1986 and 48,300 to 50,600 by 2001. In other words—admittedly there's a 10-year difference in the span—a contrast between 50,000 and the projections of the SGATF, which the government had inspired, of 125,000. Clearly, the one hand of the provincial government doesn't know what the other one is doing—in itself a commentary on the accuracy of the government's planning capacity.

The report on Ontario's Changing Population was examined in detail by an independent population projection expert, Ms. D. Macunivich, who gave evidence before the OMB for Simcoe county. She testified that the government's population study is excellent, but even when she changed some of the assumptions from reasonable to optimistic, she still was unable to project Barrie's population beyond 76,700 by the year 2011, as compared to the 125,000 figure which the government has accepted as the target.

Of course, population projections are based only on known development prospects. As Ms. Macunivich testified, if the government is determined for policy reasons that Barrie should grow to 125,000—the figure which the chief planner confirmed in his letter to the OMB—that can be achieved only by dramatic initiatives, none of which have so far been announced. Furthermore, if Barrie is going to be force-fed to a population level of 125,000, instead of the reasonable projection of some 50,000, it can only be at the expense of discouraging growth from other centres in the central Ontario region. If Barrie gains to this extent, other areas must lose.

In short, the Treasurer's assertion that the Barrie urban area has been allocated a population of 125,000 by the year 2011 is a statistical stab in the dark. There is no reasonable assumption that it will be achieved, as evidenced by the government's own figures in the report, Ontario's Changing Population; as evidenced by the absence of any policies which would justify the expectation of a

dramatic population increase of an extra 75,000 people from the projected 50,000 from the Ontario's Changing Population report, to the Treasurer's unsubstantiated 125,000.

Since all parties involved in the annexation hearings have no objection to a limited extension of Barrie's boundaries to meet foreseeable industrial development needs, and since Barrie's existing boundaries can accommodate residential needs for the population growth through to the end of this century, as envisaged by the government report on Ontario's Changing Population, there is no justification for extending urban boundaries to include thousands of acres of prime agricultural land. Such a move would be at least premature.

On Friday last the parliamentary assistant to TEIGA introduced in the course of his contribution to this Throne Speech debate the letter which was written by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) to the provincial Treasurer giving the views of his ministry—presumably the food land development branch—with regard to this whole issue. And the parliamentary assistant tended to leave the impression that there was no particular serious conflict between what was said in the agricultural minister's letter and what the government has set forth as an objective and which is pressuring through the OMB and having Barrie carry the torch on.

Let me just quote one or two comments from this to show that within an obviously very carefully written letter—a very carefully written letter—there are some fundamental differences. For example, in his letter the Minister of Agriculture and Food points out that the Simcoe-Georgian Bay task force had recommended the reservation for food production of all existing and potential class 1 and 2 lands, as well as class 3 lands currently in production, plus all specialized land suitable for fruits and vegetables and tobacco. And then he has this wonderful sentence: "Although such retention policies are praiseworthy, I have noted that they fall slightly short"—may I interject, "slightly short," said he—"of the objectives utilized by my staff in the review of planning documents." In short, he's saying, "I don't agree." Why?

I continue the quote: "These objectives specify that class 1, 2, 3 and 4 agricultural lands, as well as areas of special or unique crops or soils should be retained for food production."

A little later he makes an even more important point. He said: "If all existing and potential class 3, along with class 1 and 2 lands, were included for reservation," reserved for future food production, "the total reserved land area still contains only 53 per cent of the study area." And he adds, "This would seem to leave ample areas in which other growth could occur." Clearly, what he is saying is that there's no excuse for gobbling up such a massive amount of prime agricultural land.

Later in his letter he adds that these plans are designated urban lands that won't be required for the next 25 or 30 years—or they're envisaged to meet the requirements of the next 25 or 30 years. And he adds, and I quote: "In the interim it is desirable for these areas to remain in agricultural use and further the detailed staging for the development of these areas be required to enable farmers to make a logical and orderly retreat. In this regard, five years' advance notice might be an appropriate minimum."

Then in the second last paragraph of his letter he has another real rocker. He points out that "all of the land within existing urban boundaries will have to be efficiently used through infilling, and other similar local planning policies." In other words, if you apply that statement to Barrie, which has a capacity within its existing boundaries to accommodate a population of 57,000, when its existing population is only 33,000, what he in effect is saying is that there is no justification. Or, as I put it just a moment ago, it is at least very premature to move on to the inclusion within the urban boundaries of so much prime agricultural land when it is not going to be needed for the foreseeable future —for the next few years.

All this takes me to the next point I want to deal with briefly. It raises the question of the whole role of the OMB in the present situation—admittedly a very difficult one. The OMB is not a policy making body. It is a quasi-judicial body whose job is to interpret and to apply stated policies—the policies which have been spelled out by the government. The OMB, therefore, has the task of reconciling government policies when they are in conflict. And that, I suggest, is its task at the moment in reference to the Barrie examination.

Because what is in conflict? On one hand the OMB is faced with a statement of government policy reiterated by the chief planner, the Treasurer, in his letter to the OMB on December 15, 1976, that the government has approved in principle the population allocation of 125,000 to the Barrie urban area. But it also has solid testimony that this population projection is grossly exaggerated on the basis of present policies and the absence of

dramatic new policies to justify the force-feeding of Barrie's population projection by another 75,000 population.

On the other hand—and here is the conflict—the OMB has the government's oft-repeated policy statement that it is determined to protect and preserve prime agricultural land from unnecessary encroachment. On the basis of the evidence submitted to it, there is no justification for immediate annexation of some 13,600 acres of prime agricultural land for urban development. It may never be needed. It is certainly not needed for the foreseeable future. On the basis of the evidence now before it, and in strict conformity with the responsibility to interpret and reconcile stated government policies when they are in conflict, I suggest OMB has an obligation to assure Barrie's expansion, to meet its foreseeable industrial development—something which all of the neighbouring townships are willing to entertain—but it has also an obligation to see that that expansion shall be no more than that.

Interestingly enough in the latter portion of his comments, the parliamentary assistant had this comment. He said at no time has the government indicated how much land Barrie should have. That is rather interesting since he repeated that Barrie should have a population of 125,000 and therefore he implied that Barrie should have a great deal of land. Certainly it should be sufficient to accommodate a population of 125,000. Ideally the local people should sort it out themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that that is a bit of pipe dreaming. The function of the OMB, when you have a conflict between neighbouring municipalities with regard to annexation, is to resolve these conflicts, because each side digs itself in. And I suggest that the OMB, with the hearing before it now, should take a look at one government policy which has projected a population target of 125,000 which cannot be justified and analyse it and reduce it to the foreseeable limits that will have to be met, and on the other hand it should face up to implementing that other government policy, namely the preservation of agricultural land.

[5:15]

Considerable emphasis has been focused of late, particularly by Liberal Party spokesmen, on the alleged influence of certain consultants and well-known Tory lawyers in the planning process and the current OMB hearings on the proposed Barrie annexation.

It is true that the largest developer landholder in the picture, South Simcoe Estates, has used the firm of Practor and Redfern in the past. It is true that Proctor and Redfern did Barrie's annexation study. It is true that the annexation boundaries happen to coincide with the southern boundaries of their holdings. It is true that one Mr. Webb, the previous law partner of the Premier, is representing them.

All of this is titillating stuff, with great potential for suspicion and innuendo. But it shouldn't be permitted to distract attention from the provincial government's failure to plan on a reasonable and substantiated basis. That is the basic problem. For a government to be deliberately promoting growth targets that will result in the premature destruction of thousands of acres of prime agricultural land makes a mockery of its own guidelines for the protection of food lands for future generations. While the Minister of Agriculture and Food mouths these noble objectives, the chief planner, the Treasurer, is riding roughshod over them.

It underlines once again the desperate need for this government to respond to the demands of both the Rural Ontario Municipal Association and the Ontario Institute of Agrologists that legislation should be passed. Indeed, they said legislation should have been passed last year, designating class 1, class 2 and class 3 lands for future food production, that machinery should be set up for considering any legitimate exemption from such preservation and that such exemptions should be considered when there is no lower-class land available or when the immediate need is solidly substantiated.

Such a law is not only necessary to strengthen the position of rural municipal leaders who have asked for it to enable them to cope with the relentless pressures of developers, but such a law is needed even more to stop ministers violating this government's own stated policies on preserving agricultural land unless and until they have publicly provided solid justification.

In short, such a law wouldn't be a freeze, as the Liberals and the Tories are wont to describe it, but effective legislation protecting prime agricultural land combined with machinery for considering legitimate exemptions.

Mr. Eaton: Didn't the NDP candidate up there vote for the legislation?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to participate in the debate on the Throne Speech. I hoped to begin my remarks with some allusion to

the important event which is happening this year in Britain, and therefore in Canada as well—Her Majesty's 25th anniversary—and to draw to the attention of my colleagues in the House the example of selfless devotion and dedication to duty which she has given us, which I think each of us should exercise in our responsibilities to the resolution of the current conflict within Canada. However, I will dispense with my wishes in order to remain within the time limits which have been allotted to me.

One of the things that I have learned in my relatively short stay here is that sometimes in the heat of the moment within this House, members may transgress the limits of parliamentary procedure and propriety, diverting attention from the fulfilment of our responsibilities to the people of this province. It is at such times, Mr. Speaker, that we look to you and your deputy to direct our attention to the task at hand. You, Mr. Speaker, and your deputy have carried out your often onerous duties with exceptional skill and grace, and I offer you both my sincere appreciation.

There are several topics which require you, Mr. Speaker, and your deputy to excise —to exercise your right of caution.

Mr. Wildman: "Excise" is a better word.

Hon. B. Stephenson: One of those has been one which has precipitated perhaps more rancour than was necessary: that topic, of course, was the Workmen's Compensation Board. Recently the Leader of the Opposition initiated a series of public meetings on this topic, an action which I find regrettable since it was undertaken, as it was stated in the press release which accompanied the announcement, for crass political purposes.

This action prompts me to provide some factual information regarding this much-maligned and seldom-praised institution. Perhaps I should begin with a statement of the historical development and purpose of the board. In 1915 this Legislature established The Workmen's Compensation Act and the board in Ontario to minimize conflict between employers and employees over assignment of fault for work accidents, and to provide as well for impartial adjudication and rapid payment from a fund based on the principle of collective liability at reasonable cost to society as a whole. These original principles remain the underpinnings of the Workmen's Compensation Board function and of its philosophy today.

In spite of the 60 intervening years, years marked by the most dramatically rapid social and technological change experienced in human history, our population has tripled and industrial processes and new products by the hundreds have been developed, bringing with them myriad unanticipated complicating factors and problems. With these increases has come an increase in the numbers of accidents and an even great increase in demand for service from both employers and employees.

Since 1915 the scope and coverage of the Act have been greatly expanded to include total medical aid and physical and vocational rehabilitation. But despite these improvements the Workmen's Compensation Board has been wrongly accused, and I quote, "of riding roughshod over the legitimate demands of the working people."

It must be remembered that the Workmen's Compensation Board does not deal with machines nor with products; it deals with people. Each claim represents a human being and each must be, and is, dealt with on an individual basis.

Mr. Wildman: As if they were machines.

Mr. Gaunt: If they were any slower they would stop.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Each claim must be dealt with on its individual merit. I would agree that the process of collating all the relevant facts, assembling the basic file, creating the computer control and producing the initial checks and statistical information may resemble an assembly line. But the resemblance stops there.

Mr. Wildman: It never comes to a head.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Each and every claim must be reprocessed at least every two weeks to ensure the legislative service to the individual claimant is fully and properly carried out. The support of exotic electronic systems has been invaluable to improve the claims function of the board, but a responsible compensation system depends not upon automation, but upon individual consideration of each and every claim with human understanding, with equity and with fairness.

This assembly has legislated to the Workmen's Compensation Board the role as a quasi-judicial agency, to make difficult decisions regarding claims and levels of benefits. Under the Act, the board cannot substitute ad hoc-ery nor expedient greasing of squeaking wheels for either careful management or responsible decision-making. Basing its deliberations on collected factual informa-

tion, on the opinions of internationally recognized experts in medical and health-related fields, on the particular characteristics of the life circumstance of each claimant, the board tries diligently to exercise that function honestly, responsibly and humanely—and that is a fact.

Mr. Martel: Says who?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Another fact: During 1976 a total of $357 million was distributed to claimants—$198 million in compensation, $100 million in pensions, $55 million in medical aid and $4 million in rehabilitation. Administration costs in that year totalled $26.7 million, less than seven per cent of the total amount of money the board is responsible for.

A second point I feel should be noted is that the Ontario system of workmen's compensation is recognized as a model throughout the world. The Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario is widely acclaimed for the non-legalistic, non-adversary, collective liability system and for the benefit levels which are provided at reasonable cost.

Mr. Martel: Provided you can establish a claim.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The United States federal white paper on the need for reform of workmen's compensation in the United States reports extremely favourably on the role, the achievements and the function of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario. Each year dozens of administrators from many states of the Union and from many other nations are sent by their jurisdictions to learn the administrative process of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and just recently I had the pleasure of accompanying the governor of Ohio through the rehabilitation centre in northwest Toronto.

In spite of the opposition's insistent verbal extravagences—painting the board as an oppressive, inhumane, Gestapo-like body, depriving workers of their rights—the fact is that its picture is simply not true. I submit that the aim of that group is to fashion its fabrications in conventional wisdom, if you like, through its well-used mechanism of the repetitious and continuous expounding of ill-founded personal viewpoints and careless or deliberate distortions of truth. I find it interesting that, while people who govern elsewhere are trying to learn from our accomplishments—

Mr. Wildman: Be specific.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —some people, who would give their eye teeth to govern Ontario, are declaring that we have accomplished nothing at all.

I would like to deal with comments about the board contained in the Ombudsman's report because that information should be put into proper perspective. Within the Ombudsman's area, the Workmen's Compensation Board was included in the government agencies group—

Mr. Martel: Your friends couldn't be wrong, could they?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —as opposed to the government ministries group. This is quite a distinction since the board was thereby compared with agencies such as the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, the Labour Relations Board and the Liquor Licence Board, whose volume of decision-making is minimal compared with the board's massive decision-making responsibility.

The report indicated the Ombudsman had dealt with 349 complaints about workmen's compensation during his first 15 months. The total number of compensation complaints received during that period was 602; 349 were dealt with, and the report recognized that more than two-thirds of the complaints filed about the Workmen's Compensation Board did not come within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman, since they were either premature or related to problems such as delayed payments rather than the decisions of the appeal board.

During the first 15 months there were 141 complaints related to the final appeal level. Those 141 complaints consisted of claims over a span of 47 years, during which the board has made countless decisions on almost 10 million claims. Only one complaint—

Mr. Martel: Well, the 457 to my office over 11 months was not in the 47 years.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —related to an appeal of a 1976 claim and only four related to the 395,528 claims reported in 1975. The bulk of the claims related to the period from 1965 to 1974 which, incidentally, was the period spanned by the three-level system, first introduced in 1965 to ensure greater opportunity for appeal.

Of the 141 cases in which the Ombudsman had jurisdiction, 29 were closed. In 14 cases, the board decision was found to be fair and just. Recommendations for change were made in 15 cases. The Workmen's Compensation Board accepted recommendations in five cases and in the remaining 10 other action was

taken, such as further hearings before the board on the basis of additional information.

Mr. Mancini: A lot of those.

Hon. B. Stephenson: At a meeting with the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Ombudsman said that when compared with the multitude of decisions made by the Workmen's Compensation Board, the comparatively low volume of complaints was a tribute to the Workmen's Compensation Board. This was not the perspective reported to the public, but again, I think it demonstrates—

Mr. Martel: Baloney.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —that the board is not the irresponsible, oppressive agency some would like the public to believe it is.

Mr. Warner: Why don't you resign?

Mr. Martel: Don't be an apologist.

Hon. B. Stephenson: There is one other point which I would like to present—the causal relationship between work conditions and illness and injury. Under the provisions of The Workmen's Compensation Act, the board provides compensation and pensions for work-related illness and injury. It is not now, nor has it ever been, especially difficult to determine the relationship between trauma or accidental injury and work performed. There are, as well, a few illnesses such as pneumoconiosis and asbestosis and silicosis which can be readily, or as equally readily, directly related to work.

Mr. Wildman: Then why aren't they?

Hon. B. Stephenson: However, there are many illnesses, some of the most problematical, which are multicausal.

Mr. Martel: Like chronic bronchitis.

Hon. B. Stephenson: A multicausal illness is, of course, one which develops as a result of a number of factors—

Mr. Wildman: What about the silicosis?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and I would list for you the factors.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The genetic structure of the individual, which determines the degree of sensitivity or resistance to allergies or irritants and other materials;—

Mr. Makarchuk: Are you sure about that?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —the exact nutritional status of the individual; personal habits such as cigarette smoking, exercise, alcohol consumption; the simple process of aging; and finally, exposure to potential environmental irritants such as chemicals or radiations.

One's racial origin may also be a significant factor. For example, a white-skinned, blue-eyed blond is far more prone to develop cancer of the skin of the face than any of the dark-skinned brothers or cousins. I would, particularly, draw this to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis), who, just a few days ago in this chamber, defamed a well-respected epidemiologist, by suggesting that in raising this issue—

Mr. Martel: He used filthy language.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —in his careful critique of Dr. Selikoff's brief, the epidemiologist was motivated by racial and socio-economic discriminatory attitudes. The only word for that kind of accusation is shameful.

Mr. Wildman: Withdraw.

[5:30]

Hon. B. Stephenson: Chronic bronchitis, hearing loss, emphysema and malignant disease or cancer are examples of multicausal diseases. Where such diseases can be shown to have a causal relation and to have been caused by the relationship to the materials and substances—

Mr. Martel: Filthy.

Mr. Warner: Are you using that filthy language? You are a disaster.

Mr. Wildman: I have got a silicosis case.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and circumstances within a work place, the Workmen's Compensation Board is able to provide compensation under a very broad interpretation under the existing legislation, and that is precisely the trail-blazing route which this board has followed—

Mr. Warner: Minister of apology.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —demonstrating leadership in this area for all other North American conpensation agencies.

The fifth point I would like to make with reference to the board is the demonstrative leadership of the board in the field of vocational rehabilitation through the establishment of an institution and a programme that is second to none. It is a programme that

sponsors a rehabilitation centre in northwestern Toronto that is renowned for being the most comprehensive, the most progressive and responsive and effective centre for getting people back on the job, for restoring health and repairing the damage which injury has caused and as far as possible for returning people to a normal and productive way of life.

Mr. Warner: It has the highest number of injuries too.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Recognizing the need to enhance vocational rehabilitation, the board within recent weeks has approved additional vocational rehabilitation officers and rehabilitation specialists to increase that complement to a total of approximately 130. The additional staff is to be directed almost totally to the regional areas of the province in order to improve the function there. These additions will enable the board to concentrate much greater effort on returning injured and disabled workers outside of Toronto to more suitable work and to help industry create employment opportunities for them.

My final comment regarding the Workmen's Compensation Board deals with appeals, because there has been a great deal of criticism that appeals require two years or more. I suppose that is a situation which is possible but it is certainly very rare and perhaps I should explain very briefly the appeals mechanism. The first level of review is the appeals examiner who, after reviewing a file, can recommend one of three courses of action.

First, he may recommend that the appeal be allowed, based on new evidence or errors within the claims division. The examiner would make that recommendation to a single commissioner who can accept or reject the recommendation. Nine per cent of all appeals are handled in this manner. Secondly, the examiner may recommend the appeal be referred directly to an appeal board of three commissioners. About 22 per cent of appeals are dealt with in that manner. Thirdly, the examiner may refer the matter to a single commissioner after further investigation. About 69 per cent of appeals follow that procedure, and there is always the right to appeal to the three-member board from a lower decision.

In the nine per cent of cases referred directly to a single commissioner, the decision is available usually within one week. In the 22 per cent referred directly to an appeal board, the elapsed time averages out at about 13.5 weeks, eight weeks before the appeal and 5.5 weeks from the beginning of the hearing until the decision. In the 69 per cent of cases in which further investigation is required, the elapsed time averages 7.5 weeks, four weeks before the hearing and 3.5 afterwards. This figure is for a hearing held in Toronto; it may take up to 10 weeks if the hearing is held outside Toronto.

Mr. Makarchuk: What are they supposed to do in the meantime? In the meantime, they have to go on welfare.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: One delaying factor for which the board cannot be held responsible is postponement at the request of the person filing the claim or the appeal. In December 1976, for example, the appeal board heard 83 cases. However, it received 73 requests for postponements. Another problem is setting up appointments with independent physicians, obtaining medical records and obtaining hospital admissions. Some cases may take longer than the average times I've mentioned and may, in fact take longer than the 24 weeks required for the two-hearing process, one before a single commissioner and one before the appeal board. However, they are definitely the exception rather than the rule.

I believe the Workmen's Compensation Board is serving the people of this province very well, given the legislative mandate which controls it—

Mr. Grande: Apology, apology.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and the fact that it consists of mere mortals who are dealing with complex human problems related to compensating employees for illness and injuries directly related to the work place. I use the word "compensate" advisedly because, frankly, I question whether any sum of money or any amount of rehabilitation can truly compensate a person for the psychological damage suffered as the result of a loss—

Mr. Warner: You should compensate us for your presence.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —or a degree of physical disability following an accident.

Mr. Speaker: You have one minute left.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that this House realizes the government of this province has a strong commitment not only to the support and

enhancement of the workmen's compensation function—but also to the method of preventing the increasing number of accidents and work-related illnesses—

Mr. Martel: That would be something new, wouldn't it?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —which, in fact, are bothering this province at this time. If in presenting the factual information about the Workmen's Compensation Board, I am labelled, as the Leader of the Opposition has pejoratively put it, "an apologist for the board," I can only state that I would rather be so labelled than to be the author and perpetrator of a virulent programme of questionable opportunism to achieve political gain at the expense of injured and disabled workers in this province.

Mr. Martel: That's what you said about Elliot Lake.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I have made a personal commitment to do all that I can to assist the disabled workers of Ontario—

Mr. Makarchuk: How come they are coming out to the hearings?

Mr. Samis: You better read Francis of Assisi, you need it.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —both by assuring that the Compensation Board provides benefits with dispatch, with equity and, above all, with humanity and fairness, and particularly by working diligently to reduce the hazards of the work place through an innovative, aggressive and dedicated programme of occupational health and safety legislation.

Mr. Martel: Don't be too full of rhetoric.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in the Throne Speech debate, and I intend to be brief and to the point. I am going to deal later, just briefly, with the WCB. We have obviously touched a sore point with the minister.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, I just like the facts, that's all.

Mr. Martel: Oh, nonsense.

Mr. Mackenzie: I want to leave the shilling for the private sector to the member for Oriole and others on the government side of the House. I mean, who else would read into the record a speech by the president of Westinghouse to the Financial Institute of Canada as gospel? The Conservatives have tried to picture the NDP as being doctrinaire and rigid, or a class party.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It's true.

Mr. Mackenzie: As the old saying goes, if the proof of the pudding is in the eating, or if the proof is in your actions, then never has a party been so exposed by its positions and policies as being clearly doctrinaire, rigid, inflexible and so outmoded or out of touch with the times as the Conservative Party.

This government has tunnel vision. It can see and hear or admit to nothing but assistance to the private sector and defend the status quo in dealing with all of the problems of the people of Ontario. I think the feelings of most New Democrats, certainly mine, is that there is no need for ideological rigidity at this point in time on either side of the House. What is needed above all else is a commitment to people as distinguished from machines and enterprise, a clear recognition of our problems and a willingness to deal with those problems without fear of losing favour with some group, and a willingness occasionally to break with some of the conventional traditions in our province.

The current Speech from the Throne, which attempts to have a little something for everybody in the province but doesn't really tackle our problems, I submit is going to lead to only more cynicism on the part of the people and distrust of and disbelief in politicians and political parties in this province. Much of the speech, as I listened to it, merely outlined some of the housekeeping measures that it is necessary for any party to undertake to run a government, and really when it comes to specifics or something that could excite the public or offer a useful course of action, it is just not there.

Surely this government has got to start addressing itself to the problems of the people of Ontario and to their fears and their aspirations. In my constituency unemployment is clearly the major problem, but I sometimes wonder if the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) really realize the plight of some of those who are unemployed. The younger people at the top of the list, or those who happen to suffer some slight handicap, some form of disability in their efforts to get a job, don't want welfare. They want to work. They want to establish themselves and be able to look forward to having a few of the good things of life.

I wonder about the increasing number who have 10 or 12 years seniority. They have started a family, they have got a housing programme under way and they simply want to be able to make the payments on their house and to protect the present. What about the older workers we are finding, in increasing numbers, out of work? They have earned, they feel, some security in their final years. Their best years are behind them. How can a government be so abstract, so unfeeling, when there is a real matter of human dignity at stake? They don't want welfare either, and they don't deserve to live out their final years in fear and hopelessness.

When I heard the Treasurer of the province of Ontario say the province did not have a responsibility to provide jobs, I could hardly believe my own ears. It is the people who elect a government in this province, and those people the government has a responsibility to. If there is a problem, if people are hurting because of a lack of employment, then the government's policy should be designed to put people to work in this province I don't think it's proper that their only responsibility seems to be to keep the corporate and business world healthy so they don't hurt.

As far as I'm concerned, the Treasurer's position was a copout and a darned cheap shot at the unemployed of this province. When one listens and follows the government's action to deal with an economic downturn in the community, as we heard in the Throne Speech, we can clearly see how out of touch with reality and how rigid this government and this party have become. Over the last six years, the consistent approach has been to prime the business pump. Tax credits, sales tax exemptions on machinery; all, we're told to create employment. Yet just as consistently we see unemployment climb from 140,000 in 1971 to 316,000 this year—just about the highest in the province's history. Sometimes I get the feeling that to the Tories they're only numbers.

Surely the approximately $1.15 billion that we've pumped into these kind of incentives since 1971 could have produced a significant number of jobs in housing, in forest regeneration, environmental clean-up and the funding of secondary manufacturing facilities in our resource sector; or the highly job-intensive services to people, particularly the infirm and the mentally retarded.

I'm always a little amused at this government's total commitment to private enterprise, without borrowing some of their practices at least. What's wrong, for example, with requiring a little equity for government moneys or tax concessions to the business community? It makes sense to the business. Can any one of you see business, any business enterprise, lending money to another firm without requiring some security, some equity, for their money? I don't think so, and I wonder why it doesn't make sense to this government.

Why not demand jobs in return for the incentives? Why not develop our manufacturing potential in the resource field? Why does the loss of ownership and control, to say nothing of the drain of profits that goes with foreign ownership and the export of raw materials, hold such a fascination for the Conservative Party? I've never been able to understand it.

We used to can almost 80 per cent of our own peaches in the province of Ontario; now I understand we're down to about 22 per cent. I wonder, does the resulting loss of jobs, the disappearing tender fruit land, the additional drain of dollars to purchase imports, make any business sense at all? Are we not, literally, hocking the future of this province?

The Throne Speech gives no real encouragement to the need for waste reclamation or recycling plants and collection centres in this province. The government is willing to move immediately to ban non-returnable bottles and increase unemployment in difficult times, yet is not willing to move at the same time to set up the recycling plants and collection centres that are necessary to conserve our waste products. Spokesmen for the glass industry tell me that they could use four to five times the amount of waste glass they're presently getting. Seed money in this area could produce positive and multiplying results in the near future.

Over the past 10 to 20 years, the trend in the private manufacturing sector has been toward less jobs. At the same time we have a substantial increase in service and public sector jobs. But once again the approach of this government is to cut back in the area of social services. Its inflexible rigidity really shows in its dealings with the unemployment problem by cutbacks in labour-intensive public sector jobs. The myth of Tory competence becomes obvious through their inability to tackle the real problems of how we distribute the wealth of this province and the fruits of our production in a way that's a heck of a lot fairer to all of the people.

[5:45]

Why does the Throne Speech fail to deal with another major concern of our constituents, the constant struggle of the older people

and the people with homes to make ends meet? How do they pay their taxes and meet major cost increases, like energy and utilities? For pensioners and those on fixed incomes, major increases added to the cost of the nickel-and-diming-to-death they're getting through increases in costs are really starting to hurt. Those trying to buy or to hang onto and maintain their homes still don't know where they stand with regard to property taxes.

In Hamilton they still wonder at the duplication of services still too obvious in regional government. Government cutbacks in social services undermine the support programmes, the meals-on-wheels, the housekeeping, et cetera, needed to keep pensioners in their homes and out of the institutional and nursing homes.

Where are the homes for the low-income and large families? They are in such short supply. How many Throne Speeches in this province have promised this kind of additional housing. And what's the situation? In Hamilton, as of January 31, we had registered—and they had updated the cheques—at a meeting of the Hamilton Housing Authority 720 applications for large low-income family homes. What did we have under construction? We had 57, plus 131 rent subsidy. There was a waiting list of six months even to get one's name on the list for one of these homes.

When it comes to the rent review legislation, most of us looked upon that as a chance, something that might really assist some of the people in the apartments. I think some of the increases that were applied for and were granted were too large, but at least the 20 per cent increases that were applied for in my riding—and I give credit to some of the rent review officers—were rolled back to 10 or 12 per cent. But what happened? All the bad landlords in all of the real problem buildings we found went to the appeal board. The appeal board in almost every single case raised the increases back to within a dollar of what had originally been granted, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, there is no appeal to the appeal board.

Mr. Martel: Thirty-two per cent.

Mr. Shore: Do you want an appeal to the appeal board? Is that what you want?

Mr. Mackenzie: I think the minister has allowed his biases to show and has deliberately undermined this government's own programme.

Mr. Shore: Who wrote that for you?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton East has the floor.

Mr. Mackenzie: The HOME programme has to be another example of this government's total ideological rigidity. Land costs, along with interest, are the major components in housing costs. This government is clearly on record as supporting the private market price.

HOME lots must go on the market at the market price to protect the private sector. Now that we're selling off the land across the province, the price is total market price. The government says with pride, and I heard them in this House the other day, we should be able to make a buck. Mr. Speaker, I say to you not at the expense of inflated housing prices to people in the province of Ontario, and not if it's simply designed to shore up and guarantee the speculator's profit in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Martel: That's what it's all about.

Mr. Mackenzie: Another issue which this government runs from is the problem of disappearing farm land. I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that it's an issue that greatly concerns thoughtful city dwellers as well as the farmers in our province. Furthermore, there's an understanding that surprises you, when you get around, of the need to make provisions for the farmer and the equity he has built up in that farm when we talk about disappearing agricultural land. Once again, rather than address itself to that question so that we can get the co-operation of all in taking action to preserve our farm land, this government hides its head in the sand. It would be hard to convince any of my constituents, that there is any such thing as a Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations involved in consumer protection, whether it is jumps in automobile insurance costs from those friendly companies which want to free private enterprise so they can charge even more—

Mr. Martel: They want to free the vultures.

Mr. Mackenzie: —or whether it's the diabetic who has just had his made-in-Canada Connaught Laboratories insulin vial jump from $3.60 to $4.60. So much for price controls in this province.

In the east end of Hamilton there has long been a need for some type of community hospital. The case was well argued and documented by my predecessor in this House, Reg Gisborn. My colleague, the mem-

ber for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) has continued the request. A previous Minister of Health in this House, a member of the Tory government, accepted the need and promised action in this field. What does this government do? It refers it to the health council for the umpteenth study. That's really progress; one step forward and three back.

My colleague the member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Davison) cites a blatant consumer ripoff by some of the income tax sharpies, and the minister responsible said it is not his responsibility. The Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) makes a big thing of banning Sunday shopping and then does nothing as loopholes in the law are exploited and the law is made to look like an ass.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to indicate improvement in the labour relations field in this province. Surely all of us recognize the need for improvement in the labour management sector if we are to improve production and better our chances on world markets.

Hon. B. Stephenson: How wrong can you be?

Mr. Mackenzie: And yes, I think the minister should not be quite so defensive. She seems to think she's the only one who has the answers and it's funny she's not relating with the rest of the people.

Mr. Shore: Who wrote it for you?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Mackenzie: The labour minister announced plans for new safety and health legislation, and in the first couple of weeks that we had the legislation the unions required mediation to find out if the bill really means what it says.

Hon. B. Stephenson: In one local.

Mr. Shore: Let whoever wrote it for you read it.

Mr. Mackenzie: Bargaining in good faith in this province—it's not just one local, Madam Minister.

Mr. Wildman: The Sault Ste. Marie local has the same problem.

Mr. Mackenzie: Bargaining in good faith continues to be a joke in labour circles and no amount of abuse brings any government initiative to improve the situation. As one example, let me cite the cement, lime and gypsum workers at the quarry in Aberfoyle.

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: You're too loud, you're going to wake some people up. You might learn something, Margaret.

Mr. Mackenzie: Nine months out of work, these 12 decent honest local citizens; the minister should go and talk to them. They made a desperate effort to achieve a first contract, trying for some continuity in their jobs so that they're not out of work as people are brought in from other areas in certain seasons of the year.

The issue is plain—job protection, union security, a first contract. Wages aren't even the issue. And what happens? We see a private security firm from Quebec come in, escort the scabs through the picket lines and work to break that strike after nine months.

Hon. B. Stephenson: We have one of the best mediators in Canada on that job right now; one of the best.

Mr. Mackenzie: There are very few things as despicable, Madam Minister, as a scab.

Mr. Conway: You will just have to resign.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No way; and let him take over?

Mr. Mackenzie: Stealing a man's job is about the lowest form—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Hamilton East has the floor.

Mr. Conway: Let Marvin take over.

Mr. Mackenzie: The examples I could go on to in this area are legion.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Oh no they are not.

Mr. Mackenzie: But I have to make one comment here. We talk about the efficiency of private enterprise. I wonder how one explains a group of strikebreakers, to begin with, at higher pay; plus eight outside security people brought in—boarded, and on long shifts escorting people in and out of that plant—from the province of Quebec; all to take away the jobs or break a union of 12 decent men. The costs on it just don't work out.

Mr. Shore: You've got to watch Quebeckers.

Mr. Mackenzie: We move to runaway plants, and I don't have the time—my time is nearly over—there are a number of them that I could deal with in this province—

Mr. Wildman: The member for London North is the Evel Knievel of the Legislature.

Mr. Mackenzie: They are current situations in runaway plants. The Ajax plastics plant is only one example where the workers are losing their benefits and their built-up seniority and pension plans over the years. Delays, costs and frustrations resulting from the current arbitration and conciliation procedures have been outlined for this government for years. Once again, there has been virtual inaction up to this point.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Workmen's Compensation Board we do have a disaster. I don't have time to go into it, but I'm sure we will get into that in this House. Most MPPs are loaded down with cases, virtually turned into social workers rather than legislators. I have over 175 cases myself in this field and I've turned an awful lot of them back to the unions.

Many claimants are forced onto municipal welfare rolls due to delays in receiving their money from the board. I've had to intercede with the local welfare authorities myself to try and get welfare while we argued about what's happening. And I want to make it clear that I'm talking about legitimate claims.

Mr. Shore: Certainly.

Mr. Mackenzie: There is a management problem; there's an administration problem; paper work abounds. Delays, lost files, inadequate rehab programmes, are daily problems of the members. The minister's response seems to be petulant, arrogant defiance. She certainly doesn't admit there's anything wrong with the board and she says in effect the problem does not exist: "If you have problems, just give them to me."

After hearing some of the answers from the minister, I want to tell her I wouldn't turn over a single one of my cases to her; I wouldn't trust the results.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I wouldn't turn over a dog fight to you.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Here, here now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The point about trusting a minister, that's getting unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: What point of order have you got?

Hon. Mr. Welch: That language is unfortunate.

An hon. member: The member for Sudbury East wouldn't know the difference.

An hon. member: Throw him out.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: Well, maybe you should have been in here when the minister made her speech and her remarks about the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Members can make points without impugning the character of the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister and the member take their seats.

Mr. Shore: How are you feeling, Elie, all right?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I just point out that I did not hear what remarks were made because I was otherwise engaged.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Shame.

Mr. Martel: Shame? Read her speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is over the time which was allotted to him.

Mr. Shore: He hasn't got anything to say; it doesn't matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It was my understanding that the time left was supposed to be used by this member but I understand now there is also another member who would like to make a contribution for two or three minutes if you would bring your remarks to a close.

Mr. Martel: Well, the government House leader came in here and interfered.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Right is right.

Mr. Mackenzie: Really, I would not turn one of my cases over to that minister.

An hon. member: Throw him out!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting valuable time.

Mr. Mackenzie: The people of Ontario are looking for some positive and innovative leadership. They want a government that will respond to their needs in this province. People don't want a radical revolution. They are not interested in ideological dogma. They do want a government of common sense. They want nothing more than a fair and honest break. The Tories in this province seem in-

capable of such fair and honest government, and probably the sooner they go to the people the better.

Mr. Good: There are two short items pertaining to budget paper E and the Blair commission's report that I would like to make reference to, Mr. Speaker.

First, I feel that non-profit and charitable organizations which properly qualify under a laid-down standard of rules should be exempt from property tax. The proposal to remove this exemption will only serve to erode the viability of the voluntary sector. Voluntary organizations play a valuable and irreplaceable role in community life, helping people to help themselves, fostering and supporting an attitude of self-reliance and of community spirit. If these organizations are subject to property tax, much of the time and energy volunteers now devote directly to community services will have to be diverted to fund-raising activities. This is not only a waste of valuable human resources, but it may also serve to erode the base of volunteer support, as many feel they will no longer be working to provide services but to pay taxes.

Services that will have to be curtailed by voluntary organizations will to some extent have to be replaced by government. Government activity is unlikely to cover the same range of services and will most certainly cost the taxpayers more than the cost of preserving the tax exemption. But, perhaps most important, government intervention will undermine the vital sense of community participation and self-determination.

The government proposals suggest that the municipality could then decide which, if any, of these organizations should receive grants to help to offset their municipal taxes. Under the proposals, certain properties would be reclassified. Because of this, non-profit organizations such as the YMCA, YWCA, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides and the Rotary Crippled Children's Centre, would pay taxes on 100 per cent of market value, while those non-profit organizations such as Huronia Hall and Senior Citizens Home Apartments would pay 50 per cent.

A recent study has indicated that charitable organizations without completely offsetting rents would have a negative consequence. The proposal would stifle the development and growth of non-profit organizations, and community spirit and unity would be dampened. The study foresaw the elimination of non-profit agencies and the replacement of these services by government or the private sector. Assistance of some kind is seen as necessary, this study has suggested, and municipal grants equal to taxation would eliminate the problem. I am sure it would, Mr. Speaker, however, we have no guarantee that municipal councils or the exemption review committee, as proposed by the Blair commission, would come to an agreement that all currently exempt charitable organizations should receive grants or that they were offering valuable service.

I think the present system of exemption from property tax is much simpler and is not open to political interference. The exemption of these properties does, in fact, mean that their tax load is paid by the community at large. A small price, I say; and I suggest it be shared by all residents of the community.

Mr. Speaker: May I point out to the hon. member that it is 6 o'clock?

Mr. Good: I'm sorry. My watch must be in error. Thank you.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 544.)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

22. Mr. Makarchuk—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Ministry of Revenue give the reason and table all supporting evidence and correspondence related to the granting of a land speculation tax exemption to Lynden Hill Farms Limited, of R.R. No. 6, Brantford on the sale for $4 million of parts of lots 40 and 41 in the county of Brant? The file number of the lien clearance certificate is 33-014234. Tabled April 4, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener):

No exemption was granted under The Land Speculation Tax Act, 1974 in respect to the sale of the designated land by Lynden Hill Farms Limited.

The registration of a lien clearance certificate is no evidence of exemption. Lynden Hill Farms Limited remains liable for any tax payable.

The Land Speculation Tax Act, like other tax statutes, prohibits the communication by any person of any information obtained for the purposes of administering the Act.

23. Mr. Angus—Inquiry of the ministry: Would the Minister of Natural Resources list each provincial park campground and indicate total capital expenditures in the last 10 years for each campground; the number of staff normally employed; the normal yearly operating costs; and the distance to the nearest private campground? Tabled April 4, 1977.

Answer by the Ministry of Natural Resources:

	Capital expenditures from 1967-68 to 1976-77	No. of staff employed July-August, 1976	Operating costs 1976-77[1]	Distance (miles) to nearest private campground
	$		$	
Aaron	87,322	9	44,700	Less than 1 mile
Algonquin	2,260,556	200	1,198,000	5
Antoine	15,518	2	6,264	7
Arrowhead	613,913	18	95,000	2
Balsam Lake	816,596	45	146,000	9
Bass Lake	347,496	19	85,000	15
Blacksand	116,023	9	47,294	10
Blue Lake	208,455	12	57,750	7
Bon Echo	278,245	55	263,712	6
Bonnechere	73,103	7	38,000	5
Caliper Lake	269,531	5	41,000	5
Carillon	1,075,874	37	160,000	13
Carson Lake	22,940	3	12,000	1
Charleston Lake	851,781	25	132,000	5
Chutes	16 ,911	10	56,751	Less than 1 mile
Craigleith	60,050	11	72,900	1
Cyprus Lake	529,519	23	131,900	7
Darlington	367,143	29	110,500	15
Devil's Glen	5,633	2	14,000	2
Driftwood	72,120	6	22,000	2
Earl Rowe	1,300,321	46	200,000	5
Emily	327,197	24	97,000	5
Esker Lakes	314,676	10	59,000	18
Fairbanks	263,496	14	53,602	12
Ferris	562,953	11	52,000	6
Finlayson Point	122,650	8	56,581	6
Fitzroy	463,619	24	89,000	12
Five Mile Lake	59,076	4	29,000	3
Fushimi	261,050	5	33,000	25

	Capital expenditures from 1968-68 to 1976-77	No. of staff employed July-August, 1976	Operating costs 1976-77[1]	Distance (miles) to nearest private campground
	$		$	
Greenwater	293,710	5	29,000	21
Grundy Lake	478,737	50	170,000	2
Halfway Lake	820,082	14	48,730	20
Holiday Beach	187,968	21	130,000	2
Ipperwash	520,158	25	153,000	1
Iroquis Beach	355,714	21	110,400	3
Ivanhoe	315,052	9	55,000	1
Kakabeka Falls	437,042	22	98,995	1
Kap-Kig-Iwan	255,163	8	44,000	26
Kettle Lakes	358,553	11	65,000	5
Killarney	124,262	15	70,802	6
Killbear	1,105,968	65	220,000	2
Klotz Lake	50,520	3	17,114	1
Lake of the Woods	91,775	5	40,300	12
Lake St. Peter	58,573	6	30,000	1
Lake Superior	439,508	35	237,000	8
Long Point	194,834	24	136,000	12
MacGregor Point	2,940,609	20	91,400	2
MacLeod	115,940	6	37,665	14
Mara	107,606	19	62,500	4
Marten River	635,891	15	83,416	Less than 1 mile
Middle Falls	6,514	4	14,360	40
Mikisew	124,611	12	60,000	10
Missinaibi	89,457	4	27,000	58
Mississagi	206,687	8	63,885	11
McRae Point	691,329	19	76,500	4
Nagagmisis	276,530	9	57,000	23
Neys	48,430	13	54,856	16
Oastler Lake	171,440	12	50,000	2
Obatanga	279,225	12	61,166	5
Ojibway	219,686	8	41,900	12
Outlet Beach	375,340	54	210,000	Less than 1 mile
Pakwash	82,377	8	26,400	5
Pancake Bay	289,712	15	97,572	14
Pinery	2,027,965	116	480,000	Less than 1 mile
Point Farms	456,107	21	105,500	11
Presqu'ile	567,570	44	185,000	7
Quetico	567,405	17	101,206	12
Rainbow Falls	239,417	18	66,397	3
Remi Lake	459,488	11	59,000	4
Restoule	622,013	13	95,521	3
Rideau River	172,817	22	82,000	9
Rock Point	679,970	15	63,500	3
Rondeau	497,712	53	293,000	2
Rushing River	296,710	16	85,500	6
Samuel de Champlain	387,297	13	84,414	7
Sandbanks	47,377	10	70,000	Less than 1 mile
Sandbar	341,768	7	39,300	7
Sauble Falls	100,712	12	73,300	Less than 1 mile
Selkirk	179,027	17	95,000	10
Serpent Mounds	220,320	20	95,000	Less than 1 mile
Sharbot Lake	250,502	12	59,700	6
Sibbald Point	742,032	60	260,000	6
Sibley	150,672	19	99,400	22
Silent Lake	1,235,192	10	60,000	4

	Capital expenditures from 1967-68 to 1976-77	No. of staff employed July-August, 1976	Operating costs 1976-77[1]	Distance (miles) to nearest private campground
Silver Lake	89,682	11	64,600	3
Sioux Narrows	140,739	6	43,300	3
Six Mile Lake	101,830	21	100,000	8
South Nation	18,953	3	17,000	Less than 1 mile
The Shoals	168,391	5	32,000	14
Tidewater	115,791	3	17,000	186
Turkey Point	260,746	19	134,000	11
Wakami	90,930	6	35,000	26
Wheatley	255,611	24	154,000	1
White Lake	555,010	15	92,655	4
Windy Lake	178,671	14	51,829	10
Inwood[2]	37,940	Under concession	3,545	1
Sturgeon Bay[2]	113,402	Under concession	9,635	4

[1] 1976-77 operating costs do not include the cost for permanent staff salaries which equals about $2,000,000 for the entire parks system.

[2] In 1976-77, these two parks were privately operated by concession agreement; the figures for ministry expenses are for pre- and post-season operating and maintenance only; the majority of the operating costs were borne by the concessionaire.

24. Mr. Cassidy—Inquiry of the ministry: What was the total amount paid as earnings to the Premier's chauffeur for the fiscal years 1973-1974 to the present? For each of these years, what amount was paid for this chauffeur as: (a) basic salary; (b) overtime payments; (c) clothing allowance; (d) meal allowance; (e) other allowances; (f) expenses? Tabled April 4, 1977.

Answer by the Office of the Premier:

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Fiscal year	Salary	Overtime	Clothing	Meals	Other (Accommodation, motels, etc.)	Expenses (Toll charges, ferry fares, gas purchases, gratuities)
	$	$	$	$	$	$
1973-74	12,351.96	Nil	413.02	809.78	Nil	57.33
1974-75	14,256.61	Nil	374.50	941.90	109.30	46.75
1975-76	15,369.85	Nil	723.75	969.35	274.96	67.00
1976-77	18,224.30	Nil	278.20	925.93	462.95	130.47

CONTENTS

Monday, April 18, 1977

Rental housing, statement by Mr. Rhodes 525

Management consulting services division, statement by Mr. Auld 526

Women crown employees, statement by Mr. Auld 526

French-language instruction, statement by Mr. Wells 527

French-language instruction, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. S. Smith Mr. Breithaupt 529

Rental housing, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Breaugh 531

Lake pollution, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Lewis 533

Energy conservation, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Peterson 534

Women crown employees, question of Mr. Auld: Ms. Bryden 536

Radial tires, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Stong 536

Workmen's compensation, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Martel 537

Children's services, question of Mr. Norton: Mrs. Campbell 537

North Pickering project, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Godfrey 537

Rockwell International, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. B. Newman 538

Candidate's conduct, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy 539

Niagara centre for youth care, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Kerrio 539

Algonquin Park, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Conway, Mr. Eakins 540

Drug publications, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Swart, Mr. Conway 540

Ambulance services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Nixon 542

Highway extension, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Wildman 542

Waterloo Electrical Service Areas Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 543

Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 543

Guelph Sesquicentennial, Mr. Worton, Mr. Davis, Mr. Deans, Mr. S. Smith 543

Tabling answers to written questions No. 22, 23 and 24, Mr. Welch 544

Throne Speech debate, continued, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Swart, Mr. MacBeth, Mr. MacDonald, B. Stephenson, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Good 544

Recess 572

Appendix, answers to written questions 573

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Auld, Hon. J. A. C., Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Brunelle, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Edighoffer, H.; Acting Speaker (Perth L)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)

Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B.; (Algoma NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)



No. 15

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Monday, April 18, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(concluded)

Mr. Breithaupt: As I gaze about this crowded chamber, Mr. Speaker, I certainly realize, of course, what an honour and privilege it is to wind up this Throne Speech debate on the part of the Liberal Party. I recognize that to a very great extent the contribution which I may make and that of my counterpart, the House leader for the New Democratic Party, the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans), are likely to be regarded as little more than a prelude to the big event of the evening, namely the windup—or should I call the wind up—speech of the Premier (Mr. Davis). It will be interesting to see how Hansard delineates the difference between the two phrases.

One wonders, indeed, if there is some significance to the fact that the Premier has elected to be the grand finale, so to speak, of the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I am sure the three government members who are present will pass on to the Premier my views with respect to the contributions he has made in the past.

Mr. Eakins: Let's put it on the record.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You can count on me, Jim; others wouldn't.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now that we have had a member cross the floor, they are up to four, of course; but I presume that the benches may indeed be somewhat more crowded as the witching hour of 9:30 draws nigh.

Mr. Angus: Watch it; here comes the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Breithaupt: Last year, the Premier was content to make his contribution early in the debate but, of course, he was in a somewhat more cautious mood at that time.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thanks to you guys.

Mr. Breithaupt: He was anxious not to be provocative; at least that was what he constantly assured us.

This year the situation is a little different, and I have the distinct feeling we can expect considerable provocation from the Premier later this evening—a provocation which doubtless will be exacerbated by his colleague, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) tomorrow.

It is almost amusing to watch the manoeuvring that is going on. According to the political pundits, the Premier is being pressured to go to the electorate; and, of course, why not? The Gallup polls indicate, shall we say, a slight rise in Conservative popularity? All indications point, unfortunately, to the economy and unemployment situation being likely somewhat worse as the year moves on before it begins to improve.

Mr. Spence: It's terrible.

Mr. Breithaupt: Also, the provincial government is finding it increasingly difficult to cope with the results of its own fiscal mismanagement.

Mr. Spence: I would think so.

Mr. Breithaupt: On the other hand, surveys show that for the most part the general public considers minority government is working well and that there is apparently no valid reason for an election at this time. Against this background, we have the Premier anxious not to be seen as pulling the plug to cause an election. We see the leader of the New Democratic Party, the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Lewis), saying of the Throne Speech: "This is great. Minority government is working and there's not one thing in that document that inspires anger in my heart." He undertakes that the official opposition would be positive models of co-operation, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Liberal Party, of course, are being reasonable, responsible and constructive.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And scared to death.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Premier, therefore, is on the horns of a dilemma: how to precipitate an election without appearing to do so. It will be fascinating to watch his endeavours to achieve them. Then, of course, the Premier's unique brand of convolutions and

contortions, both mental and verbal, are a never-ending source of fascination to us all.

Mr. Nixon: And amusement.

Mr. Breithaupt: However, perhaps he should bear in mind—

Interjection.

Mr. Breithaupt: —the words of his colleague, the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel (Mr. Johnson) when that worthy gentleman seconded the Speech from the Throne. He exhorted us to remember, and I quote: "At a time of such economic uncertainty, a time when the definition of our nation is being questioned, we would serve our constituents best by solving problems, rather than engaging in political rhetoric or partisan grandstanding."

Mr. Eakins: That's right.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Throne Speech has been interpreted by many people as an indication that minority government is working and working well. It incorporated a response to almost every issue raised since the last election by opposition parties, maintaining that, and I quote: "With dependable legislative co-operation the government's programme can be achieved by the end of the present year." I might add, of course, an election notwithstanding.

If legislative co-operation is the only requirement, then that would be fine. However, as a Toronto Star editorial on March 30, pointed out, most of the problems to which the Throne Speech purports to offer solutions have been "with us throughout the 30 years Tory governments reigned supreme at Queen's Park."

Mr. Haggerty: Shame.

An hon. member: Bring them down.

Mr. Breithaupt: "Promises to solve them all now invite a certain amount of scepticism."

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you for the big hand.

Mr. Eakins: You're the only one here to receive them.

Mr. Breithaupt: The same editorial also stresses the fact that the Premier, and I quote, "even if he had a secure majority, couldn't hope to get this amount of legislation through a full four-year term of office, let alone the single session the Throne Speech is supposed to deal with."

Mr. Eakins: That's right.

Mr. Breithaupt: Typical of Throne Speeches, this latest edition provides no specifics, only generalities. We need to know how the proposed measures are to be administered, what are the costs involved, and whether the government seriously intends to implement the proposals, or whether the whole speech is just so much pie in the sky—a veritable election platform, in fact. As an unregenerate sceptic, I prefer to reserve judgement at least until tomorrow's budget.

The final paragraphs of the Throne Speech show a remarkable degree of poetic licence. They spoke of "building a sense of promise and of national pride, of a fair and balanced society and of economic stability, of distributing economic opportunity fairly throughout Ontario."

We were informed that the "government's programme provides for every Ontarian the opportunity to live in freedom, work in peace and attain self-fulfilment and satisfaction. It assures our people that their Ontario, our Ontario, affords them the capacity to shape their own particular and unique part of the Canadian dream in confidence, security and freedom."

I suggest the government tell that to the 300,000 men and women in Ontario who are unemployed, tell that to the overburdened taxpayers of this province, and tell it to the people struggling to meet rapidly rising energy costs from an already overstrained budget.

On the subject of current unemployment figures, the Ontario Economic Council has issued a stern warning that this province faces above-average unemployment through the next decade. Projections by the council for the next five years show an unemployment rate of 7.1 per cent on average from 1978 through 1982, compared with 4.2 per cent from 1968 to 1972 and only 3.6 per cent in 1966. The council has recommended tax cuts, especially personal tax cuts, and reductions in sales and excise taxes and more vigorous manpower policies to match people and jobs. Continued restraint in government spending is also recommended.

This serious unemployment situation has not come about overnight. Last December we all witnessed a good deal of publicity, pomp and circumstance in connection with the Treasurer's so-called economic strategy statement. At that time, my colleague, the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson), called upon the government to take into account Conference Board predictions that

our unemployment problem in Ontario would be very serious for the coming year, that is, 1977. We stressed the fact that this province's predicted increase in unemployment was higher than the national average and that we were already at that time running at 6.3 per cent compared with 5.8 per cent previously.

We asked at that time whatever had happened to those 116,000 new jobs that the Treasurer promised in his budget of April 1976. How does the Treasurer justify job vacancy rates for Ontario throughout the last half of last year which were not only lower than the national rate, but much less than half the rate of the prairie region—that is, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta combined? Is the Treasurer prepared to permit Ontario to continue to lag behind the prairie provinces in job creation?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Breithaupt: Does this government really have no concern over the eight per cent of our work force which is unemployed—the 316,000 and more men and women who cannot find jobs in this province of opportunity? As George Radwanski of the Financial Times pointed out on March 28, this serious unemployment situation "carries a number of consequences. In the first place, it isolates one of the most basic objectives of a free, prosperous society to give every willing citizen the opportunity to pursue gainful employment commensurate with his abilities. Without that opportunity, many other freedoms mean little."

Mr. Nixon: And the Tories don't care. There's just one cabinet minister present, and he's on the way out.

Mr. Peterson: He's a junior one anyway.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And that is coming from a guy who knows what it's like to go out.

Mr. Nixon: He's even a retreaded Liberal.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Kitchener has the floor.

Mr. Breithaupt: Our free enterprise system cannot exist without opportunities for individual initiative and achievement, opportunities that begin with a job. The average worker in Canada produces something like $19,000 annually in goods and services. With 316,000 and more unemployed, we in Ontario are losing more than $6 billion in badly needed economic growth this year. It is totally inconsistent in our democratic free-enterprise beliefs to suggest than an eight per cent unemployment rate is an acceptable price to pay in the fight against inflation. The Treasurer, it would seem, does not find this rate unacceptable.

Mr. Eakins: He doesn't care.

Mr. Nixon: He's not even here to listen.

Mr. Breithaupt: May I remind him of his 1972 budget statement when he told us: "Any unemployment figure in excess of three per cent is not acceptable to the Ontario government. We know from experience that the Ontario economy can operate successfully at that level."

Mr. B. Newman: Who said that?

Mr. Peterson: Why, the member for Wentworth could employ three barbers himself.

Mr. Breithaupt: If the Ontario economy could work successfully at the level of three per cent, then it must be clear, to use the phrase of those bumper stickers, unemployment is not working, that the Ontario economy is being mismanaged.

Our young people are particularly hard hit by the unemployment situation. This province's unemployment rate among workers under 25 years of age is 14.8 per cent. Among those under 20, it's 19 per cent. There are 143,000 young Ontarians who cannot find work. As my leader pointed out in his contribution to the Throne Speech debate, this youth unemployment figure is equivalent to the combined populations of two communities close to the hearts of most Conservatives in this province, the two communities of Brampton and Chatham.

Mr. Nixon: Here's the Minister of Lotteries. That's the second minister.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I was here at 8 o'clock. Where were you?

Mr. Breithaupt: Statisticians tell us that young people will be coming into the work force faster than the economy expands until the mid-1980s.

Mr. Nixon: You don't have much staying power.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I was just looking after my responsibilities.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Canadian Council for Social Development has warned that Canada could be faced with a politically and economically explosive situation if nothing is

done to ease the severe rate of unemployment among our young people.

[8:15]

This council recently deplored the haphazard manner in which governments have dealt with the problem and the, "prevailing public attitude which ranges from one of indifference and apathy to blaming youth themselves." We cannot write off these unemployed young people as the price of fighting inflation. We cannot abandon them. We cannot and we shall not do so.

Mr. Nixon: Trudeau has the answer to that.

Mr. Breithaupt: For young people, special measures and new approaches are required to create jobs.

As a recent Toronto Star article pointed out, and I quote: "Unemployment among our young people can no longer be regarded simply a part of a larger unemployment picture. It's a new ailment, chronic and intransigent in nature, requiring special treatment."

New and dramatic structural changes to our economy must be initiated in order to facilitate entry into the labour force of our young people. We propose the establishment of an Ontario youth service with the objective of generating employment for young people in both the public and private sectors. One proposal already mentioned by our leader is to supplement unemployment insurance benefits now received by unemployed youth.

The federal government has already shown interest in greater flexibility for UIC funds and is now participating in a job-creating programme in Newfoundland which Ontario would do well to study carefully. A supplement of $10 per week could create 100,000 jobs for the overall price of some $50 million. A home insulation programme would enable homeowners to insulate for the cost of materials only. The Ontario youth service, under proper direction, could provide some of that labour. By upgrading Ontario's housing stock to 1975 federal standards, we could reduce consumers' fuel bills by some 36 per cent and reduce our energy consumption for an annual saving of some $412 million at 1977 prices.

Provision of in-home services for elderly people in our society would enable them to continue living independent lives outside of institutions. The potential cost saving for government is enormous. The Ontario youth services would assist elderly residents with home maintenance, cleaning, meal preparation and shopping, at the same time providing companionship to many who are tragically lonely.

Mr. Nixon: It sounds good to me.

Mr. Breithaupt: To create jobs for our young people in the private sector, the Ontario youth service would pay a portion of the salaries for young people who are hired by industry as trainees or apprentices.

Hon. Mr. Welch: They could come and visit me.

Mr. Peterson: You're going to need someone to visit you after the next election.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I'd be grateful.

Mr. Breithaupt: This measure would be of particular assistance to small businesses. Funds for such programmes are available from the federal government but we are now seeing that they are being channelled primarily into community colleges for institutional training.

Mr. Nixon: The federal government takes the lead again.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Ontario youth service would reorient our efforts to emphasize our on-the-job training in co-operation with Canada Manpower.

Mr. Hodgson: Somebody has got to take the lead, Bob.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Ontario youth service would also undertake to substantially upgrade the vocational counselling provided to students, particularly in high school. At present, students are provided with almost no information on trades in demand, rates of pay or methods of application. Despite the very clear predictions of our over supply several years ago, hundreds of students were steered into nursing schools and teachers' colleges, and even worse, far more than could be employed were accepted, trained and graduated with unmarketable skills.

Mr. Nixon: Totally irresponsible.

Mr. Breithaupt: An overwhelming majority of our unemployed youth want to work. We must provide them with the job opportunities before their frustration erupts in violence or they turn on our economic system in a manner of a graduate—

Hon. Mr. Welch: What are you, the straight man over there Bob?

Mr. Breithaupt: —from Carlton who said, and I quote: "For the first time in my life I'd be willing to go on unemployment insurance because I think this terrible situation is the government's fault."

Mr. Hodgson: Join the NDP tonight, Bob.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Liberal Party has long advocated increased assistance to the small business sector which is labour-intensive and can create new jobs more quickly and cheaply than capital-intensive industries. I'm sure that the 10 Conservative members who are here at the present time have spent some time considering the policy—

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is getting better.

Mr. Nixon: It is only eight.

Mr. Breithaupt: —paper which we have issued outlining the position of our party in the field of small business, a sector which has been long neglected by the provincial government. The problems and needs of small and large businesses are clearly not the same. A small business is flexible, able to adapt quickly to—

Mr. Nixon: You're a mobile cabinet minister.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Some of us count as two.

Mr. Breithaupt: —changes in the market and possesses great potential for technological and other innovation, and it also employs between 50 and 60 per cent of all Canadians. We believe that a legislative commitment to small business should be undertaken, similarly to the American commitment entered into by the federal government of that nation.

Lack of managerial expertise and entrepreneurial spirit have had serious results to the viability of small business. We have proposed the establishment of entrepreneurial advisory centres to be funded by the government and administered by the private sector. Shortage of capital also severely restricts the start-up and expansion of small business. We propose allowance for a full tax deduction against other income for investment in venture capital for small business start-ups and expansion by both corporations and individuals and also for the provision of government services in sharing of losses actually experienced by the financial institutions on loans provided to small business.

Mr. Nixon: Here comes the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman), number three from the bottom.

Mr. Mancini: He was in my riding and he got seven people out to a meeting.

Mr. Ruston: Were there only seven people out to that meeting?

Mr. Nixon: Did he only get seven in Essex?

Mr. Breithaupt: I must say in response to that comment that I am not doing all that much better.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, yes, you are.

Mr. Breithaupt: At present, the burden of payroll taxes to pay the increasing costs of social welfare programmes falls most heavily on small firms. There are no income compensating public policies to offset this grave problem—

Mr. Nixon: None at all.

Mr. Breithaupt: —which in turn restricts capital formation and therefore the ability to finance growth.

Mr. Nixon: They are pouring in. Here comes number four.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener has the floor only.

Mr. Breithaupt: We have proposed government payment of payroll taxes for each additional worker employed by a firm in a given year up to a net gain in manpower of 10 persons for a three-year period. Corporate tax costs of small businesses should be lowered to ensure their ability to develop internally generated sources of equity capital. A forgivable succession duty on small family business corporations could be extended to apply to businesses where shares are owned by more than one family. We also believe Ontario should undertake a preferential purchasing policy for small business. It should be possible to set a target of 40 per cent of all government contracts and sub-contracts to be awarded to small business within a three-year period. Another potential for job creation is the province's mining industry which has suffered a serious decline under the short-sighted policies of this government.

Mr. Nixon: Ever since John White.

Mr. Breithaupt: We should be able to depend upon the mining industry to create new wealth and new jobs. However, as the Northern Miner noted recently, "Ontario mining is heading for an eventual decline unless there is a marked change in the province's investment climate and policy to-

wards high-risk exploration ventures." The Ontario metal mining industry provides jobs for about 40,000 people directly and for many more indirectly, and produces directly about three to four per cent of the gross provincial product. But now, for the first time since World War II, no major new mines are under construction.

Mr. Nixon: Shame.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are no new mine openings scheduled for anywhere in Ontario in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Nixon: John White's legacy.

Mr. Breithaupt: The present Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), formerly the Minister of Natural Disasters—Natural Resources—

Mr. Peterson: That's good-quality humour for a change.

Mr. Breithaupt: —was of a view that the reason no mines are opening within the province of Ontario was because of the socialist hordes being at the gate. Perhaps in his new position he will have a chance to think that through again. Ontario's mining industries are in the fifth year of a slump and, according to a report prepared by the mines division of the Ministry of Natural Resources, the industry is continuing to decline. That report found that an early warning indication of the health of the metal mining industry is the level of exploration activity. According to this indicator, Ontario can anticipate a continuing decline.

Mr. Nixon: Unless of course there is a change in government.

Mr. Breithaupt: That could be a possibility, of course. Exploration expenditures in Ontario during the 1972-1976 period were about $15 million per year, down substantially from the annual average of $23 million in the 1967 to 1971 period.

Interjections.

Mr. Breithaupt: I hope I am not keeping you from anything. No discovery leading to probable new mine construction has been made in Ontario since 1971.

Mr. Nixon: That was the last year of John Robarts.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tell us about the last year of Mitch Hepburn.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's correct. Many of the remedies for our ailing mining industry are within the jurisdiction of Ontario's government.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Housing was still a Liberal.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) was still a Tory.

Mr. Breithaupt: In order to restore health to this vital sector of our economy and to create jobs, the government should, first of all, revise its mining taxes to make the expected rate of return more attractive in relation to alternative investment opportunities. Ontario's mining taxes and the revisions in 1974 resulted in more than a tripling of revenues from mines, even though profits from the industry dropped by about 40 per cent.

They should immediately modify the junior exploration company financing policy of the Ontario Securities Commission. The OSC policy, issued last April, has all but eliminated the raising of risk capital for mining exploration. Clearly, the restrictive regulations are causing more harm to legitimate operations and to our economy as a whole than they are to dishonest penny stock promoters.

Mr. Nixon: If only James Dunn were here.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Sir James Dunn. Show a little respect.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Liberal leader raised questions on the matter in this place last fall, and my colleague from Rainy River (Mr. Reid) expressed, as early as last May, his concern about the restrictive nature of this policy. Finally, the OSC says it is considering a policy change.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He mentioned it to his brother, John.

Mr. Breithaupt: In response to the Minister of Housing, I'm sure his mentioning of that policy to his brother, the federal member for the riding, will have done a lot more than in fact any mention to this government would have done.

Mr. Nixon: Because this government doesn't care about northern development. It's going to be wiped out in the north.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Kitchener can make his own speech, I think. You may continue.

Interjections.

Mr. Breithaupt: As the song says, Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate a little help from my friends.

Mr. Speaker: I'm not sure you'd call it help, but the hon. member has the floor.

An hon. member: Just waiting for the crowd to gather.

Mr. Breithaupt: The unemployment problem will clearly continue to worsen unless fast and effective action is taken to stimulate the economy. In this connection, I must confess I was quite disappointed in the federal budget. I agree with our leader's view that the budget failed to meet the most important economic challenge in Canada and in Ontario—the urgent need for job creation.

An hon. member: You'd make a good federalist.

Mr. Breithaupt: The provincial Treasurer may consider such a budget to be honest medicine, as he terms it. But I would venture to suggest that this country's present, vast army of unemployed will find it a very unpalatable medicine, indeed. Doubtless, in an attempt to appear humane and concerned, he at least unbent sufficiently to say, and I quote, "These are not happy times for the economy. Some of our citizens are experiencing real hardship." End of quote.

I suggest that was rather a masterpiece of understatement, but the Treasurer has praised the federal budget and indicated his own main objective was "to be supportive of overall federal leadership". Well, I agree with the Toronto Star; it's some change of attitude for the provincial Treasurer, who only a year ago was proudly recounting how he had acted to stimulate the Ontario economy against Ottwa's inadequate budgets of 1974 and 1975. Now he tells us we cannot further increase aggregate spending without crowding capital pools, fuelling inflationary expectations and, of increasing importance, burdening the independence and incomes of future generations with massive debt. If there's anyone who knows about massive debt, it's surely the Premier and the Treasurer of this province.

Mr. Nixon: Disgraceful.

Mr. Breithaupt: Those who like to follow the provincial Treasurer's activities have had considerable grist for their mills recently. I was interested to note that a month or so ago he told Ontario realtors that the province could soon be experiencing the biggest demand for housing in its history. Three main reasons that he cited were that housing prices had stopped outstripping gains in income, that mortgage rates have dropped, and that property taxes have been held down by municipal restraint and by generous provincial grants.

Mr. Nixon: Why is Darcy McKeough making all these speeches?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Why is the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk trying to make one?

Mr. Nixon: Will you stop interjecting, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Breithaupt: One wonders why this latter statement would seem to be a little unrealistic, to say the least. However, I won't allow myself to be diverted at this point. I wish to concentrate upon the general statement that there will be an enormous demand for housing. The question is, of course—is the demand going to be met by supply? I'm delighted that the Minister of Housing is among those present this evening.

Mr. Nixon: He was here from the start.

Mr. Breithaupt: For some time there has been a crying need for affordable housing in this province. A study of housing requirements for Ontario shows that demand for new housing will remain at high levels for the next 10 years, averaging some 88,000 units annually through 1981. Yet housing starts in Ontario have declined from 110,536 in 1973 to 79,968 in 1975. The preliminary statistics for 1976 indicate total housing starts in urban Ontario in 1976 increased by only four per cent over the previous year, while total housing starts in urban Canada as a whole increased by some 15 per cent.

[8:30]

Mr. Nixon: Another Ontario failure.

Mr. Eaton: How far were they behind us before that, though?

Mr. Breithaupt: In examining our housing needs, we must consider the age and other characteristics of our population. According to various population studies, the most significant factor causing an increase in the number of households will be the fact that the post-war baby boom generation will reach the prime ages of family formation between 1971 and 1986. Ontario government projections show there will be an increase of more than a million persons in the 25 to 44 age group in those years. Virtually everyone is aware of the tremendous rise in the cost

of housing over the past few years. The price of housing has been rising more rapidly than personal disposable income or than the general price level.

Mr. Nixon: A tragedy.

Mr. Breithaupt: The cost of the average resale home in Ontario increased from $25,784 in 1970 to about $52,612 in 1976. In 1961, 69 per cent of all Ontario families could finance the purchase of the average Ontario resale home sold through a real estate broker and still spend less than the recommended one-quarter of their gross income for principal and interest payments. In 1971, 58 per cent of families could finance the average resale house. But by 1974, only 29 per cent of families could afford to do so.

We in the Liberal Party consider a situation where a substantial majority of the working citizens of this province are unable to purchase a home should they wish to do so, and where a substantial number of tenants are paying crushing rents, to be simply intolerable. The government's record in either stimulating housing construction in the private sector or itself supplying government-assisted housing, is pitiable. Possibly the key to achievement of a reasonable price level for single-family lots is the establishment of a massive land-servicing programme in the environs of our cities, towns and villages. Instead of land-banking programmes, the government would be better advised to spend the same amount of money on the provision of water and sewage trunks and to streamline the subdivision approval process to encourage an oversupply of lots in the market.

In short, the provincial government would probably accomplish much more if it were to concentrate on the provision of more serviced land in co-operation with the municipalities, and reduce the red tape which slows down approvals and raises housing costs as developers hold land for an excessive length of time.

We must encourage reasonable expansion of communities which have already installed hard services and make adequate provision of soft services, instead of building new cities and towns. Standards should be made more flexible so that, for example, septic tanks can be used where conditions rule against sewers. Incentives should be provided to municipalities to encourage development of a variety of housing geared to the needs of poorer families and of senior citizens.

The Throne Speech promised to us that the government "will continue to increase the amount of rental housing for senior citizens and families of low income." We can only hope that it will not continue this process at the same pace as it has attempted to meet the need in the past.

Mr. Nixon: Housing for the whole cabinet.

Mr. Breithaupt: The leader of the official opposition put it rather well, I thought, when he reminded the House that before the Ministry of Housing was formed, we were building low-income family units in Ontario—socially assisted housing—at somewhere between 2,000 and 8,000 units per year. Then we created the Ministry of Housing in October 1973.

Mr. Nixon: The member for Brock was the first minister.

Mr. Singer: He discovered the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) at about that point.

Mr. Breithaupt: In 1974 we built 494 units of socially assisted family housing units—

Mr. Nixon: He ruined it.

Mr. Breithaupt: —in 1975 we built 474 units, and in 1976 we built 202 units for all of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: A disgrace.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Totally untrue.

Mr. Singer: Good for the Minister of Housing. He had one programme this afternoon.

Mr. Breithaupt: I am wondering if 1977 will see a continuing decline in this area.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Your research is as bad as theirs is; you depend on them. We know about your numbers.

Mr. Singer: Just for Metro.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We know about your numbers. We heard them last election.

Mr. Breithaupt: If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, at this point I would take this opportunity to draw your attention to the fact that a very senior member of our caucus has announced he will not be a candidate in the next general election. He has served the people of Kent and Elgin for 22 years—

Mr. Nixon: Very well.

Mr. Breithaupt: —from the days when a very small opposition—

[Applause]

Mr. Nixon: And he's going to change his mind.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, Mr. Speaker, he has—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Don't go, Jack. Come on back with the other small opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Have to join the Tories to do that.

Mr. Breithaupt: He has served the people of Kent and Elgin for 22 years from the days of a very small opposition, which at that time had the total accommodation in the area which is now known as the west lobby. His counsel and knowledge are matched by only a handful in this House. He is known, of course, to you as the hon. member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. Spence), but to those of us in the Liberal caucus, particularly, he will always be affectionately known as Uncle Jack.

[Applause]

Hon. W. Newman: And over here too.

An hon. member: Clap a little harder and we'll get him back.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The hon. member of the drainage committee. That is how I remember him.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, the membership of this House is currently divided into three parts, each of which represents a certain political party. There is, however, another division of members to which I would refer. There is the first group of 26 members who have been in the House since before 1967. There is a second group of some 19 who are in the class of that year. And finally, there is the group of 80 members who have come here in the years, really, since 1971.

Mr. Nixon: Johnny-come-latelys.

Mr. Breithaupt: The first group has had long and distinguished service dating back to 1948, as I see the dean of the House, the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) here tonight.

Mr. Nixon: I hear he's announced his retirement for the fifth consecutive time.

Mr. Eaton: He is going to run again.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: And he will win for the sixth.

Mr. Nixon: They can't find another live Tory down there.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's somewhat like Enrico Caruso taking all those farewell tours, year after year. But it's well received, I assure you.

That group numbers among its members, of course, the Premier and former leaders of both the New Democratic Party and of the Liberal Party. It includes many of the members of the cabinet and indeed includes the Speaker of the House. And that group remembers when this chamber was in use for only 10 or 12 weeks in each year in a short spring session. It remembers when being a member of the Ontario Legislature was very much a part-time occupation and a budget of less than $2 billion was dealt with.

The third group has come here within the lasts six years. In their interest and activity they represent a growing change in the style of political obligations for members in this province. They come from a much more mobile and demanding Ontario where each election is a new one, and where there are indeed very few safe seats.

Mr. Peterson: I don't trust young people in politics.

Mr. Nixon: Anybody under 40.

Mr. Breithaupt: Those of us, Mr. Speaker, who are in the class of '67, have now completed almost 10 years in this Legislature.

Mr. Nixon: Forty-five?

Mr. Breithaupt: And I believe that this group, of which I'm pleased to be a member, has a great opportunity to encourage the development of the institution as a real Legislature.

Perhaps more than the other two groups we have seen the most change in our years as the operations moved from those of a sort of super county council, to the full-time demands of being a member, active both in the House and its committees, as well as being involved in all sorts of problems and interests of the citizens, the groups, and the municipal bodies which one represents.

The reports of the Camp commission have been before this House and many of the recommendations of the five volumes have been acted upon. Most particularly, I would refer to a major recommendation which has not been accepted as yet. It was stressed by the select committee which was under the effective chairmanship of the dean of the House, the member for Ottawa West, and it was this, referred to on page 3 of their report:

"In the opinion of this committee, responsibility for the legislative building should be transferred to the Speaker. This would avoid the divided jurisdiction that currently creates problems, ensure that the legislative function has primacy in the building, and also ensure that future planning for the building will be carried out adequately, only under the direction of the Speaker. To avoid duplication, the Speaker should contract with the Ministry of Government Services for the operation and maintenance of the building; however, the direction of the building and the well-being of its employees and occupants must be the responsibility of the Speaker."

Mr. Speaker, we have seen many changes of rules, adopted last December, and we are coping with a new committee structure and with a time division for estimates. We have seen the first of the private members' balloted business moved to the committee stage. We also have a new method, through the Speaker's panel, of getting the private bills sorted out and on their way.

But it is with respect to the control of this building that I see the whole thing coming together. If we are really to be a Legislature, then this building must be under the Speaker's control. It must serve the members for office and library needs and it must be separate from the government of the day.

I have often wondered about the provincial government of this Ontario of ours over these past 34 years—

Mr. Conway: You are not alone in that.

Mr. Breithaupt: I have indeed pondered the reasons behind successive Conservative election victories since 1943—

Mr. Nixon: Completely irrational.

Mr. Breithaupt: —and I believe that I have found the secret. The secret came to me early this morning as I was putting out the garbage. I had one rather large blue bag—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: A collection of old speeches by Stuart.

Mr. Breithaupt: —which was filled with nourishing kitchen scraps, and indeed some contributions from our one-year-old daughter Jennifer Jane, which I will not further describe. There was, secondly, a large white bag that had in it certain government-vended non-refillable and non-returnable bottles. Since I had spent Saturday cleaning up the lawn there were in between 24 green bags full of leaves and twigs and other items that follow a long winter. It was the 24 bags that suddenly brought it all together.

Mr. Nixon: Poor bags.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You should mulch it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Green bags; there they were, dull looking, round and full, mindless and without any comprehension of their world, and they were perfectly interchangeable; and I thought of the present cabinet.

Mr. Nixon: Bette, are you going to stand for that?

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I thought on one hand of the Premier (Mr. Davis)—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are the poor man's Elmer Sopha.

Mr. Breithaupt: —and on the other hand of the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Auld), and I thought of the other 24 in between. How are they interchangeable? Well, they seem to be able, easily, to take and give bad advice, and they can certainly be moved around—

Mr. Singer: Interchangeably.

Mr. Breithaupt: —from one position to another, as musical chairs, or shall I say as musical green bags, as the last cabinet shuffle in February shows.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I didn't get moved.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for York East (Mr. Meen) learns more about Ronto than he perhaps wants to know and suddenly is moved from Revenue to Correctional Services.

Mr. Nixon: On his way out.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) finds that the lack of Sunday school attendance may not be the only reason for criminal activities and is moved from Correctional Services to Government Services.

Mr. Nixon: Right. Talk about a lateral move.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Don't knock it.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) looks for more civil servants to holler at and therefore is moved from Government Services to Revenue. Of course, if the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) gets his way she will also be moved from Toronto to Oshawa, but that is another story.

So we have three interchangeable green bags. But then we have another foursome I should refer to. First of all we have the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Taylor), showing his views of human needs and attitudes about welfare assistance were indeed suited to make him a member of the executive council; the only problem was that it was the executive council that advised Sir Francis Bond Head in 1937, to which his views would be more apt than they are in 1977. So he is moved from Community and Social Services to Energy.

Then the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell) is suddenly stunned by the energy mess in Ontario, and the rise of costs and the lack of provincial planning for 34 years, and he is suddenly moved to Health.

The member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller) has had a hard time closing rural hospitals and trying to come to grips with a monstrous budget that uses a third of our provincial funds so he goes from Health to Natural Resources. And then the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. Martel: What can be said?

Mr. Nixon: Whatever happened to him?

Mr. Breithaupt: For a man who should daily repent for the sins visited upon the native peoples in the English and Wabigoon River systems of this province he goes to a brand new ball game; he becomes the honorary acting deputy lieutenant governor for northern Ontario. I presume he will go into official residence in Minaki Lodge to bask in the reflected glory of all those millions of misspent tax dollars.

[8:45]

We also have the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton), who at least had some kind words of encouragement from us as he took over his portfolio.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Gladbag.

Mr. Breithaupt: Indeed, with the added income I trust that he will be able to get, or at least rent, a second pair of shoes while his are being resoled. This will be, for him, a luxury which many of the people of this province on the welfare and assistance schemes he administers cannot presently enjoy.

Hon. Mr. Norton: My staff has already taken care of it actually.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, there are 24 of them and the cost of all this together with the other two I have mentioned, is $1,037,500.

Mr. Nixon: What a waste.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Who is that with the glasses on?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Who is the masked man?

Mr. Breithaupt: Being a reasonably intelligent person I was able to multiply that out and add in a few items.

Mr. Grossman: Who is that man?

Mr. Breithaupt: We are paying more than a million dollars for the services of this cabinet and yet only six could be here for the start of the question period last Friday.

Mr. Nixon: Shame.

Mr. Singer: Shame.

Mr. Breithaupt: This game of musical chairs, or of musical or otherwise little green bags, has gone on for nearly 34 years in Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: Too long, too long.

Mr. Breithaupt: This is hopefully the last time we will see it.

Mr. Nixon: It's the last.

Mr. Breithaupt: Because more and more of our Ontario residents are seeing through the laudatory articles pumped out by Canadian Press and the other news services.

Mr. Nixon: You are going to be pumped out.

Mr. Breithaupt: More and more are seeing through the big cars and the public relations and the executive assistants that on occasion can make the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) seem witty or, indeed, the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) appear to really care about injured workers. Indeed, these folk can even make the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. F. S. Miller) seem serious and the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) appear to be awake.

Mr. Nixon: Incredible.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well then, why don't we join with the member for Scarborough West, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis)—

Mr. Grossman: Go ahead, why don't you?

Mr. Breithaupt: —and his socialist horde and throw the rascals out?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I told you, join with them.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are two reasons and I want to share them with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eaton: Beat the retreat, beat the retreat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: The first reason is because this last cabinet shuffle, this last dance of the dinosaurs, has not as yet been fully publicized for what it is.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Now I know why you have the dark glasses on, Bob.

Mr. Breithaupt: The reason is taken from that violent and stimulating television programme that shows a real slice of the world as it is and describes the hopes and fears and expectations of people in this province—it's a programme called The Government We Deserve.

Mr. Nixon: Is that Judy's programme?

Mr. Breithaupt: It's a violent programme, of course, but in Ontario, after 34 years, that government still has a few more weeks, or months perhaps, and the people of the province will deal with it and see whether we really have the government we deserve.

Mr. Nixon: No more time.

Mr. Breithaupt: We will have that government until the people of this province finally see through the years of Conservative mismanagement. It will last until our citizens recognize the staggering deficits which the Davis years have built up in Ontario, which will be the real legacy of the government led by the member for Brampton (Mr. Davis).

Eventually the universe will no doubt unfold as it should, and that government will too be swept away—

Hon. Mr. Snow: Where have we heard that before?

Mr. Breithaupt: —unloved, unmourned and unremembered. Tonight we are another day closer to that eventuality.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Here is your chance.

Mr. Breithaupt: The other reason we shall keep this government in power for a few more days at least is because we want to see the budget.

Mr. Grossman: Is that a promise?

Mr. Breithaupt: We want to have on the public record the actual plans—

Hon. W. Newman: Oh, now the truth comes out.

Mr. Nixon: How reasonable can we be?

Mr. Breithaupt: —and the real programmes of this government, and not just hear on the hustings about all the wonderful things they were going to do if they had but had the chance.

The amendment to the resolution before us is there only for political posturing.

Mr. Nixon: Right.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Leader of the Opposition doesn't really want to end this phoney war he's got going with the Premier.

Mr. Nixon: He is not even present in the House.

Mr. Breithaupt: As the Leader of the Opposition said last Friday, in his usual flowery way, these little delays and these little moments of controversy will not an election make, you will have to work a lot harder than that.

Mr. Nixon: Is that when they flip-flopped?

Mr. Breithaupt: That was not only good advice from him to the Premier, it is also my advice, and that of my Liberal colleagues, to him tonight.

[Applause]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has the floor.

Mr. Peterson: Give 'em hell, burrhead.

Mr. Deans: That certainly was a crushing speech. It's a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak in this what will likely be the last Throne Speech debate of this particular Parliament.

Mr. Peterson: Are you not feeling well, Ian?

Mr. Gaunt: You are running for mayor this time, are you?

Mr. Deans: I expect that at some point the Liberals will take their courage in their hands and will in fact stand up for something.

Mr. Eakins: Flip-flop Ian.

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: Although, as my leader says, I ought not to count on it, given their past performance.

Mr. Eakins: Tell us why you reversed your vote on Friday.

Mr. Deans: Nevertheless I don't intend to dwell on anything said by the Liberal House leader or on anything said by the Liberal Party. I remember comments made to me in the House some number of years ago by the then Premier John Robarts after a speech I had made, which followed a speech made by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) when he was the leader of the official opposition in those bad old days. I can remember John Robarts looking at Bob Nixon and then looking at us and saying: "I know where the enemy is." I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as I listened to what was being said tonight I want to say to the Tories, they sure still know where the enemy is; it's right over here and don't forget. They're your friends. Cuddle up to them; you need them.

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you find another Marvin somewhere?

Mr. Eakins: Where were you Friday?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The socialist hordes.

Mr. Deans: I also want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in thinking back on that day, it dawned on me as I looked at the sins of this government and I thought of the way it approached the many problems that confront the people of the province of Ontario, that I know where the blame lies; it lies right over there in the front benches on the other side of this House and the executive council of the province of Ontario, many of whom are missing.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Oh take it easy, Ian, take it easy.

Mr. Peterson: If you don't like them, why did you borrow the Premier's suit for your speech?

Mr. Deans: While I'm on my feet and talking about those who are missing, I think it reflects badly on the Legislature, and certainly badly on the government that they can't muster but a few of their members to listen to the windup debate on the Throne Speech that they all thought was so important.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Such vanity.

Mr. Deans: Last Friday morning I expected that few would be present, because on Fridays, for as long as I've been here, they seem to find other things that are much more important to do than the business of the province of Ontario here in the Legislature.

Mr. Cunningham: They go home on Fridays.

Mr. Deans: But I did expect, having looked back over the years to the days of John Robarts, that they might at least have extended to the speakers this evening the courtesy to attend, even though they weren't interested, as they have never been, in the content or the thrust of what's being said. They might at least have shown an interest in the business of the province of Ontario and come into the Legislature and spent but a few moments learning something about the views of other people, and not sitting simply listening to their own rhetoric, rumbling around in the cabinet rooms and the caucus rooms of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Germa: Arrogance, arrogance.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Such ranting and raving.

Mr. Kerrio: Move the adjournment.

Mr. Martel: With what's his name, the other cabinet player.

Mr. Deans: In any event, the budget comes tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Ian, quit the posturing.

Mr. Deans: And as the budget comes tomorrow there will—

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: It's certainly nice to see the Premier (Mr. Davis) again.

As the budget will come tomorrow, I'm sure the government will be able to more clearly define much of what they've said in the Throne Speech. I hope the government will be able to put a little flesh on the bones that were scattered throughout the 60-odd recommendations that were made in the Throne Speech that was read to us not two weeks ago or three weeks ago.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, there won't be time for that.

Mr. Hodgson: Promise?

Mr. Nixon: I hope not.

Mr. Deans: At that time, tomorrow and in the days that follow, we'll respond in a simi-

lar way, with appropriate and constructive suggestions, assuming of course that the Liberals stay with their ill-conceived views and remain the supporters of the government.

Mr. Breithaupt: We are just trying to help you out.

Mr. Deans: In any event, I want to take a moment or two to look at the government, because I wondered a little bit from time to time as to how they might be remembered after the next election. I looked at the cabinet one day last week. I was sitting here watching them—one day when there were more than half a dozen present—and I thought to myself, I wonder just what will be written about them after the next election and they're all gone.

Mr. Grossman: That they won again.

Mr. Deans: I looked at the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) and I can see it now: "Here lies Jim Snow, Greyhound and Gray Coach". Or here's the provincial Treasurer, may he rest in peace. He had the opportunity to develop a land-use policy for the province of Ontario for 10 long years—

Mr. Nixon: He's down at the Albany Club.

Mr. Deans: —but every time he had the opportunity, he reneged until he finally dismantled the entire planning branch of the ministry to ensure there would never be a land-use policy in Ontario.

Or the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr). You can see him now—he's famous, world-famous, for Reed and Dow Chemical.

Or the Minister of Housing, famous in another portfolio for Krauss-Maffei, and famous in the one he's in for dismantling it.

Or the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson). And I thought a lot about the Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Nixon: Grand girl.

Mr. Conway: Lovely girl. Lovely girl.

Mr. Deans: I heard my colleague from Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie)—

Mr. Nixon: If she had played her cards right, she could have been a Liberal.

Mr. Deans: —talking about the Ministry of Labour this afternoon and I thought to myself, now there was an opportunity, if ever there was one, for a minister to show what she was made of.

Mr. Nixon: Whatever happened to her?

Mr. Deans: We could have seen other initiatives in the area of good faith bargaining that would have brought to finality some of the difficulties that confront many people in the province of Ontario, but we didn't. We might have seen some honest worker protection in the province of Ontario, but we don't have it. We might even have seen a manpower policy in her capacity as the minister in charge of manpower, which she took over from the previous minister, which was taken over from the late—not late in the sense that he's now gone completely but—

Mr. Nixon: But not lamented.

Mr. Deans: —late in the sense from the Legislature, the hon. member who was previously from Hamilton West, Jack McNie, who undertook the job of manpower policy. I remember—the Premier will be interested—Jack McNie telling me something as we were standing at a party. I said, "Jack, tell me the truth, what do you do?" He said, "Ian, I don't know." I said, "Jack, have you got a policy at all?" He said, "Ian, I haven't." I said, "Well, what in heaven's name is your function?" He said, "I'm still waiting to hear."

Mr. Nixon: He is not here to defend himself.

Mr. Deans: Then he announced his retirement.

Mr. Lewis: Well, why do you think he's recounting the conversation?

Mr. Nixon: Precisely.

Mr. Deans: Or we could look at the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), a fine fellow—the most anti-consumer individual I've ever met. In fact, I'm surprised he's still here because I distinctly recall—

Mr. Nixon: He's not here. He heard you were speaking.

Mr. Deans: —he said he was going to resign if rent controls were continued in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Mancini: Let him resign.

Mr. Deans: I wonder why he hasn't resigned yet? One would have thought that he might at least have lived up to that commitment if no other.

Mr. Conway: He read your speech on the EMO.

Mr. Deans: Or maybe we could consider the hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett)—he'll go down in history. It will go opposite his name, Minaki Lodge. Was it $9 million or was in $20 million?

Mr. Eakins: Tell us about EMO.

An hon. member. Twenty-six million dollars.

Mr. Deans: Or maybe even more.

Perhaps the previous Minister of Energy—now the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell)—who refused in the face of mounting costs, or the problems being confronted by those on fixed incomes, whether aged or infirm—

Mr. Nixon: Here he comes. The next leader of the Tory party. Here he is.

Mr. Deans: —to take any steps to relieve the burden of mounting hydro costs.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Nonsense.

Mr. Deans: Famous for saying "nonsense" to the people of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, just to you.

Mr. Deans: How about the current Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. F. S. Miller) in his previous capacity—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, let's stick with Dennis.

Mr. Eakins: Yes. Let's have more on Dennis.

Mr. Deans: —as the Minister of Health?

Mr. Eakins: Tell us more.

Mr. Deans: When they write about him, they're going to write about him in the terms that he was the man who decided to close hospitals, and he can't even plant trees in his new portfolio.

One wonders about the competence of these people. The previous Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor)—like a bull in a china shop. He starts out screaming and ranting and raving about the cuts he's going to make. He scares the people in the social services field half to death. He doesn't care whether the Children's Aid Societies are adequately funded or not. He cares not one whit about the incomes of people on low incomes. He doesn't provide any form of assistance for them in spite of mounting costs and then they move him.

Mr. Eakins: Is that you, Jim? I can't believe it.

Mr. Deans: And then my colleague, the House leader for the Liberal Party, made mention of the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith). I don't remember him for quite the same thing. My recollection is much kinder than that. All I can think about is that he's the minister who had to have his speeches vetted by the Premier's office.

Mr. Eakins: Is he teaching you in Sunday school, Ian?

Mr. Deans: And then we have the Solicitor General who stands in his place and defends a policy which says that the police should police the police—that there ought not to be, or certainly there is no initiative to undertake, the placing of citizens—

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Just defending the Ombudsman. Exactly what he recommended.

[9:00]

Mr. Deans: —the placing of citizens on the boards of police commissions in order to ensure there is adequate protection, and that the investigations that have to be conducted from time to time are conducted impartially and with an understanding of the needs of the community. When one looks at them—I'll talk to the Premier in a moment—when one looks at them one by one, and the things that they're famous for, one has to ask oneself how it is that the Tories can stand on the hustings of the province of Ontario and talk about their competence and ability to manage and the feeling they have for the people of the province of Ontario and their understanding of the province's problems. One has to ask oneself whether people who have those kinds of things written against their names can honestly say they understand one whit about the needs of the people who are supposedly under their jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The finest and most creative opposition I have heard yet.

Mr. Deans: I'm going to tell the House that there are many tens of thousands of people across this province who, if asked, would tell us today that they don't have confidence in it because they have watched it operate. They've watched this government bungle one issue after another. They've watched this government which didn't tell them, in 1975 when they were electioneering, about all the things they intended to do to them; they've watched this government which, in spite of mounting unemployment, in spite of housing shortages, in spite of all kinds of economic and social problems across this

province, has failed to respond adequately, or even respond at all, to the majority.

I'm going to tell the House that if one could look outside that select little group which forms the cabinet and see, in the back benches of the government, people who could fill their shoes, then one might have some hope for the future. But the truth of the matter is that, at this point, the people at the back are more tired than the ones at the front, which makes for a very difficult situation when the public of Ontario have to find someone suitable and adequate to deal with the problems that are mounting; the problems that this government—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't want to interrupt, but don't look behind you.

Mr. Deans: —ought to have been able to solve; the problems that have been brought about by the mismanagement of this government; the problems that have been brought about over 34 years of Conservative rule. It must be hard to be the Premier of the province of Ontario in the Conservative Party at the moment because, unlike other Premiers and Prime Ministers and leaders in other countries and other jurisdictions, he can't even blame anybody else for the misfortunes that are befalling the people of the province of Ontario. They've been brought about, one after the other, by mismanagement of Conservatives, one government after another for 34 consecutive years. It's hard to believe. It's hard to believe after 34 years of Conservative rule that an economy, so strong, based on natural resources, with an industrious and highly-skilled work force, could be so mismanaged that in 1977 we have a $2 billion deficit;—

Hon. W. Newman: And you want to increase it.

Mr. Deans: —so mismanaged that we have 330,000 people unemployed in 1977; so mismanaged that we have an energetic, hard-working citizenry unable in 1977 to purchase a home of their own at a price they can afford. It's hard to believe that after 34 years of consecutive government by the Conservative Party in the province of Ontario that we would have a policy that didn't even recognize the need to develop secondary and tertiary industry for the benefits that would flow from it in northern and southern Ontario. It's hard to believe that after 34 years in office and numerous warnings—

Mr. Nixon: Tom Kennedy, where are you when we need you?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Looking down.

Mr. Deans: —given to you by all kinds of people ranging from people in this House, through all of the economic experts, through anyone you care to talk to, that we could be in the year 1977, knowing what we knew 10 years ago, and still have no manpower policy to deal with the unemployment that confronts so many people; a policy with no clear—

Mr. Nixon: It's incredible.

Mr. Deans: —and concise directions, either for retraining or for the evaluation of job opportunities. And to think the government has spent 34 years—and the Premier says to me that he's going to go to the people. I'm going to tell him, he's going to go to the people—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't said that.

Mr. Deans: —but when he goes to the people, he's going to have to explain to them how it could be—in recognition of all the problems that have confronted Ontario under his administration and under the administration of his predecessors—that he was unable to come up with answers to the most fundamental problems confronting the majority of people. It's hard to believe that we wouldn't have developed methods to ease the burden of property tax after 34 years of Tory rule in Ontario. It's hard for me to understand, in spite of the best efforts of many of my colleagues and many other people outside in society, how we wouldn't have an energy policy in place by now.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Everything's hard for you to understand, Ian.

Mr. Deans: It's not only the existing energy sources, although that would be easy, but that co-ordinates all the new energy sources that have been brought to the government's attention, that shows the kind of initiative that takes grasp of the potential and develops for the people of the province of Ontario an energy policy that one could be proud to call something that will meet the needs of the future.

Mr. Nixon: How about windmills?

Mr. Deans: Now, the Premier might say to me, "Well, it is too difficult." And it is too difficult for a Tory government, because they are traditional. Because everything they do is based on what's been done by somebody else some place else. There is absolutely nothing innovative about one single cabinet minister or about the government as a whole.

It is hard to understand how it could be, after 34 years in the province of Ontario under a Conservative administration, that we would still be debating the need to have adequate worker protection in the work place. It is hard to understand how it could be that people are still rising in their place and raising with the various ministries and the various ministers the problems that are confronting workers as they go to work in an attempt to earn a living to provide for their families and they find themselves working in conditions that are intolerable and unsafe and this government, no matter how hard it tries, can't write legislation to protect them that can be understood by the people over whom it has jurisdiction.

It is difficult for me in 1977 to think that a government after 34 years could bring in a Throne Speech with an excess of 60 identifiable items needing to be resolved and how it could be proud of the fact that in the year 1977, 34 years later, there were still in excess of 60 items that the government hadn't been able to deal with.

Mr. Nixon: You started out with 22.

Mr. Deans: I say to you that I don't know how the Premier could be proud to be able to identify 60 things in the province of Ontario that after 34 years he and his government and the governments that preceded him, all Conservative, hadn't been able to come to grips with.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can think of several more we would like to add yet.

Mr. Deans: We are going to think of several more. I want to suggest to the Premier we are going to have several more. Do you know what it speaks to, Mr. Speaker—the fact that this government could find in excess of 60 items, and, as the Premier says, several more that are needing to be done, desperately needing answers to be found for them in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: You used the word "desperate." I didn't use the word "desperate."

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order.

Mr. Deans: It speaks to the inadequacy of this government for 34 years. It speaks to the inability of the Bill Davis regime for the last six or seven years. It speaks to the lack of sensitivity of the regime that preceded him. It talks directly to the inability of the Conservative Party in the province of Ontario to be able not only to understand what the problems are, which I doubt very much, but to formulate policies to react to the problems and to solve them in a way that would make sense.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what we are really speaking about isn't whether the Davis government should be able to continue in office, it's whether the Conservative Party hasn't abdicated its responsibility to the public of Ontario and whether or not we should be looking to see whether there is some way that they can be removed from politics altogether, because they are corrupt in the sense that they have—

Hon. B. Stephenson: Shame.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Shame.

Mr. Deans: —not sat down and dealt with problems of the people that they were responsible for.

[Applause]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind the hon. member that that is quite unparliamentary to accuse the government of being corrupt or anyone else—order, please—individually or collectively. I know you explained it, but would you please refrain from using such language?

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: I didn't plan to use it again anyway so that's fine.

An hon. member: He just got carried away.

An hon. member: He should be named.

An hon. member: They are bankrupt.

Mr. Deans: I want to suggest—oh, no, they are not bankrupt. Bankrupt is another thing. We are bankrupt; they caused it.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult to imagine in 1977, after 34 years of Conservative government rule, that northern Ontario doesn't yet have the kind of equalization of opportunity and cost that they have been asking for, pointing out was necessary, working towards achieving. They have sent representation after representation. They have sent representative after representative from the north to Queen's Park to bring to the government's attention that there are inequities in northern Ontario over and against southern Ontario that ought to be corrected and must be corrected. This government has failed at every single turn to come to grips with these problems. This government turns around and instead of putting policy in place, it moves a tired minister to something called

a new ministry for political purposes and no other reason.

Mr. Nixon: Nothing else.

Mr. Deans: I want to tell you more.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you going to vote against the bill?

Mr. Martel: Bring the bill in.

Mr. Deans: Over those selfsame 34 years, the same kind of representation has been made to this government by numerous people from eastern Ontario and the same result has come forth: There has been absolute neglect on the part of the government in terms of trying to bring about policy that would resolve the difficulties that those people face.

When one looks at northern Ontario and at eastern Ontario, when one considers the inadequacies of the ministers, and when one looks at all 60 items that this government now feels it ought to do, I can't help feeling that that alone, if nothing else, would be sufficient to vote no confidence. But there's more. That only speaks to the 34 years the Tories have been in; it doesn't even begin to talk directly to the problems that confront us as the result of the administration of Bill Davis and his government.

Does the Premier know that 15 years ago it was possible for the average wage earner on a single wage in the province of Ontario to purchase a home of his own? Does he know that today, in 1977, not only is that not possible, it isn't even a dream of the average wage earner on a single wage. That's not progress, and that happened in 15 years under Tory governments. That happened in spite of the fact that there were numerous representations made to this government over those 15 years, pointing out the difficulties and suggesting methods of resolving them. This government, because it's in bed with the majority of developers, because it doesn't give a damn for the majority of wage earners, couldn't bring itself to initiate policies that would begin to speak to that particular problem.

For 15 years the government has had warning after warning of the profiteering and exorbitant price-costing that has been looming across the province of Ontario. What has the government done about it? Nothing. For 15 years it has had suggestion after suggestion of means to deal with increasing costs to consumers in the province of Ontario, but there hasn't been a single policy initiative by this government to resolve that.

For at least 15 years it has been brought to the governments attention that the economic fuure of this province, lay almost entirely in our capacity to harness the natural resource potential of the province for the purpose of developing secondary and tertiary industry. For 15 years the government has had brought to its attention that if we were ever going to survive in the world marketplace, we had to be able to take advantage of the natural resources that we had that belong to all of the people of this province; we had to put an end to the taking of those resources out of this province in an unprocessed and semi-processed state. We said that if we were ever going to have economic stability in this province it could be developed only if we were to use those resources as the catalyst for the secondary and tertiary development. I tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, that has never sunk into the heads of the Conservative Party or the government of the province.

It is interesting to see what has happened since 1967 which is the year when I was first elected to the Legislature. In 1967 the budget of the province was $2.2 billion. From then to now, only 10 years later, the budget has gone up to $12.6 billion. I remember the campaign of 1971 and how we set out a programme for housing; how we set out a programme that would provide income stability; how we set out a programme for the preservation of land—

Mr. Nixon: How did they ever turn you down?

Mr. Deans: And the government costed it. In those days the government's budget was just over $5 billion, and the answer was it would bankrupt the province of Ontario. Isn't it funny how, in the intervening period of time, the government has been able to increase its expenditures from that $5 billion to more than $12 billion with a $2-billion deficit? The problems that we spoke of in 1971—the lack of adequate housing, the need for a farm income policy, the need for a land-use policy, the need for protection for low-income earners —are still there in exactly the same way that they were there in 1971. The government didn't do a single thing to resolve them, and during that period of time it still allowed the budget of the province to go up by $7 billion.

[9:15]

What did the government do with all the money? Take a look at the wages of the people of the province of Ontario. Is the Premier going to suggest to me that the earning capacity of the people in the province of Ontario kept pace with the expenditures of this government? Is he going to suggest to me,

Mr. Speaker, that anywhere out there among the average working people of this province there are people who are now earning six times what they were earning in 1967? Is he suggesting to me that the people of the province of Ontario can afford to have the government spending at the level that it is currently spending?

I just think, as my colleague says and as was said by others, that maybe the people of the province of Ontario don't realize yet just how mismanaged the economy of this province has been. Maybe they don't yet understand just how badly this government has handled the fiscal affairs of the province of Ontario. Maybe they don't yet understand just how inadequately this government has responded to the social problems of the province of Ontario. Maybe they haven't yet been told clearly enough just how inadequately this government has responded to the housing needs and all of the other needs I have spoken about.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to do what I can to make sure that they hear that message, because that's the message the next election will be fought on. It's not going to be fought on some pie-in-the-sky thing dreamed up by the Premier. It's going to be fought on the record of the Tory party for 34 years.

Mr. Warner: Why doesn't the government just resign?

Mr. Deans: We have watched the government over the last 10 years, part of which is the direct responsibility of the current Premier who has been unable to recognize that during times of heavy private sector spending the government ought to be holding back on its expenditures.

I believe in counter-cyclical budgeting. I've always believed in that. In answer to what the Treasurer threw across the House one day a couple of weeks ago, I've always believed that the role of government was to allow the private sector to spend in times when the private sector was booming. I've also always believed that the responsibility of the government was to ensure the credit rating of the province and to ensure that there was money available for times such as these so that we can engage in the kind of expenditures that have to be undertaken in order to ensure that the peaks and the valleys of the economy, which flow naturally from the private sector development and economic programmes, are smoothed out; so that the people of the province benefit in a more stable way and so that they may look forward to a more reasonable degree of stability in their income and their economic well-being.

I suggest to the government that that was a responsibility it had and that the opportunities throughout the Fifties and Sixties were legion to undertake that kind of programming, that kind of fiscal responsibility and that kind of economic management. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this government has failed on those counts. This government has never managed this economy from one day to the next. This government doesn't believe in management; this government hopes that the economy will be sufficiently strong to withstand their bungling. It hasn't been, and that's unfortunate for the majority of the people in the province of Ontario.

During my time in the Legislature, I can distinctly recall my colleague from Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Burr) raising with the government all kinds of alternative energy sources that might be reviewed and looked into for a new energy policy. I can distinctly remember my colleagues from Sudbury, Sudbury East, Nickel Belt, Port Arthur and others, raising with the government the problems of northern Ontario and placing before it policy initiatives that would have helped to resolve those problems. I can distinctly remember my colleague from York South (Mr. MacDonald) on numerous occasions placing before the government farm income policies, food pricing policies and land-use policies; and the government rejected every single one.

I can remember my colleagues from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) raising in the Legislature the need for tenant protection. Where is it? Where is the standard lease form we were promised 10 years ago? Where is the protection for the tenants in the province of Ontario, in spite of the learned observations and the efforts of my colleagues from Lakeshore and Riverdale? I remember my colleague from Yorkview, for at least the period of time that I've been in the Legislature—

Mr. Breithaupt: He is a new boy.

Mr. Deans: —raising with the government the difficulties that confront people in automobile safety and the problems of the need for auto insurance protection in the province of Ontario. What does the government do? Absolutely nothing.

I personally raised on numerous occasions over the 10-year period, and particularly four

or five years ago, the urgent need to develop a manpower policy in the province of Ontario. Nothing's forthcoming.

I remember my colleague from Ottawa Centre talking to the government week after week about the need for property tax reform in order to ease the burden of property tax on middle- and low-income people, on people who are on fixed incomes. Does the government move? No, it doesn't.

I can remember the housing policy initiatives, the review board for price initiatives, the statements here by my colleague from Beaches-Woodbine on the need for action on interest rates to try to stabilize the cost factors that confront the majority of people. I've heard my colleague from High Park talk about the need for action in the field of small business to ensure an adequate opportunity for people in the small business field; and my colleague from Port Arthur, who acted as the education critic, expressing the frustration of teachers and parents and expressing the frustration of taxpayers over the high burden of cost that must befall those who have to pay the cost of education in the municipalities.

I could go on and on. There are so many different areas where policy initiatives have been placed before this government over the last 10 years and they've been neglected, and they've been neglected to the detriment of the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, lest you think that I'm perhaps exaggerating ever so slightly—I'm sure you wouldn't think that of me in any event—let me just read to you what we said to the government in 1968 in the Throne Speech amendment, which shows a certain amount of clairvoyance, I suppose, in some way, about the way the economy was going. Let me read it. Mr. MacDonald moved the amendment and it goes as follows: "This House further regrets the government's continued refusal to assist the Ontario people in coping with soaring costs of living, and specifically its failure to keep exorbitant price increases in check through the public mechanism of a prices review board; to raise northern family incomes by promoting economic development and to eliminate gross disparity between those prices charged for consumer products in the north and those in the rest of the province; to reduce the high cost and eliminate the other inequities of automobile insurance; to protect tenants from exorbitant rent increases; to increase the minimum wage; to adopt measures essential to closing the gap between the demand and supply for low-cost housing in Ontario; and to reduce the oppressive burden of the property tax."

Mr. Nixon: All good stuff.

Mr. Deans: I suggest that in 1968 we were saying these were the problems that the people of the province of Ontario are facing, and I suggest that in 1977 these are the same identical problems that the people are facing and this government under Premier Davis has done nothing to stop them.

Mr. Martel: Put Leo Bernier in a new portfolio.

Mr. Deans: I go on. In 1969 we were asking them to affirm housing as a basic right. We were asking them to solve the problems in the tax system. In 1971, we were telling them that a house-building programme was essential, that municipal works acceleration was required, that a commitment to long-term full employment had to be made, and on and on.

Year after year, at least during my time here, we've been telling them that these are the problems that the people of Ontario are facing and are about to face and the government should have policy initiatives in place to resolve them. And year after year they brought in Throne Speeches not worth the paper they were written on, with promises that were never lived up to. They brought in Throne Speeches that didn't address themselves to the problems that the people of Ontario were facing. Year after year we came back and we suggested new initiatives, different initiatives, pointed out the areas of greatest concern; and year after year this Conservative government of William Davis and those who preceded him have failed to come to grips with what it is that confronts the majority of average- and low-income earners in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: This year's Throne Speech identified the problems.

Mr. Deans: This year, as my leader says, the Throne Speech identified the problems—10 years after the problems were first identified. If they had taken the initiative during that 10-year period we wouldn't be faced with the kind of economic stagnation that we're faced with; we wouldn't have people who can't afford to buy houses in the province of Ontario; we wouldn't be faced with the difficulties that are currently confronting the majority of people.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Absolute balderdash.

Mr. Deans: I suggest they were derelict in their duty over those 10 years and they have no answer for it now.

In addition to that I want to suggest also to you, Mr. Speaker, that you can't separate the benefits that flow from public spending over private spending if it is either in capital expenditure or in income maintenance. I don't know how the Treasurer and the Premier and others are able to draw a distinction in terms of the benefit that flows from the building of a building, whether it be public or private, because the cement, the wood, the steel and everything that goes into the building comes from the private sector. Every single industry related to the construction industry in the province of Ontario benefits from it; the workers who build the building are exactly the same workers; and for someone to suddenly say that there is a distinction to be drawn, they just don't understand the processes that are gone through.

I can't believe for a moment that you believe it, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that you think that somehow or other there is something magical about some private developer building a building, or the government building a building, in terms of the economic benefits that flow to those people directly related to the construction industry.

I suggest to the government that if there are projects throughout the province of Ontario that are valuable and should be proceeded with sometime in the next two or three years that this is the time to commence. The need is greatest now. The benefits that will flow will in any event be flowing to the private industry which the government is so careful to protect. So therefore if the government members can draw themselves away from their dogma, and if they can see that they have a responsibility to the public of the province of Ontario in both private and public sectors, for heaven's sake show some initiative.

I also suggest to the government that at a time when we should be looking carefully, there are benefits which flow from investment in the private sector, that that investment brings about profits, those profits bring about taxes, and we would benefit in terms of the cash flow of the province of Ontario and the tax dollars that are raised, both in terms of those who are working and in terms of those who manufacture the products to be used.

But the government's answer to tax relief is $160 million in rebates for production machinery. I have said a lot about rebates for production machinery, and I want to just quickly go through what I think about them. I don't think there is any reasonable, sensible person, who believes for one minute that the putting in place of new production machinery can do other than eliminate jobs. I don't think there is anyone who believes it.

We are operating in the province of Ontario at considerably below productive capacity now with the machinery that is currently in place. To replace that machinery with new machinery that is more automated, that can produce at a far greater rate, when the marketplace can't consume it, when there is no need for it, and to lay claim that what the government suggests is a fact, that this somehow or other creates employment in the province of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You just don't understand.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Deans: —is wrong—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Deans: —and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Martel: There are 316,000 people unemployed.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I point out that the hon. member for Wentworth is the only one who has the floor. That goes for people on all sides.

Mr. Kerrio: Point that out to the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I am pointing it out to everyone. The hon. member for Wentworth will continue.

Mr. Kerrio: Explain it to the Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: And all I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that the sad part of it is that we have a Treasurer in the province of Ontario who just doesn't understand.

Mr. Nixon: And never has.

Mr. Conway: That will make him Premier.

Mr. Cunningham: And never will.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Karl Marx would be proud of you.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: And what about Harpo and Groucho and all the others? How would they feel at a time like this?

Mr. Breithaupt: Don't forget Zeppo.

An hon. member: And Gummo. He is always the one who is left out.

An hon. member: Don't forget Gummo!

Mr. Lewis: What an odd voice. Is there no end to the Treasurer's silliness?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I want also to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that while the Treasurer talks of my not understanding, there is one thing I do understand. I understand that there are already sufficient write-off provisions in the income tax and corporate tax Acts to allow the very companies which are getting the remission of the $160 million to write off those costs now. And for the Treasurer to take $160 million of the taxpayers' money in the province of Ontario, which could be used directly to stimulate the market, which could be used to create jobs that are much needed and to give it to people who already can benefit now from the tax write-off provisions is wrong. It is an abdication of his responsibility. When he shakes his head in the affirmative, I can only assume, as he says himself, he just doesn't understand.

[9:30]

In any event, the government of the province of Ontario has been faced over the years with a number of problems and one of them was the request for processing in the north. I can remember the great debate that went on in the Legislature about how we were going to have more processing done in the north. But the legislation and the initiatives were so fraught with loopholes and exemptions that there is, I suspect, less processing in northern Ontario today than there ever was.

That's where the problem lies. In spite of what it might claim it is going to do, there is so little monitoring that the government doesn't bring in programmes that meet the need.

Mr. Martel: How many exemptions were issued this year?

Mr. Deans: In the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, when you need nursing homes you get, as my colleague from Cambridge said, fancy jails. When you need rental accommodation, you get a $1.8 million a year expenditure by the Ministry of Housing—that's maximum—which doesn't flow to the need itself. When you recognize that the government programme has been in effect now for, I suspect, 10 years and that during that 10-year period it has had limited success, it is ludicrous for this government to think that the infusion of $600 per unit to a programme which even to this point doesn't begin to speak to the needs of the province of Ontario will do, or to think that that answers the low-rental and rental-accommodation problems that confront everyone across the province.

We need middle-income housing. We get the abandonment by the Ministry of Housing of the only programme that provided anything resembling middle-income housing.

We need property tax relief. We get corporate tax relief.

We need employment policies. We get a whole range of empty promises, from summer jobs for students that will never materialize because they never have, to no jobs at all and no concern shown by the government.

We need long- and short-range planning and this government doesn't seem capable of undertaking that kind of planning because their record over 34 years shows that there has been a steady deterioration of the capacity of the government to govern since it took office 34 years ago.

Mr. Conway: We have Wintario and the new jail.

Mr. Deans: We have had 34 years of out-of-date, inadequate non-policies, and we need a change.

Mr. Laughren: And they have the member for London North (Mr. Shore).

Mr. Deans: I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that minority government in the province of Ontario has worked. It has worked because those of us on this side of the House have bent over backwards to make it work. We have done everything in our power to accommodate the government in trying to resolve what it saw as the difficulties that it had as the government of Ontario.

We have on numerous occasions softened our position in an effort to try to bring about a policy which might turn out to be better than the non-policy that was there before. But I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the role of the opposition is not that of shoring up the government. The role of the opposition is surely that of providing the government with the kind of constructive criticism that this opposition party has provided that government with over the last one and a half to two years. I want to tell you there have been times when we have moved so far in our attempts to accom-

modate this government that it's almost been embarrassing.

Mr. Conway: Friday morning was a good place to start.

Mr. Deans: But we are prepared to accommodate the government further. If it can change tomorrow, if it can bring in policies tomorrow that will somehow or other speak directly to the problems of unemployment, if it can bring in policies that speak directly to the housing need, if it can bring in policies that speak directly to the iniquitous tax burden carried by the majority of middle- and low-income people, if it can speak directly in its budget to the problems of safety in the work place, then I suppose—

Mr. Eakins: Have you changed your minds again?

Mr. Deans: —with the Liberal support and with our constructive suggestions this government could go on for some long period of time even yet.

Mr. Cassidy: God save us!

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: Why are you the only one applauding?

Mr. Deans: I want to tell the Premier that if it is his wish to have an election, I want to assure him that all of the things that I feel about the inadequacies of this government will be told to anyone who will listen. I am going to point out, to the best of my ability, how for 34 years this government has failed to produce policies—

Mr. Martel: Has the government got another $5 million in the slush fund?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's have some order.

Mr. Deans: —and this government has been primarily responsible for the decrease in employment opportunities, for the inability of people to buy houses and for the tax burden they must carry. This government is overexpended and overborrowed and ought not to be governing the province of Ontario; and for that reason my leader moved an amendment, which I shall not read but which is on the record now. I want to suggest to the Premier that it would serve the people of the province of Ontario far better if the Premier and his cabinet showed some of the goodwill that we have shown in making minority government work and accepted the amendment.

Mr. Grossman: But not an election.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Brampton has the floor.

Mr. Conway: The ranks are thin.

Mr. Warner: Spare us the whole thing and tell us you will resign right now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere come to order?

An hon. member: And, you might add, grow up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I really won't comment on the constructive suggestion from the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere, Mr. Speaker. I think I heard what he suggested. I really haven't had an opportunity yet tonight to visit the Lieutenant Governor, although after listening to the contribution from the House leader of the New Democratic Party, I really feel I should rush down immediately to have a visit with her.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Ah, shut up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I listened carefully to the member for Kitchener; believe it or not, I really did. I didn't start listening until he reached that part of his address where he was in eastern Ontario, which is sort of a good place for the hon. member to be.

Mr. Nixon: What do you mean by that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it's a good place for him to be.

Mr. Nixon: Sounds pejorative.

Mr. Conway: The Lutherans of Pembroke invite you any time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only say to the former leader of the Liberal Party—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the members for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk and Renfrew North remain silent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I really have to start out my brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, by complimenting you, sir, on the way you keep everybody in this House in proper order most of the time.

Tonight it's a privilege for me to summarize the arguments put forward by members of our government in support of the Throne Speech and in response to the no-

confidence motion that has been ritualistically advanced by the Leader of the Opposition. Tomorrow, should the government survive the no-confidence motion tonight, the Treasurer will present to this House a budget which is really the second part of this government's programme for 1977.

An hon. member: Disaster.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm sure that the Treasurer will find every opportunity in his remarks to be non-provocative and restrained; but, in the event that he should not, I thought that in the interest of balance and decency, I might go out of my way to be non-provocative and restrained tonight, as suggested by the member for Riverdale. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, it would not be totally frank of me to suggest that it is easy for me to be non-provocative. In listening to and reading through the comments made by both the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party in this House, there is a fair amount that one could choose to be provocative about, I guess, without being at all partisan.

I wonder if I might begin tonight, Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the direction and the thrust of the Throne Speech, to respond in some brief fashion to some of the suggestions advanced by our two opposition leaders. I wonder if I might begin with the good and hon. member for Hamilton West and the leader of the third party. I don't intend to reorganize his front benches tonight because, unlike our party here, there's ample talent to reorganize it in any way that I might see fit. Those people are rather totally restricted.

Mr. Breithaupt: That went over like a lead balloon.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to say that in many respects his response to the Speech from the Throne—

Mr. Reid: You had better wake your colleagues up so they can get these lines.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —was indeed thoughtful and well-considered.

Mr. Reid: They don't even understand what you're saying.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, taking the good news first: I want, on behalf of the government to express my own sincere thanks—

An hon. member: Where did you come from?

Mr. S. Smith: In the chamber. He wasn't here for my last speech.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —for the comments he made with respect to minority rights. We have not always agreed on the propriety of minority rights responses on the part of our government, and particularly our response to the challenge of providing French language services in Ontario. I sense—and I may be wrong in this—that in many respects there has been some lessening of partisan division on this issue—between the leader of the third party and myself. And in that, I think he is making an important admission about Liberal policy to this point; even more importantly, a statement of faith about the type of commitment he wants us to make in the future.

I'm not even offended by the desire of the member for Hamilton West to take credit for all of the innovations and programmes in the Throne Speech. The leader of the Liberal Party is prone to associating himself with great people and with great ideas—albeit after the fact. He has taken, I am told, to comparing himself with the Rt. Hon. John Robarts, former Premier of this province and a distinguished member of this Legislature for many years.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Never.

Mr. Nixon: We haven't had a balanced budget since he left.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't know what John Robarts ever did to him to deserve this. However, I'm sure that Mr. Robarts, being the kind of man he is, Mr. Speaker, is at least a little flattered. There are some who would suggest—and I would not go on the record as suggesting that I might be one of them—that other considerations might have influenced their general support for our programme; but that would be really very unfair and I have never wanted, in this House, to make any suggestion that could be construed as being unfair.

Mr. Nixon: You never even say anything.

Mr. Singer: Perish the thought.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Despite the new-found interest which the government appears to be garnering from the Liberal caucus, the address made in response to the Speech from the Throne by the leader still indicates that they are caught up—and I guess we should have anticipated this—in some of the bitter, self-defeating circular argumentation which so expertly destroyed their 1975 election campaign

and which still hangs around as a cloud over their caucus.

Mr. Ruston: That cloud's clearing, Bill.

Mr. Nixon: You mean we're against you wasting money?

Mr. Good: You're the one who lost the 20 seats.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You people lost the chance to form a government and you know it. You blew it. I see the member for Wilson Heights smiling. He knows that you blew it.

Mr. Peterson: We won't blow it this time.

Mr. Gaunt: You're still brooding over losing your majority.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For example, we have that age-old call for massive tax decreases right across the boards. You know, I'm always amazed and I've been here for a while—

Some hon. members: Too long.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I would say to the hon. member who made that observation—be very careful. Your tenure could be very, very brief. It could be very, very brief.

An hon. member: What's the date?

Mr. Good: You told me that 10 years ago, too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I don't want to hear the interjections repeated a second time. I don't want to hear them the first time. If there's anything that we prize in this Legislature, it's freedom of speech. The hon. member for Kitchener was allowed to be heard. The hon. member for Wentworth was allowed to be heard. I wish you'd extend the same courtesy to the Premier. It might also be helpful if the Premier spoke through the Chair. It might be less provocative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will try to take that circuitous route through the Chair, but I'm just very anxious that they hear what I say.

An hon. member: Oh, we'll hear you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, you are such an intelligent, logical person; I have no need to persuade you with my argumentation. I worry more about your colleagues, and I'm really trying to get at them through you.

Mr. MacDonald: Flattery will get you nowhere with him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I'm not so sure.

Mr. Lewis: Easy. Easy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm always amazed, Mr. Speaker, through you to my colleagues opposite, by the degree to which people in opposition shamelessly call for tax decreases almost in a ritual self-affirmation that they are really in opposition. This sort of backwards-forwards approach to government always comes along with a strident attack on the deficit. I heard a bit of that tonight.

[9:45]

Let's just pursue that for a moment because I know it touches on a strain of logic which is almost particular to the Liberal Party of this province. I have no illusions about the New Democratic Party being caught up in the same strain of logic.

Mr. Nixon: You're big spenders too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They want to lower taxes and they don't care about raiding the Treasury at the taxpayers' expense. They're consistent, as always, in that old socialist inconsistency.

Mr. Nixon: You're the expert on that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But for the Liberals, it is one of the most confounding mysteries of their faith that they can call for changes in government spending from time to time, reduction of taxes which has the same effect on the Treasury as increases in government spending, and then they call for a lower deficit. I don't totally understand it but I'm sure, over the next period of months, they will try again to explain it.

Mr. Reid: It's called deficiency in government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How disappointed they must have been in last year's budget where the government reduced its deficit markedly, and how frightened and uneasy they must be with respect to tomorrow night.

Mr. Singer: We sure look worried.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I think, Mr. Speaker —yes, you're very worried about it, I say to the member for Wilson Heights.

Mr. Singer: It's bad timing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I think it would be edifying for all members of the Legislature and for the province as a whole to note that the reasonableness and the faint glimmer of balance which sometimes invades the remarks

of the leader of the third party in the House are totally devoid from what he is prepared to say about this government and about the province when touring on behalf of the political interests of his own political party.

Perhaps it is one of the real luxuries of a third party that one can say things in various places and not have them reported or held up to public scrutiny to the same extent the things said by a member of the government are held up to the public scrutiny, as they should be.

Mr. Nixon: Why is Darcy making all those speeches?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand that on March 16, at a nominating meeting in the riding of Middlesex, the Liberal leader made a very interesting speech—

Mr. Nixon: There were 900 at that nomination.

Mr. MacDonald: That's all the vote you will get.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —a speech which perhaps spoke more eloquently than ever of the moral bankruptcy, the political opportunism and fundamental hypocrisy—

Mr. Nixon: We are going to pick that constituency up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that has now become part of the Liberal incantation across this province.

Mr. Breithaupt: This is all without being provocative.

Mr. Nixon: Who wrote that baloney for you?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I should point out that the member for Middlesex, and parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Eaton)—

Mr. S. Smith: Why don't you call me Spiro Agnew too?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —had his political career greatly advanced by the type of cheap and dishonest politicking which the leader of the Liberal Party would consider carrying forward at that meeting.

Mr. Reid: You should have spent the evening playing tennis. You would have been better off if you had played tennis.

Mr. Nixon: That's a fifth-rate comment.

Mr. S. Smith: Get a new speechwriter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand the Liberal leader made some absolutely amazing predictions in his speech. If he stands by those predictions, as I share them with you tonight, I'm sure he will want to say so at some point during the next few days. If, however, he thinks some of those predictions might be as excessive and outlandish as they sound, he might also want to take the opportunity of saying so during the next few days. I understand he believes we have made education in Ontario one large Grand Central Station, and that there is no testing in our school system, and that we have destroyed the initiative of our young people.

I understand he said this government is committed to taxing churches, Boy Scout groups and charities, and that if we were to get a majority we would ram an inequitable tax system down the throats of the people of this province.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for the Liberal Party has had an opportunity in this debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just stating the facts. I am not being provocative.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand he said this government is arrogant toward smaller communities and that there was something less than honest in the decision by the Highway Transport Board on the matter of Gray Coach and Greyhound. Sure, some of them applaud, certainly. That is what is going to destroy their party. I understand he said we did not as a government want to track down those people who may have been improper recipients of home buyer grants under the home buyer grant programme.

Mr. Good: You lost the 20 seats, we didn't.

Mr. Nixon: Nine million dollars you gave away.

Mr. S. Smith: So far you are right on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, he said all of these things. I am glad he acknowledges it. I understand he said that a renewed mandate for this government would see the closing of 22 more hospitals in Ontario. I challenge him to tell us where and I challenge him to find that commitment in our programme.

Mr. S. Smith: No, I said it might.

Mr. Nixon: Fortunately the courts stopped you.

Hon Mr. Davis: I understand he believes our House leader is a rather sneaky fellow, that he plays around with Wintario grant letters, that he doesn't deal with them honestly or directly.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, the unkindest cut.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Did you say that about me?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, my God.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I tell you, it was one of the historical speeches in the history of this province.

Mr. S. Smith: Why don't you say what I said, which is that he signs the winning ones and his deputy signs the losing ones?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is the prerogative of the Chair to recess this House and I will avail myself of that prerogative if you don't straighten up.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, you don't have to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk try to restrain himself.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I make reference to these rather outlandish and sad statements in the House only because I think all of us in this—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The leader of the third party should see a shrink. That's what he should do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Only because I think—

Mr. Breithaupt: So should the Treasurer.

Mr. S. Smith: Would the Treasurer recommend his?

Mr. Kerrio: Hand over your credit card, Darcy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that all of us in this Legislature should understand there is a level of criticism, a level of attack which helps to keep our system balanced and honest. I believe that, by and large, those levels are respected by all sides in this House in so far as debate in this Legislature is concerned.

Mr. Good: Not in the last 10 minutes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But when people become cynical about our political system and ask why people lose faith in it, I have to believe that part of the answer lies with those who gladly participate in and encourage excess.

Mr. Breithaupt: Such as you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I put these notions on the record only because I was so disturbed by the tenor, the cheapness and the rancor of the comments that were made.

Mr. S. Smith: What a cheap speech from the Premier of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: More important than that, because they weren't honest and because they had no support in fact. It is a sad indication of just how prepared the third party will be to distort, misrepresent and weaken this government's extensive programme, irrespective of how they may vote today and in the future.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: What programme? A deficit programme.

Mr. S. Smith: You need a new speechwriter.

Mr. Lewis: You already have all that Liberal vote. How much more do you want?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite a bit. You can never have too much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Leader of the Opposition has already participated in this debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the Leader of the Opposition, the question is not really one of distortion—

Mr. S. Smith: I hope you raise your level a little bit. What are you going to call him—cheap, dishonest?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but merely one of the rather jaunty, rather imprecise ways that he tiptoes through the issues in order usually to make three or four points, which he did again seek to make rather ritualistically but so dependably in his response to the Speech from the Throne.

First, I think it is clear that when he talks about things like civilizing the Workmen's Compensation Board and using other linguistic excesses, which I will make reference to in a moment—

Mr. Lewis: That is an excess? You should hear me when I am in full stride.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —oh, I have heard you for years—he tries to establish that only one party in this province cares about people in this province. Once again, he implies we are perfectly prepared to let people suffer from

occupational hazards and diseases, that we on this side seek no remedy for them, have no programmes in place to help them and that, in a sense, if there was a definition for modern callousness and lack of regard in today's Ontario, that definition would be Progressive Conservative.

Mr. Reid: That's a good line.

Hon. Mr. Davis: His self-righteous preening is more vexing, Mr. Speaker; it has become insulting.

Mr. S. Smith: Get a new speechwriter. This sounds like your Windsor speech.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's the old argument made in an old way by a Leader of the Opposition who is more a prisoner of the past than I think he would be prepared to admit. He took the time to stress his links with the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in suggesting that he would offer co-operation.

Mr. Breithaupt: You knew Tom Kennedy. I mean, it's not all bad.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I accept his offer of co-operation, Mr. Speaker, and I point out only in passing that the very same offer of co-operation preceded only by hours a motion of no confidence in this government which was very general. All that took place between his offer of co-operation and his motion of no confidence was the sound of his own voice. How easily he convinced himself and how easily he convinces himself when he talks to himself. His motion left almost no stone unturned. I read it carefully. It dealt with the property tax, Workmen's Compensation Board, jobs, poor management of the economy, tax cuts dealing with natural resources and agricultural land and, God knows, everything else.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are a lot of things needed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition was caught in a rather difficult bind between the day that Her Honour read the Speech from the Throne and the day when he offered his eloquent, as usual, if somewhat archaic, response. Firstly, he could not restrain himself from saying that he liked the Speech from the Throne. I recall that being said.

Mr. Lewis: I said it in my reply.

Hon. Mr. Davis: God knows what he must have had to deal with in his caucus. The hard-liners must have been gnawing at their nails—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The real Reds over there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as the Leader of the Opposition once again let his own innate honesty get in the way of old-time socialist dogma. But within a few days the transformation had occurred.

Mr. Lewis: It didn't take long.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The fix was in place, and the new Stephen was once again the old Stephen, merely carrying forward a burden of dogmatic pursuit—

Mr. Lewis: It's reassuring.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which has weighed down so many leaders before him and will weigh down so many in the future, just as the dogma, the ritual, the self-righteousness and the—

Mr. Lewis: It is not Churchillian, I'll tell you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Premier doesn't need the help of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: I'm not so sure.

Mr. Singer: Miller wrote better stuff than that. Miller was much better than Segal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It really is the old question, Mr. Speaker—you would understand it—and this is one which has been dealt with by—

Mr. Singer: Miller was much better than that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Nor the member for Wilson Heights.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, sir. I just want you to know that Mr. Miller wrote better stuff than Mr. Segal does.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is one which has been dealt with by many thoughtful historians and political scientists of whether or not the New Democratic Party is a party or whether it is a movement. I suspect that when they are in government they claim they are a party, and that when they are out of government they claim that they are a movement.

Mr. Lewis: I think that's right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which has not been a clever rationale for explaining defeat upon defeat in election after election in this jurisdiction and some others from time to time.

Mr. Peterson: Calling them a movement is very unparliamentary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But looking through and listening to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, it is clear that after almost a century of various socialist experiments in other places, and illustration upon illustration of the sheer functional failure of old-time, 19th century socialism, the particular proponents of socialism that the Leader of the Opposition has the privilege of leading here in Ontario haven't learned one darned thing.

We have—and it's so simple, it's so evident—the old-time, bureaucratic faith-healers led by self-proclaimed missionaries who want to help Ontario find salvation through bankruptcy. Mr. Speaker, God held Ontario. The Leader of the Opposition was a missionary in Africa once, I'm told.

Mr. Lewis: It's very sophomoric writing, you know.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is soporific as well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Their solution to the preservation of jobs and to the creation of more jobs is not support for the private sector—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —or allowing people the freedom and the incentive to grow and to expand and to generate real private sector opportunities that will be there fer generations to come.

[10:00]

Mr. Peterson: Why don't you make the man who wrote this read it? That will pay him back.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But their solution is massive holdings of public equity by the people of this province.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Buy into this plant; open up this one here; have a Crown corporation doing this and doing that. We can determine after eight years of government in Manitoba that the costs of this particular outdated approach have become really very clear—

Mr. Singer: Come out against the government of Manitoba, yes. That's a good one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and are an example of how the suggestions advanced by the Leader of the Opposition would cause sheer havoc and folly in the economy of this province, and cause an absolute nightmare for the taxpayers of this province.

You know, one person who has been observing the NDP in Manitoba—

Mr. Lewis: This isn't Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —was recently heard to say that giving the NDP a chance to run Ontario would be a little like sending a fox to watch a chicken coop.

Mr. Lewis: That's an old Tommy Douglas line—the fox among the chickens.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, listen, we learn something every day.

Interjections.

Mr. Ruston: No reading in the House, Bill.

Mr. Singer: You can do better than that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's important for all of us to understand the code which the NDP uses. When they want massive government growth, massive raids on the Treasury, massive public ownership, and in some cases nationalization, they usually use the term, "social justice" as the cover.

Mr. Lewis: It's not a bad cover.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's not a bad cover.

Mr. Lewis: Not bad at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Those are nice words, they're warm words—

Mr. Lewis: Amiable friendly words.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with which many of us choose to associate ourselves. Words which allow the masking of the old-time power-grabbing and manipulations—

Mr. Lewis: Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —of the economy under the guise of reform. No question about it. It takes in some people in the media, it even takes in the member for Wilson Heights. It takes in some people in our society—

Mr. Lewis: I don't believe this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but it is a con, and a serious, well thought out and often insincere con, which relates to a whole view of society—

Mr. Lewis: It is not so well thought out —spontaneous, not well thought out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was thought out as early as the thirties.

Mr. Lewis: No, no. No, no.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's a view of society which is distorted and unfair, and in many respects very insensitive and highly monopolistic. If you look at Manitoba, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, listen, it's a great example of those people having responsibility.

Mr. Breithaupt: You could look at Newfoundland, if that's the proper place.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Twenty years of Joe Smallwood.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And if you look at all this government ownership you will see an economic landscape cluttered with failed or failing government airplane factories, bus factories, and I am told even government Chinese food factories.

Interjections.

An hon. member: And the lowest unemployment rate in Canada.

Mr. Reid: They have all left.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is interesting to point out that at a time when Ontario is seeking to reduce—and has reduced—its public service to cut back the burden which government can place on the people, the civil service in Manitoba has been increased in the past four years by some 60 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: You know, this—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Leader of the Opposition stop mumbling?

Mr. S. Smith: Say the interjections more distinctly.

Mr. Breithaupt: Speak more clearly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The thing I find most frightening, and I say this in friendship to the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Lewis: I should think so!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —is that the rigidity and the almost orthodox religious loyalty to outdated ideas and badly structured programmes really does affect what might otherwise be a rather bright intellect and precise political judgment.

Mr. S. Smith: Maybe you should write Darcy's speeches.

Mr. Conway: I thought reading speeches was not allowed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I'm just glancing at it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Premier will ignore the interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: He would do better to ignore the speech that was written for him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'd be delighted to, Mr. Speaker. I don't find it easy to ignore them, but I'll do my best.

Mr. Deans: You can't even read it with a straight face.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I look at you and I have difficulty keeping a straight face. I did it well. All during your address you were smiling to yourself, and I didn't say a word to the House. You were laughing at yourself.

Mr. Deans: I write my own drivel, I can't afford to hire anybody.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I agree with the hon. member, it was drivel. It was drivel.

Mr. Lewis: This was supposed to be a blockbuster tonight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is a very thoughtful analysis of your party. Very thoughtful.

Mr. Lewis: It is wonderful.

Mr. Breithaupt: If that's thoughtful we are all in trouble.

Mr. Martel: Some Boy Scout wrote it for you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, or I'll recess the House for 10 minutes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The people of this province are given a daily diet, by the Leader of the Opposition, of criticisms and programmes which, as prophecy, offer every indication of an approach to government which is totally foreign to our people. It is so badly out of date as to be a denial of the progress and humanization we have achieved in our society over the last many decades. There are times when the Leader of the Opposition is not helped by his friends in other provinces—

Mr. Martel: Like Joe Who.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —who talk about various schemes for instant social justice and equity, such as the notion that no one should make

more than two and a half times as much money as anyone else in society.

Mr. Lewis: This is reaching.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You know, I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition—

An hon. member: Great friend of yours.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —because I know he would want to point this out to his friend—and I have respect for the Premier of Manitoba—that in Cuba they're allowed a ratio of four to one.

Mr. Lewis: Cuba?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Manitoba two and a half; Cuba four to one.

Mr. Lewis: Another province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What have the poor people of Manitoba done and, indeed, what would the people of Ontario have to do to be faced with this same simplistic insensitivity?

Mr. Martel: You get carried away.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You see, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty is really one of principle, and that principle is profound.

Mr. Lewis: Believe me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes it is. The Leader of the Opposition may attack the Workmen's Compensation Board—and I'll get back to that shortly—and he may make a speech or two about pollution, but when you come right down to it, the difference between us over here and those people over there, is not over these issues, but on the opposition's subservience to the idol of total, dehumanizing, levelling, insensitive, and despairing equality, taken to the point where its advocates can no longer understand—

Mr. Breithaupt: What absolute tripe.

Mr. Lewis: Is this the campaign?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the aspirations of people for self-improvement, for excellence, prosperity and personal growth—

Mr. Breithaupt: Like the ones who want to own a home.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which are part of the make-up of this province and the heritage of our people.

Mr. Peterson: Author, author, author.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What their lack of sensitivity has produced is a real inability to understand many issues and an almost insensible drive towards distortion and misunderstanding which do pose a threat to this province.

Mr. Lewis: This is too extreme, much too extreme to wash. Let's have another line.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I've got to say to the Leader of the Opposition—unlike him, I'm never extreme. I'm never extreme.

Mr. Lewis: Much too extreme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Look at the agricultural stabilization and the whole agricultural land issue.

Mr. Lewis: You can't fight a campaign on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What campaign? What campaign? I was pleased to see the leader of the Liberal Party admit in the House—though I'm not sure that he would admit it elsewhere—that we do not face a crisis on food land, and we do not face an immediate crisis on food supply. When you look at the agricultural land issue and the agricultural stabilization issue as it played itself out in this House, it is clear that the position of the official opposition was really that of trying to move us forward toward the same public equity position which they would like to see the government hold in all sectors of our economy—

Mr. S. Smith: He is attacking your green paper, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —a public equity position of impact and strength and importance, particularly in the farming community.

Mr. Lewis: This is not a credit to you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, that kind of state farm programme, which would reduce—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's what you want.

Mr. S. Smith: Allstate.

Mr. Breithaupt: You are in safe hands.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Premier has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That kind of state farm programme which would reduce farmers to tenants, is precisely what has apparently taken place in Manitoba, with the purchase

of some 179,000 acres of private farm land by the NDP in that province.

Mr. Lewis: How many?

Hon. Mr. Davis: One hundred and seventy-nine thousand.

Mr. Lewis: Which province is that, Cuba? Which one?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. The one which you know even better, the one of Manitoba.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I didn't know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is unbelievable, that after so many decades—

Mr. Breithaupt: How are the Tories doing in New Brunswick?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the New Democratic Party would still believe that people want government to run and own farms and act as a landlord, with farmers as tenants; or to punish initiative, energy and achievement through the tax system; or run business and, basically, have the government be the absolute, total centre of society. That's basically what you want.

Mr. Lewis: You are going to have to count on tomorrow night.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Firstly, in the case of the farming, that approach would destroy the farmers of this province. And, secondly, I disagree fundamentally, as do my colleagues on this side of the House, with that view of society.

Government is not the centre of society, as we see it. The individual and his or her striving for excellence and achievement and prosperity and security—that is the centre of society as we see it.

Where we differ from the rather loose and laissez-faire somewhat haphazard philosophy of our friends in the Liberal Party is very clear. We have a philosophy. They don't.

Mr. Breithaupt: Poppycock.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Liberalism, to paraphrase an expression of the Leader of the Opposition, is neither the art of the possible nor the art of the reasonable. It is not even an art.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I don't know. It is artful, I tell you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I added that myself.

Mr. Reid: We knew things were going downhill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is the loose grab-bag of patch-quilt, contradictory policies which are put together generation after generation in some faint hope that the people of Ontario can be so driven to despair and utter desperation that some day the hollowness of that option might be attractive.

Mr. Conway: Jack Horner doesn't think so. Jack Horner doesn't believe you there, Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't consult Jack Horner about this.

Mr. Peterson: Who did write your speech then?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: You shouldn't let them write your speeches for you, you are much better on your own.

Mr. S. Smith: Why don't you attack Nova Scotia? It has a Liberal government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not only underestimating the people of Ontario, but is also overestimating the power of despair.

Mr. Singer: To paraphrase again.

Mr. S. Smith: Try a précis instead of a paraphrase.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We believe there is a need for governments to begin now to rectify an imbalance. The dusty, old, tired radicals of the Regina Manifesto in the 1930s—that's where it all comes from.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, God!

Mr. Reid: I thought you were serious all the way through.

Mr. Lewis: It won't work. Don't you understand?

Mr. MacDonald: Lubor Zink wrote that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who? I don't know him. At least not well.

Mr. Singer: That fellow Segal is good. He exceeds Miller beyond belief.

Mr. Breithaupt: Can't you work the Winnipeg general strike into this as well?

Mr. Singer: It's good that you are afraid of Miller with Segal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What they don't understand over there is that across this country we have seen governments' share of total wealth climb and climb again—

Mr. Lewis: This is too much.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —until it has now reached the level of 45 per cent.

Mr. Peterson: Which ministry is that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In 1962, the British government's share of total wealth was 44 per cent—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, no!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and now, in 1977, their share is 62 per cent.

Mr. Peterson: Which ministry is Segal going to tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is in the hope of keeping us off that road that the balance must be rectified.

Mr. Singer: Segal says!

Mr. S. Smith: You are on your way to Margaret Scrivener.

Mr. Reid: Oshawa next stop.

An hon. member: Dispense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't want to answer the interjections, Mr. Speaker, but I am being tempted.

We think the people of Ontario want to have some of these questions asked. And they want to have a government which is prepared to guarantee economic and social security, because it is prepared to seek that balance—

Mr. Singer: And Segal has the answer. Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and, when necessary, a mandate to steer our society away from those who would follow the old spending paths—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on. Oh, my goodness.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the old devotion to massive public bureaucracy and massive public spending without question or doubt.

Mr. Breithaupt: How many civil servants do you have? Sixty thousand?

Mr. Lewis: Bring back John Miller.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the question of Quebec and Confederation—

Mr. Singer: What did Segal say about that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party have done.

Mr. S. Smith: Ah, Spiro Agnew.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I want to take specific issue, if I may—you can defend Marc Lalonde as much as you want; go right ahead.

Mr. S. Smith: You insult him as much as you like too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't insult him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Premier has the floor. Will he speak through the Chair?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I want to take specific issue, if I may, with one statement, or perhaps more important, its form, which was attributed by Hansard to the Leader of the Opposition—in his reply to the Speech from the Throne before I touch on Confederation briefly. It disturbed me, and I mention it.

Mr. Lewis: What's that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In dealing with the decision announced by the new Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) with respect to residential services and troubled children, the Leader of the Opposition in expressing his concerns used the following expression: "I don't know how the children will not be defiled by the inadequacy of the rest of the ministry." I don't know what the Leader of the Opposition meant to say, and I hope it is not what he did say.

The residential services programme, and the programmes which this government have supported and instituted to help troubled children in Ontario over the decades, rank amongst the most progressive, the most humane, the most well-funded and comprehensive of any jurisdiction in the free world or otherwise. Problems in those programmes and difficulties are things which a responsive and humane government must respond to. These are problems which we are responding to as best we can.

[10:15]

The Leader of the Opposition—and this is proper—may have criticisms of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, he may wish to direct these at many civil servants and others who work loyally within that con-

text, and he may have criticisms which he would want to address to the new minister, or the previous minister, or to any member of this government—

Mr. Lewis: I think you are taking it out of context, do you know that, because I was pretty careful about that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You read it.

Mr. Lewis: I will go back and read it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But to suggest that children would be defiled by the inadequacies in the ministry—

Mr. Lewis: You know I don't mean—

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, come on, don't be ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —is an excess of language, if not in intent, which casts very serious doubts upon the sincerity and balance of his comments in that area.

Mr. Lewis: That is not fair. I dealt with that pretty carefully.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Read it carefully, and if I am wrong I will apologize, because I was very disappointed in it.

An hon. member: Do it now.

Mr. Renwick: When the going gets tough—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand the opposition is now running a series of hearings across Ontario to hear those people with concerns to express about the Workmen's Compensation Board. I want to make a prediction: There won't be one person appear before any one of those partisan hearings who will have anything good to say about the board.

Mr. Breaugh: You are quite wrong. We had three last week.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am just stating the obvious. Those members wouldn't be going there if they thought the people were going to say something nice about the board.

Despite the fact that over 91 per cent of all of the claims which are handled to the common satisfaction of the board and the claimant, despite the clear position which our jurisdiction has as a leader in the area of workmen's compensation—and they can't show us a better one—in the area of rehabilitation and occupational health, it will be impossible for our friends opposite to find one person who has anything good to say about it.

Mr. Renwick: We are not preoccupied with statistics.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I guess this typifies more than anything else the opposition mentality and part of the old NDP con game that we have come to know and deal with here in Ontario—if there is a human suffering or difficulty it can be exploited, and be made a political football, and can be used for one's political purposes. That is exactly what they are doing it for.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Those hearings are nothing but pure partisan politics, pure partisan politics, and their leader knows it.

Mr. S. Smith: That's cheap.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What about Cassidy's memo on rent review?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, listen, I've even got some correspondence—never mind—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Only the Premier has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you right now this government will not step back from its support of our Minister of Labour, who is seeking to ensure the Workmen's Compensation Board retains appropriate levels of benefits and maintains an actuarially sound financial position.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, yes.

Mr. Renwick: She isn't interested in any of the actuarial nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We utterly reject the notion of some broad insurance scheme which could make workers who do not now pay for workmen's compensation pay—

Mr. Laughren: That's total crap.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and which would have the same guarantee of viability and dependability as did the various auto insurance schemes which went absolutely bankrupt in other NDP jurisdictions.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are not just going to let the workers of Ontario be subjected to that kind of risk.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is sad that the Leader of the Opposition would be so unthinking and so callous. I believe that the programme put forward—

Mr. Lewis: Help, help. Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right. He ought to think it through very carefully.

Mr. Martel: You said that in Elliot Lake, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe that the programme put forward by this government represents a sane and responsible response to the problems that face Ontario and to the challenges which our people believe we can meet and overcome. It is a programme with five areas of priority: long-term job creation, overall economic growth and prosperity—

Mr. Lewis: Very long term.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the control of government spending, which the parties opposite don't agree with—

Mr. Deans: It's a fraud, that's what it is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the hon. member thinks the Throne Speech and programme is a fraud, so be it.

Mr. Deans: That's what I think.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He knows what I think of his approach.

The continued protection of Ontarians from high rents, high prices and unfair wage demands. It is sad that this anti-inflation commitment, so important to our senior citizens and to the working men and women of Ontario who lost one-half the days to strikes in 1976 than they did in 1975, should be opposed by the parties opposite, but it remains part of our programme nevertheless, just as do commitments in environmental protection, French-language instruction, energy research and conservation, increased agricultural production, court reform, and reforestation. It is not a document for those who are defeatist.

Mr. Lewis: It sounds like the Regina Manifesto.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not a document for those who peddle in the wares of gloom and doom. It provides for the economic and social stability in Ontario which is vital to the national unity of this country and vital to the well-being of Canadians everywhere.

Mr. Deans: After 34 years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition said in his closing remarks on the issue of Quebec in particular: " . . . when you're talking about sovereignty with economic association, there is an increasing appeal to a lot of people in Quebec. That, I think, is why it is so desperately important that Ontario keep the option open—keep the doors open . . . " I think I quoted him accurately.

I want to point out that while our doors are open to Quebec and our lines of communication are good, they're open and they're frank. We do not maintain doors open to the option of independence for Quebec with continued economic union with Canada. I think the Leader of the Opposition and I differ on this as well.

Mr. Lewis: I think you are taking it out of context because I was pretty careful about that. I will go back and read it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe that there is endless good faith, as do the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party, as long as we are all working together as Canadians to build, to improve, to share and to understand. The minute the doors are closed by any partner to the debate it is naive and, I think, dangerous to hope that somehow there will be some solution thereafter which will make things almost as good as they were before.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Lewis: On a point of personal privilege, I consider this a very crucial matter. I don't think anything I said about Quebec at any time during that speech implied any willingness to accept on my part or that of my party the prospect of independence with some kind of economic association. I eschewed that completely and it is unfair of the Premier to imply it.

Mr. Speaker: I think that was a point of order rather than a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't want to get into a prolonged debate on the observations made about the election of the government in Quebec, which had as part of its stated objective—

Mr. Renwick: Withdraw the remarks.

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: You are wrong and you know it. Don't play that game because it will come back on you.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Renwick: That's not worthy of you. The situation is rough enough without that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You check it carefully.

Mr. Renwick: Don't do that again in this House. That is rotten.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member for Riverdale. We've had a pretty good debate up to now tonight. Let's continue.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's get on with the last few minutes of the debate.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This party that I lead—

Mr. Martel: Will do anything.

Mr. MacDonald: Will use any tactic.

Mr. Deans: How can we believe the Premier?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member for York South.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —stands for one Canada that's indivisible, united and absolutely committed to a balance between the federal and the provincial governments. It stands for an Ontario which provides a climate of economic opportunity for prosperity and well-being.

Mr. Peterson: Would you put that to music?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Above all, through our Throne Speech and through tomorrow night's budget, we stand for an Ontario that is vibrant and strong and capable of meeting even the most serious economic challenges with confidence in ourselves, a rediscovery of self-reliance and a belief in our future. We offer a positive and extensive programme of government which should give every Ontarian reason to have confidence, to have hope and to have security. It is a programme that I am pleased to promote here in this Legislature and throughout the province when necessary.

Mr. Lewis: That was uncharacteristic of you. That was unnecessary.

Mr. Cassidy: And you always have one in every speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: The implication of that is really offensive.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Throne Speech debate now being concluded, I shall call for the vote as follows:

Mr. Johnson moved, seconded by Mr. Shore, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

"To the Honourable P. M. McGibbon, OC, BA, LLD, DU (Ottawa), BAA (Theatre), Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

"May it please Your Honour:

"We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us."

Mr. Lewis then moved, seconded by Mr. Deans, that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session be amended by the addition of the following words:

"That while it is recognized that the concerns expressed in the Speech from the Throne, delivered by Her Honour, are genuine attempts to redress grievances resulting from many years of government mismanagement; and while it is recognized that those portions of Her Honour's address which dealt with questions of national unity are eminently supportable; nonetheless we must insist that this Conservative government has once again failed to establish priorities and policies which would resolve the following major concerns in the province of Ontario:

"1. The failure to ensure employment, both short- and long-term, with particular emphasis on (a) direct government involvement in major long-term job-creating projects of wide diversity, public and private, across Ontario, (b) economic stimulation by the promise of substantial tax cuts, (c) major development and building of diversified housing for low- and middle-income citizens, (d) an intensive programme of secondary and tertiary manufacturing based on our resource sector;

"2. The failure to call for an early end to the AIB despite increasing public concern that controls are now hurting far more than they are working;

"3. The failure to moderate increases in the cost of living by refusing to recognize that (a) the present property tax formula places an unfair burden on middle-, low- and fixed-income families, (b) food prices, energy prices, land and housing costs are above the consumers' reasonable capacity to pay;

"4. The failure to protect adequately our natural-resource heritage, be it water, minerals, forests or agricultural land, compounded by the continued absence of a land-use plan for Ontario;

"5. The failure to call for a complete overhaul of the Workmen's Compensation Board to civilize it, to humanize it, and to make it respond sensitively to many of the people it was created to serve;

"And for all the foregoing enumerated reasons this government no longer enjoys the confidence of this House."

The House divided on the amendment by Mr. Lewis, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Angus	Auld
Bain	Belanger
Bounsall	Bennett
Breaugh	Bernier
Bryden	Birch
Burr	Breithaupt
Cassidy	Brunelle
Davidson	Bullbrook
Davison	Campbell
Deans	Conway
Di Santo	Cunningham
Dukszta	Davis
Ferrier	Drea
Foulds	Eakins
Germa	Eaton
Grande	Edighoffer
Laughren	Ferris
Lawlor	Gaunt
Lewis	Good
Lupusella	Gregory
MacDonald	Grossman
Mackenzie	Haggerty
Makarchuk	Hall
Martel	Handleman
McClellan	Henderson
Philip	Hodgson
Renwick	Johnson
Samis	Jones
Sandeman	Kennedy
Swart	Kerr
Warner	Kerrio
Wildman	Lane
Young	Leluk
Ziemba—34	MacBeth
	Maeck
	Mancini
	McCague
	McEwen
	McKeough
	McMurtry
	McNeil
	Meen
	Miller, F. S.
	Miller, G. I.
	Morrow
	Newman, B.
	Newman, W.
	Nixon
	Norton
	O'Neil
	Parrott
	Peterson
	Reid
	Rhodes
	Ruston
	Scrivener
	Shore
	Singer
	Smith, J. R.
	Smith, R. S.
	Smith, S.
	Snow
	Spence
	Stephenson
	Taylor
	Timbrell
	Welch
	Wells
	Williams
	Worton
	Yakabuski—71.

Pair: Stokes and Smith, G. E.

Ayes 34; nays 71.

The House divided on the main motion by Mr. Johnson, which was approved on the same vote reversed.

Resolved: That a humble address be presented to the Honourable P. M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

PETITION

Hon. Mr. Welch: Before moving the adjournment of the House and with the permission of the House I would like to table the response to the petition filed by the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Bain).

Agreed.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 10:32 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 18, 1977

Throne Speech debate, concluded, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Deans, Mr. Davis 581

Point of privilege re position on Quebec issue, Mr. Lewis 615

Tabling response to petition filed by Mr. Bain, Mr. Welch 617

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 617

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K.; Minister of Correctional Services (York East PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of Colleges and Universities (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Government Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 16

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 19, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

SPEAKER'S RULING RE: MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. Speaker: On Friday last, during the question period, a rather unusual procedure developed, brought about, I think it is fair to say, by the large number of ministers absent from the House during the question period.

There are two points that should be mentioned as far as the procedural aspect is concerned. First, as was pointed out, the ordinary rule as set out in standing order 31(a) is that motions to adjourn the House may be moved prior to the orders of the day only by leave of the House. I suggest that leave of the House does not necessarily predicate the unanimous consent, but is something which the Speaker must judge according to circumstances at the time.

In view of what occurred on Friday—and as no objection to the motion was made, I presumed leave of the House, and I feel that I was correct in this presumption—I point out that there is precedent for this action.

The second point on which I feel I should comment is that a member must under ordinary circumstances gain the floor in the usual way before he has the right to move such a motion. He may not interrupt the member who has the floor, by alleging a point of order for the purpose of moving the adjournment. However, the circumstances were again unusual. It was in the question period. That is, no one was holding the floor to speak on a debate; and as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis), who had the floor to ask a question, took no objection to Mr. S. Smith's interruption, I again gauged the mood of the House to be such that it was desirable to allow the bells to ring on the motion, in order to bring the House back to some semblance of order.

With respect to the other point raised by the government House leader, while it is true that he does not have any specific duties prescribed by the rules, until the orders of the day have been entered upon, it is surely the duty of the executive council to see that there are sufficient members of the council in the House during the question period to make it meaningful. Certainly, the Speaker cannot be expected to take on this obligation.

Mr. Singer: So much for Welch and Deans.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

May I take the opportunity to introduce to the hon. members, three honoured guests in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon, from Newfoundland. We have Mr. Roger Simmons, who is chairman of the public accounts committee; Mr. R. V. Winsor, the vice-chairman; accompanied by Mr. Ronald Penney the clerk. Welcome gentlemen.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege, if I may. I shall state the point with brevity; but I must state it, because in my nearly 14 years in the Legislature I can hardly think of another matter about which I feel more strongly.

Last night, almost at the end of his address, the Premier (Mr. Davis) quoted certain words from my Throne Speech reply which he first implied, and then stated, showed a difference of opinion between the government and ourselves over the question of Quebec.

My words as quoted, Mr. Speaker, were: "When you are talking about sovereignty with economic association, there is an increasing appeal to a lot of people in Quebec; that, I think, is why it is so desperately important that Ontario keep the option open —keep the doors open." Somehow, those words were then construed as suggesting that we in the NDP might countenance some kind of independence for Quebec with continued economic union with Canada.

Nothing, but nothing, could be further from the truth. I have said on a dozen different occasions—and it is all a matter of public record, well known to the Premier—that we in this party cannot contemplate

Canada without Quebec; and that we would do everything in our power, personally and politically, to prevent independence.

My plea for keeping doors open spoke specifically to the need to reach the majority of federalists in Quebec who reject separation on any grounds. On rereading that section of my Throne Speech reply I cannot see any other possible interpretation. Indeed, in that speech I, again, specifically supported the Premier's initiatives, called for consensus in Ontario, and, ironically enough, added these words; "The majority of Quebecois still want to hear the voices which speak for unity. Let us not be discordant. I judge we won't be."

Last night's episode proves my judgement wrong, and I am frankly upset about that. My remarks were subject to what can only be called the grossest misrepresentation. Occasionally, unhappy degrees of animus, exaggeration or feeling invade this legislative chamber, but surely, on an issue of this kind, there has to be a limit to partisan political expression where that expression is wholly unwarranted.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege. I recognize that the Leader of the Opposition has made this point in good faith and it is one about which he feels very deeply. I would like to address myself to that point of privilege in similar good faith and with similar deep conviction. I only regret that the Leader of the Opposition didn't refer to two items that I raised in the remarks last night. The citations which I included in my remarks last evening both with respect to the defiling of children and sovereignty with economic association were precise.

If what the Leader of the Opposition said at that time with respect to the defiling of children—

Mr. Ferris: It's a red herring.

Mr. Lewis: Order

Mr. S. Smith: It's not on his point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you prepared to—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: I would rise to a point of privilege on that as well, but I beg you, Mr. Speaker, not to allow this to happen. I uttered a point of privilege specifically dealing with one matter and I asked you not to allow the Premier to use his authority and presence in the House to shift it to another matter.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry. I did not hear the remarks. I believe the hon. member really should have risen on a point of order to correct a wrong impression that was left.

Mr. Lewis: Well.

Mr. Speaker: We would ask that the mood of the House perhaps accept that explanation or correction in the interpretation of certain remarks with which I am not familiar. Was the hon. Premier finished with his remarks? Would he please stick to the spirit of the House? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I will pass over the concern that I expressed last night on that other matter which I had hoped the Leader of the Opposition might refer. On the issue that the Leader of the Opposition spoke just a moment ago, I believe that the juxtaposition and sequence of the remarks on page 128 of Hansard, the April 4 edition, indicate quite clearly to any reasonable reader that there is, in fact, a relationship between the apparent appeal of economic association with sovereignty in Quebec and the notion "that Ontario keep the option open, keep the doors open—"

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: "—largely as the Premier said he will do and largely as the direction of policy seems to be."

Mr. Lewis: Right. Exactly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as that statement creates any ambiguity about Ontario's position—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —it should have been corrected. Let me finish, I didn't interrupt.

Mr. Lewis: All right, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As these comments made by the Leader of the Opposition appear to indicate his views, it was responsible and important for me to point out where—and I now quote from my own remarks—perhaps this was missed last night. I prefaced my remarks by saying, "I think, sir—" I didn't say that "in fact," I said, "I think, sir—"

Mr. Bain: Don't quibble.

Mr. MacDonald: Then we have innuendo.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: "—that the Leader of the Opposition and I differ."

Mr. MacDonald: Innuendo.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the member for York South should know about that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We don't want this to develop into a debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition believes that I was unfair and believes that the sequential relationship between the two thoughts do not imply either his position or the view he thinks he holds—or we hold—then I accept that gladly and I am prepared to stand corrected and I am delighted to hear him say it.

I would also take issue, Mr. Speaker, with the headline in today's Toronto Star which implies that I said one of the parties in Ontario is "soft on separatism."

Mr. Lewis: Not one of the parties—us.

An. hon. member: Right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just going by the headline. I simply did not say that. I reread what I said very carefully. It is in my view an unfair headline in every respect.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On tender topics—and I won't refer to troubled children again although I am disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition didn't see fit to raise this—

Mr. Renwick: This is a separate matter, wait.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, all right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we keep to this point of order? Thank you.

[2:15]

Hon. Mr. Davis: I suggest that loose language helps no one. It was my duty to point that out last night, as the Leader of the Opposition feels he has to today, and I respect that, but I also intend to do so when necessary in the future.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lewis: I rise on another and related point of order then, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought you just spoke once.

Mr. Lewis: No, I see them as separate matters. During the Premier's remarks last night he made reference to a specific sentence of mine taken from a portion of my Throne Speech reply which dealt with the establishment of a new children's authority. I told him at the time, and Hansard will bear it out, that I thought the reference was taken out of context. The Premier said to me he didn't think so. I said I thought about that part pretty carefully and I was sure that I hadn't uttered an indiscretion of that type, the implication of the Premier's remarks being fairly extreme.

When I went back and looked at Hansard I noticed that the Premier had said yesterday that if I would reread it again and didn't think those remarks meant what they meant he would apologize. May I simply say to the Premier, through the Speaker, that I went back this morning and read those remarks very carefully. I noted that I had acknowledged the genuineness of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), I noted that I had paid tribute to the deputy minister who was appointed and to his aide. I noted that I had hoped it would go to the Ministry of Education rather than Comsoc and had simply expressed a strong reservation about the capacity of Comsoc to deal with this question of the children's authority. It was done in entire good faith and even if the one word "defiling" was not as exact as it might have been, it could not possibly be given the interpretation which the Premier put upon it in the context of my contribution on that subject in that debate.

Mr. Eakins: You are in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't but say that I was disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition didn't say to this House that he didn't mean what is recorded in Hansard. I read very simply from Hansard—and I'm not a language scholar; I don't purport to have the command of the language that the Leader of the Opposition possesses—but I read very simply and I have read the context: "I look at the rest of the programmes in Comsoc and, honest to God, I don't know how the children will not be defiled by the inadequacy of the rest of the ministry." Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more.

Mr. Lewis: "By the inadequacy," that's right, I stand by that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I think these matters have been explained. There's a dif-

ference of opinion obviously as to their interpretation. We consider the matter closed.

Mr. Deans: You are clutching at straws.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

FIRE SAFETY IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 5, the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Stong) asked me two questions in regard to the inquest into the tragic death of five inmates of the Stratford jail, and I undertook to provide an update on the action taken to implement the 12 jury recommendations which relate to this ministry's operations.

I must preface my reply by pointing out that the hon. member's second question appeared to have been based on the false assumption that these five inmates were being held in solitary confinement at the time of the fire. These inmates were not in solitary confinement, but were locked in their regular cells as a security measure as a result of information passed to the jail superintendent by police that at least two of these men were involved in plans for a jail break. Ironically, if these men had been in solitary confinement and denied all normal privileges they would not have had either the matches or the various magazines and papers which were used by one or more of them to start this fire.

The ministry has acted on all 12 of the jury's recommendations that affect the ministry. The following is a summary of our response to each recommendation.

In regard to the recommendations relating to staff training, fire drills and liaison with local police and fire departments, effective April 1 all new jail staff are being trained in the use of air packs and firefighting equipment within one month of employment. I might observe parenthetically that the jury recommended that this be done within three months.

All other staff will have received refresher training within three months. An ongoing programme of training will also be maintained. The ministry has made allowances for the payment of overtime to facilitate this training. Fire drills are being conducted on a regular monthly basis and simulated nighttime drills are to be carried at least once every three months. Closer liaison is being established with local police and fire departments to assist in training our staff and to familiarize their personnel with the physical layout of our buildings. All ganglock boxes have been painted a fluorescent red in keeping with the jury's recommendations. Arrangements have been made to ensure prompt access to our buildings by emergency services, and master key rings are being established in institutions where this is practical, having regard for necessary overall security.

Memoranda regarding the storage of mattresses which are not in use have been reinforced and the ministry is giving high priority to the replacement of polyurethane mattresses with a type of cotton mattress. Steps have been taken to extend staff coverage at the Stratford jail. Wooden shelving in day areas of jails has been removed and is being replaced by metal shelving.

I have personally written letters of commendation to the policemen and correctional officers whom the jury commended for bravery. Ministry officials are currently working to complete a highly reliable checkback system relating to directives. In the interim, all superintendents are required to acknowledge in writing all memoranda on matters relating to inmate safety.

That covers the 12 recommendations relating to this ministry. The 13th recommendation was for the installation by the city of Stratford of an emergency telephone system, and I have expressed confidence that local authorities will give favourable consideration to this matter, which falls within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, following the question by the hon. member for York Centre, the hon. member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson) asked me a supplementary question relating to directives which are sent to jail superintendents. As I have already indicated in my reply to the hon. member for York Centre, a reliable checkback system is currently being devised by senior officials of my ministry. In the interim, all superintendents are being required to acknowledge in writing to their regional administrators the receipt of all directives related to the safety and welfare of inmates.

The hon. member for London Centre also asked whether changes had been made in the system under which inmates sent messages to their lawyers and other persons outside the jail. The ministry feels that the present system for handling inmate requests is quite efficient. This system was set up to ensure that action was taken on all reasonable inmate requests and it works this way:

Each request an inmate makes is recorded on a chronologically numbered form, filed, and kept an indefinite period of time. The

time at which the request is received is noted on the form and the inmate signs it to indicate the content of the message is accurate. Premising that the request is not frivolous, action is initiated by staff. When action has been completed, or if a request is denied, the inmate is informed and is required to again initial the request form in acknowledgement that he has been so advised.

One of the difficulties that jail staff encounter is that they are not always able to contact people by telephone on the first try and this sometimes leads to unavoidable delays in passing messages along. I have personally reviewed the request form and I feel that when attempts are made to telephone someone on an inmate's behalf, the times should be recorded whether the calls are successful or not. Therefore, I have instructed that when the present supply of request forms is used up a space will be provided on the new form for recording such information.

In regard to the situation at the Stratford jail on the day of the fire, the point about the message sent from an inmate to his lawyer involved whether or not any sense of urgency was conveyed. I do not think there could be any doubt that a sense of urgency was conveyed to the lawyer, since when he eventually received the message it appears that he immediately telephoned the jail to make arrangements to visit his client.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I have a second reply as well.

Mr. Roy: Good for you, Art.

CONDITIONS AT DON JAIL

Hon. Mr. Meen: On Tuesday, April 12, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith) asked me two questions relating to the Toronto jail. He asked for a report on an incident in which it was alleged that an inmate, Mr. Michael McKinnon, was assaulted by staff. He further asked me to comment on a letter written by six inmates in which they claimed that neither they nor visitors to the jail who witnessed the alleged assault were questioned during the investigation which followed.

In view of the fact that this matter is now before the courts, I think it would be prejudicial to discuss it in detail. I think I can say, though, that upon learning of the incident which occurred in the visiting area of the Toronto jail on Sunday, February 20, an inspector from the ministry's inspections and investigations branch was sent to the jail the following day to conduct an investigation. He interviewed Mr. McKinnon who stated that he did not wish to press charges against any correctional officer, but he reserved the right to do so at a later time if he felt it necessary. He also stated that he did not wish an investigation into the matter.

When the inspector went to interview one of the correctional officers, he learned that that officer had laid a formal charge of assault against Mr. McKinnon. At that stage, the alleged occurrence became a matter for police investigation and, as is normal practice when an official police investigation begins, the ministry investigation was terminated so as to not in any way impede the police investigation.

Miss Callwood also infers that people are locked in these cells 24 hours a day when, in fact, they are locked in them overnight to sleep and released from them early in the morning.

Mr. S. Smith: The minister has missed page two.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Thank you; thank you very much. It was out of sequence in my copy. I appreciate that.

Mr. S. Smith: I am hanging on every word.

Mr. Reid: Surprised you, somebody was listening.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Then for the benefit of Hansard, the last that should be recorded are the words "—impede the police investigation." I'll have to be really on my toes on this one.

The hon. member also asked me for my comment on an exchange of letters between Miss June Callwood and the director of the Ontario Humane Society concerning the size of the cells in the old section of the Toronto jail. I can only reiterate the committal of my ministry to the closure of the old wing of the Toronto jail at the earliest possible moment.

I have met Miss Callwood and discussed the plans of my ministry regarding the opening of the two new detention centres in Toronto within the next few weeks. This will, almost immediately, reduce the count in the old wing by more than 300 persons.

Toronto South Detention Centre, which will house 400 men and 100 women, is well advanced into the planning stage, and with the completion of construction the problems of the old Toronto jail will be relegated to the past.

Miss Callwood states the jail is verminous. I am informed that sections of the Toronto jail are disinfested weekly by a reliable extermination company. The kitchen area, in addition to the weekly programme, receives a special treatment every month. The jail also has a full-time housekeeping officer, trained by the extermination company that is under contract to the jail.

In her letter, June Callwood states that the majority of prisoners in the Toronto jail are, and I quote: "16, 17 and 18 years old." A check of this information reveals that during the period of August 13, 1976, to March 13, 1977, only 12.5 per cent—

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you take it as read?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —of the total male population admitted to the Toronto jail was in the age group of 16 to 18. Miss Callwood also inferred that people are locked in these cells 24 hours a day, when in fact they are locked in them overnight to sleep and released from them early in the morning. They spend all day, and most of the evening, in a day corridor where there are proper toilet facilities, lighting, television and so on.

Secondly, Miss Callwood claims that they are the least dangerous prisoners. The fact that a person is young, or even that it is the first time he has been incarcerated, does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that he is not dangerous nor that he has not been in considerable previous trouble with the law. Some of these individuals are charged with serious offences and others have been denied bail because they are considered too dangerous to be released into the community.

Many of them are unknown quantities. In other words, the jail does not know for sure whether they have serious emotional problems, whether they are dangerous because of excessive drug use and so on, and the jail must maintain them in a secure situation for the safety of the public.

I would agree that the physical conditions, even for overnight sleeping, are far from ideal. The new detention centres in Metro, which will house significant numbers of these people later this year, will have larger cells with proper lighting and toilet facilities.

Mr. Foulds: I wish the Premier had your sense of understatement.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It would be nice to simply close the old section of the jail tomorrow, if that were practical; but I have to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not. One simply cannot turn people loose who are a potential threat to the rest of society. In other words, to close the old section of the jail one has to have alternative accommodations.

[2:30]

Governments are like ordinary citizens. They have to weigh what they would like to do against what they can afford to do. Ontario has made major strides in upgrading older jails and replacing others with modern facilities. Old jails were taken over by the province in 1968, and already we have closed nine outdated facilities. Three more will be closed this week and two more later this year. The capital cost of the four new detention centres—one which opened in London last week, two in Toronto and one in Hamilton, which will also open this year—is approximately $60 million. As a government, we have to balance the need for new jails against the need for other facilities and services required by the taxpayer.

HOSPITAL AND NURSING HOME BEDS

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Today I am tabling —in fact, I have given copies to the assistant clerk of the House—the March, 1977, report of the Ontario Council of Health task force on the distribution of hospital and nursing home beds in Metropolitan Toronto.

Following the announcement last year of hospital closings, my colleague the member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller) then Minister of Health, asked the Ontario Council of Health to undertake an impartial review of the supply and need for hospital and nursing home beds in Metropolitan Toronto. The Council of Health established a task force under the chairmanship of Mr. W. R. Allen, QC. Both Mr. Allen and Mr. Martin, the chairman of the Council of Health, are in the upper gallery.

The report of this task force is based on the Woods, Gordon report of October, 1976 —commissioned by the ministry in July, 1976 —which compiled descriptive and analytical data to enable the Council of Health task force to make specific recommendations for the rationalization of beds in Metropolitan Toronto. The data on hospital beds and services used in the study were supplied by the facilities themselves.

The Ministry of Health is in general agreement with the report and its recommendations. It will be apparent from reading the

report that matters of timing, definition and implementation require further study and discussion with the groups or the individuals affected.

The ministry will arrange to meet with the appropriate parties to discuss the application and the implementation of the recommendations. At the same time, ministry review teams will examine the more technical recommendations and advise me on the steps necessary to put them into effect. Once the discussion review process is complete, an implementation plan will be developed for discussion, with those involved, prior to its initiation.

The first recommendation deserving special comment is that a district health council be established for Metropolitan Toronto. The ministry fully agrees with the recommendation but has committed itself to await the report of the Robarts commission on Metro Toronto, which may have a bearing on how such a council is to be established.

The recommendation to establish an assessment placement agency to co-ordinate movement among levels of care, as well as initial access to long-term care and home-support services, is also completely consistent with the intentions of this ministry. It is also, I may say, consistent with the intentions of the Ministry of Community and Social Services which would, of course, also be affected by such an agency. Discussions are under way between our two ministries on the provision of assessment and placement services. Metropolitan Toronto will receive a high priority.

Concerning bed rationalization, the task force recommends that the Salvation Army Grace Hospital cease operation as an active treatment hospital, converting to an alternative use in keeping with the role of the Salvation Army.

At a meeting on Monday, April 4, between Commissioner Harold Brown of the Salvation Army and myself, and the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), it was agreed that the Salvation Army Grace Hospital would cease to function as an active treatment hospital during 1977; that planning for the development of a new Salvation Army Grace Hospital in Lamoureaux would start in the fall of 1977, with operations of the first phase of the new facility to begin in 1982-1983; and that discussion would begin immediately with the downtown Salvation Army Grace Hospital, the Hospital Council of Metropolitan Toronto and the Ministry of Health on the development of a programme of long-term care at this facility, with emphasis on palliative care for the terminally ill. Some day-hospital facilities will also be provided.

The task force supports the view taken by the ministry in 1976 that an active treatment hospital should cease operation in downtown Toronto. However, the task force recommends that this be the Grace Hospital, whereas the ministry had proposed the Doctors Hospital. It should be recognized that the task force was in possession of the additional data produced by the Woods, Gordon study, and that their recommendations will not yield the operating cost savings the ministry was looking for, savings that had to be realized by reducing other government programmes.

My ministry will continue to fund the Doctors Hospital. We shall, however, pursue the current court case on hospital closings so as to settle the questions of principle concerning the ability of the ministry to close facilities it cannot fund.

Mr. Nixon: What about the other hospitals? What about Paris?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The ministry agrees with the recommendations concerning incentives to encourage health facilities to make better use of their resources. Regulations have recently been passed increasing financial support to hospitals in need of financial assistance to amalgamate duplicated services or to make capital investments that will result in operating savings.

The ministry appreciates the approach taken to the recommendations on paediatric bed rationalization, bed alternatives, emergency services, isolation care and obstetrical care. Work is already under way on these considerations and will be greatly assisted by the advice of the task force.

The ministry will work with the Hospital Council of Metro Toronto, the University Teaching Hospitals' Association and other relevant groups to review the rationale for the task force's proposals for other bed rationalization and the best means and timing of their implementation. This review will also involve careful consideration of the proposals' effects on staff and personnel with representatives of the employee groups affected. We will also consider the recommendation of the Council of Health for a review of the role of Sunnybrook Hospital.

Work is proceeding in the Ministry of Community and Social Services, together with the Ministry of Health, on how best to provide a spectrum of long-term care,

how to rationalize the funding of such care and how to further improve the present co-ordination between the ministries. The task force's recommendations on these points are most useful and will have to be studied by the many agencies already involved in the provision of services involved in the spectrum of long-term care.

Recognition must be given to the role of the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) in initiating the concept of this study—

Mr. Foulds: That puts Bill McMurtry on the spot.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —which will have major implications for the planning of institutional health care.

As a review of the membership will indicate, the Council of Health assembled an excellent team to review the Toronto bed-need situation and they have done a first-rate job. Indeed, the results indicate how valuable a role the Council of Health plays in advising the Minister of Health of this province.

Mr. Eakins: Stand up, Larry, and take a bow.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The report of the task force was well done and has been well received by the ministry. As the report indicates, further study is required on several recommendations and the appropriate groups will be gathered together in short order. Substantial time will have to be devoted to these studies and to consultation on the more specific and immediate recommendations.

I am pleased with the model this study provides for a review of bed needs in other parts of the province, and I am most encouraged by the comment that the task force agrees it is possible to make modifications in the system without making reductions in service. This will be the constant goal of my ministry throughout the province.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, today I will be tabling the Ministry of Transportation and Communications road construction programme for 1977-1978.

This fiscal year we are planning to spend an estimated $216.6 million on new road construction. As in the past, construction work has been spread as fairly as possible across the whole province. Most of the proposed new work on the provincial highway system—858 miles—will be on two-lane highways.

Among improvements to northern Ontario highways, which MTC will carry out for my colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), will be a continuing and accelerated construction programme, including several major new contracts. We will be continuing the passing and truck climbing-lane construction, as well as the development of new access roads and improvements to airports.

Mr. Reid: How about the road between Ignace and Atikokan?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: The one on which your candidate was going to resign if he didn't get it built.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That can come later, thank you.

Hon. Mr. Snow: In keeping with the Ontario government policy of fiscal constraint, we continue to keep a tight rein on our spending by making a critical asessment of current needs.

Mr. Foulds: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Thus each proposed construction project in this programme has been carefully assessed to ensure that we meet the needs of the motoring public in the immediate future. Above all, we have every intention of maintaining and improving Ontario's highway system to ensure that its present high standard does not deteriorate.

Copies of the green book, which I am tabling with the clerk, will be distributed to each member through the legislative post office.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL CLOSINGS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Health: Since the minister regards the Ontario Health Council task force as first-rate and valuable in its contributions to him, and since its assessment of Metro Toronto hospital bed needs and nursing home needs resulted in a significant reversal of government policy, can we ask that he asks this task force, or another constituted from the

council, to review specifically those areas of the province where the ministry may have made other unjustified and precipitate hospital closings before he proceeds further with those small communities?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I point out again that the deliberations of the task force and the council confirm the view of the ministry that, in fact, an active treatment hospital in downtown Toronto should cease to operate as an active treatment hospital.

Mr. Lewis: Somewhat different.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Different ones were concluded. I would hope that he also knows that bed-needs studies are, in fact, under way right now in Grey-Bruce under the auspices of the Grey-Bruce district health council; that there have been discussions between members of my staff and the local area planning co-ordinator with people on the steering committee in the counties of Huron and Perth to develop a bed-needs study in those two counties.

I would hope that he knows that last Friday I received a report from the Essex district health council—I went to Windsor to receive the report—as to its views—that is, views of the local citizens sitting on that council—as to what it considers to be the most appropriate rationalization of beds in that county.

Certainly none of those hospitals to which the member alludes are under orders to close. We are most anxious to carry out this process, which we know will be long and involved, but with the co-operative spirit of the local people can be very successful in maintaining levels of service and at the same time hopefully saving some hard-earned tax dollars.

Mr. Lewis: By way of an obvious supplementary, since after the event we have now instituted a series of bed-use studies in those various areas, which could surely lead to a rationalization, if any, preferable to the approach of the government, can the minister undertake to promise the communities involved that whatever the results of the court case may be, he will not close down their hospitals until he has—hopefully never, but if he must—until he has studies from the various areas showing whether there are alternative possibilities?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think that's what I was saying, but perhaps I was a little long-winded about it. I do separate the two issues.

Mr. Reid: That's hard to believe.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Being an ex-teacher, he understands. I do separate the two issues, that of the resolution of the principle in the courts, and the other being the specifics of individual hospitals within particular areas of the province; I do separate them. Whatever happens in the courts—well, we'll see what happens, but I do not have any of those hospitals under any orders to close, and certainly—

Mr. Roy: Don't be too optimistic about the courts; your record is not one of shining glamour.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —we would hope that the bed-needs studies to which I referred can be carried out as soon as possible, obviously, but certainly involving the input from all those local communities.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the minister did not refer to the hospital in Paris specifically in his answer to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, might we assume that the bed needs which have been so obviously established over these many months have now led him to abandon any plan that he might have to put the Willett Hospital in jeopardy?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Perhaps I am mistaken, but I believe a number of the beds in the Willett have been converted to chronic care. That's the way the problem was resolved there. Certainly there are no plans and there is no order outstanding on the Willett Hospital in Paris to close.

Mr. Roy: Nothing going on now.

Mr. S. Smith: What a change.

Mr. Roy: You're not going to fool around with hospitals now.

Mr. S. Smith: Not until after the election.

Mr. Dukszta: A supplementary: In view of what the minister just said about awaiting the results of studies in Grey-Bruce county, in terms of those two hospitals in Owen Sound, could he tell me how he would explain that the two administrators of the General and Marine Hospital and the administrator of Mackinnon Phillips Psychiatric Hospital are already talking about how to integrate the two hospitals, which would in effect lead to the destruction of one facility?

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I would hope, since the hon. member is the health critic, that he would know that the board of the General and Marine Hospital a number of months ago agreed in principle to pursue the possibility of an amalgamation between the General and Marine and the Dr. Mackinnon Phillips, which would in effect involve a transfer from the province to a local board of the Mackinnon Phillips Hospital. That's acceptance in principle to investigate.

That investigation is under way. Consultants—I believe the name of the firm is E.H. and E. or E.H.E., whichever way they say it—have been meeting with staff and trustees, administrators and so forth, and I would expect we'll have something from them in the next two or three months. But certainly, as far as I know, the board has not in effect said that they are definitely merging with Mackinnon Phillips. They are as interested as we are in investigating the potential, obviously with the view that we must maintain the quality of health care in the area, and hopefully save not only operating dollars now but future capital dollars. The Mackinnon Phillips hospital, I think, is only about 20 years old and has quite extensive capacity.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: Knowing full well about the merger of the two hospitals in Owen Sound, the minister is playing political football there. It's a patchwork job. What is the timing at this time and place that he should release the Doctors Hospital before an election and yet can't make a decision for Durham and Chesley at this point?

Mr. Lewis: They need to save the seat.

Mr. Mancini: They want to save a seat.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I don't know anything about the event alluded to by the hon. member, but—

Mrs. Campbell: You wouldn't know that that is a Tory riding, would you?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —it's certainly not a question of a political football.

Mr. Roy: Oh, no.

Mr. Singer: No, no.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'm pleased the member raises it, since it's the first time he has raised it with me since I became Minister of Health. As I understand it, there is considerable additional capacity—

Mr. Sargent: You never know the answers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: There is additional capacity, considerable capacity, available in the Mackinnon Phillips Hospital, which is a fairly modern facility when compared to the existing General and Marine, which has had a number of additions and a number of problems at the various levels.

Mr. Sargent: Thirty beds; you are talking about 30 beds.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think it speaks well of the board of that local hospital, the General and Marine, that they would agree, along with the ministry, to investigate the potential of combining the two and thereby saving the public the great deal of money which would be involved in eventually replacing the General and Marine if that had to be done.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't take the time of the question period to go around the province with each and every hospital. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about Durham and Chesley.

Mr. Reid: You don't have a hospital in your riding, do you?

Mr. Roy: There will be only 22 supplementaries.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: I have one last supplementary which is almost for clarification, if I may ask it. In his statement the minister artfully changed the words on page six which suggested clearly that Doctors Hospital would be funded regardless of the outcome of the legal appeal, and in his words to the Legislature he said, "my ministry will continue to fund the Doctors Hospital. We shall, however, pursue the current court case." Will the minister give a commitment to the continued funding of Doctors Hospital regardless of the legal appeal?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the revised wording did, in fact, make that clear.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister is answering.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I had hoped that the revised wording made it clear; certainly that is the point.

As I said earlier, I separate the two, the question of the court proceedings and the individual hospitals, and certainly they will continue to be funded.

Mr. McKessock: Supplementary: In view of the fact that he took the needs study in Toronto, and in view of the fact that there's just been a health council set up in Grey and Bruce, why couldn't the minister drop the court appeal on these hospitals in our area and take the advice of the newly-formed health council, the way he has taken advice in Toronto?

Mr. S. Smith: They should have done so in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am looking for the advice of that district council, and as I have already indicated in answering a question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I separate the two questions. The one is a very fundamental one—no matter which party or which individuals happen to occupy the Treasury benches—that is does the government have the right to cease to fund a programme or facility which it cannot afford to fund? That really transcends—

Mr. Singer: Why don't you amend the statute?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: Just amend your laws.

Mr. Singer: Change the statute.

Mr. Roy: That's free legal advice.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's what it's worth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One day you would support it and one day you wouldn't.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I learned a long time ago, growing up in Frontenac county, what to think of free advice. It's worth about the same.

Mr. Nixon: Don't talk about your mother that way.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The point is there are no orders hanging over any of the hospitals in Grey-Bruce. We are working with the district health council, we will have local input. Local people on the district health council will review that input and will give their advice as to what they consider to be in the best interests of the health districts of Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Bullbrook: The law suit is redundant. The Premier knows it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Riddell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have a hospital that is directly affected by the decision made by the former Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller), and now this ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are straying, we are going around the province. We are taking up too much time in the question period. The hon. member may have a chance to ask his question later.

Mr. Nixon: It is the last one, it is the last hospital.

Mr. Speaker: I said this was the final supplementary a moment ago and that must stand.

Mr. Singer: The Legislature is supposed to go around the province.

Mr. S. Smith: We only have 35 Liberal members, so where else can there be hospitals to be closed going around the province?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member didn't have an opportunity to make his point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, he did. I heard the point of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: He didn't make it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is not debatable. We have to get on to a new question now.

Some hon. members: Why?

Mr. Sargent: It's important to get the Premier off the hook, that's why.

Mr. Singer: We shouldn't go round the province because we're only a Legislature.

REED PAPER

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier: Flowing from the Throne Speech, can he indicate when he intends to bring down the revised terms for the Patrick Hartt inquiry, and perhaps clarify a little more precisely what those revised terms will do, since it still seems to be a matter of some uncertainty?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. Actually there were discussions on this as recently as 10:30 or 10:45 this morning. The matter is being very actively pursued by a number of people, including those that I undertook to consult with an that includes Chief Rickard.

I am hoping to have some reaction within a few days to the suggestions that were made as recently as this morning, and hopefully make a statement or an announcement to the House very soon thereafter. I think it is fair to state that Chief Rickard, the municipalities and others, but particularly Chief Rickard, have certain consultative processes they must go through. I understand from what Chief Rickard told me this morning that his consultative process would be under way in the next couple of days.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: As part of the consideration which the Premier is giving, is he proposing an inquiry which extends beyond the proposed or intended Reed Paper limits to matters of northwestern development rather more generally?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I indicated in the House when we were discussing this matter before, there were, I guess, a number of issues. To try to simplify it, there is the issue of the specifics of Reed; there is the broader issue that Chief Rickard raised, in correspondence and in personal visits I have had with him, as to the general development programme or policy that might be developed for north of the 50th parallel. What we are endeavouring to do, in the situation as we are attempting to bring it together, is to find ways and means of perhaps encompassing both notions at one time. I am not sure this will turn out, but we are trying to do it under the one inquiry; or the one commission, shall we say.

As I say, I can't really discuss with the Leader of the Opposition the specifics yet, because I have made these undertakings to the people who are very directly affected to give them an opportunity to see whether or not it suits their concept of it or their view of it. As soon as I have this information I will be more than pleased to share it with the House.

Mr. Bullbrook: Supplementary: Premising the Premier's agreement with me that these terms of reference might be as significant as any ever drafted by his administration, and recognizing that he is taking into account the thoughts of people outside this chamber, would he possibly consider having liaison with the members of the opposition parties with respect to the drafting of the final terms of reference, if they are not going to be included in the statute?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry, I didn't get the last part of the question.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I may, it's my understanding that perhaps the terms of reference might be included in the amending statute, in which case we'd have the opportunity of debating same. If not, would the Premier take us into his confidence, may we be privy to the general terms of reference—Chief Rickard's lack of acceptance of same? May we have some opportunity for input?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, my problem here is I am not sure which will come first; the legislation or the terms of reference. I am quite prepared that when the legislation is here, if the terms of reference have been, shall we say, understood and agreed to by the parties which are particularly interested—and that doesn't mean others aren't, but who have a particular interest—if there is, shall we say, a consensus on the terms of reference at that point then I am quite sure the minister, or whoever, would be quite prepared to have those discussed at the time of the legislation; but I think it is fair to state, and the member would understand this, not as a part of the legislation. I mean, they would be specific terms of reference that would follow from the legislation.

Mr. Bullbrook: One short supplementary: Would the Premier not agree it's asking a lot of the legislators to enact that amendment, which is going to be significant, without knowing what the terms of reference are?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. Mr. Speaker, although on occasion I agree with the member for Sarnia, I think the amendments to be legislation, while vital to this matter, can be debated in terms of principle and in terms of particulars by this House without the terms of reference. I think it is quite conceivable that we could have a situation where the government felt these amendments were desirable without necessarily having, shall we say, a study or a commission immediately in the offing and we would be dealing in the ordinary fashion. I would be very surprised if the member for Sarnia won't be able to understand it and deal with it and debate it just as effectively in this fashion. I would be very surprised if he can't.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: If the terms of reference have not been worked out and are not close to completion at this time, does Mr. Justice Hartt still think it possible to begin his informal public hearings in July,

as was reported by a former Conservative candidate from northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am always an optimist and I think it is fair to state that Mr. Justice Hartt feels—assuming that the legislation is approved with enthusiasm and no prolonged delay by members opposite, and in the hope that we can reach an agreement on the terms of reference in the very near future—that he could start even prior to July.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary to the Premier for clarification: First of all, I take it from his statement and from talking to Mr. Justice Hartt that the inquiry, whatever the terms of reference are and under whatever statute it happens to be, will relate strictly to development north of the 50th latitude and not to that section of Ontario that we might call politically northern Ontario; only that north of the 50th latitude? Can I ask the Premier's assurance that other development projects, perhaps not on the scale of the Reed Paper proposal, will in fact come under the scrutiny of Mr. Justice Hartt and have to go through this kind of scrutiny before they go ahead?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't really tell the hon. member at this point. It is one of the areas I am sure the chief will be wishing to discuss with his colleagues. The general intent is that it be the 50th parallel north, which then, I think, would probably resolve any thoughts the hon. member had with respect to potential development south of the 50th parallel. We don't know of any at this moment. There may be the potential of one or two. I would think Mr. Justice Hartt in his assessment probably would be taking them into account, I don't know; I honestly can't tell the hon. member until I hear back from those parties involved in the discussions.

[3:00]

CONDITIONS AT DON JAIL

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Minister of Correctional Services, regarding the Don Jail: Notwithstanding the reports that the old section of the jail will be closing in some year's time, can he tell what action his ministry is taking to correct the deficiencies—an alleged three-page list of deficiencies at the jail—identified by the Toronto Fire Department? These deficiencies included, I believe, the installation of an electronic warning system, automatic sprinklers and so on. Will the minister assure the House that the supposed eventual closure of the jail won't be used as an excuse to leave it as a fire hazard.

Hon. Mr. Meen: To the extent that it is necessary that modificiations or rectifications should be made, the question would more appropriately be directed to my colleague, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. J. R. Smith), since that end of things is under his responsibility—with the possible exception of the hazards created by a blocked corridor. This was brought to our attention, among other items in that report; and being one of my ministry's responsibilities as a tenant of that building I have corrected that problem. I've instructed that the problem will not arise again.

But may I just repeat that as to the other items, I believe the question should more properly be directed to the Minister of Government Services.

Mr. S. Smith: May I just say that if a tragedy like Stratford were to occur, the minister would have to answer for it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has redirected the question.

Hon. J. R. Smith: To the hon. member for Hamilton West: First of all, this inspection was made, at the request of the Ministry of Correctional Services, by the Toronto Fire Department. In its report regarding the first section, which involves the permanent stand pipe system, items (a), (b) and (c) have been completed; and the Toronto Fire Department has advised that item (d) is a heated area and no relocation was necessary.

In the new building, the check valve is being relocated to comply with the report. We are presently investigating the reasons for the drop in pressure to the booster pump; the manual operation will be discontinued, the fault has been found and corrected. Does the member wish me to go through them all?

Mr. S. Smith: That's very interesting. All I want to know is, whether the ministry is going to comply with the whole report or not?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Yes, we are complying with all of the shortfalls, the needed improvements. The ministry's electrician has been in poor health and our ministry has supplied another electrician this week so that this work can be carried on.

Mr. S. Smith: Thank you very much for that answer.

TRADE MISSIONS

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Has the minister any studies available to indicate whether or not Ontario has been getting its money's worth for the $2.3 million that his ministry has been using to promote overseas trade? I ask this in view of the recommendation of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) that this programme be scrapped?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: First of all, I think it would be well to correct the fact that it was not the Treasurer's remark that it should be scrapped; that was an interpretation placed upon it by a reporter. As for the exact comment in relationship—

Mr. Nixon: The Treasurer never denied it.

Mr. Sweeney: Those reporters are having trouble these days.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Well they do run into a bit of trouble with some of the members of the opposition as well.

Mr. Sweeney: Trying to understand what you guys are saying.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am misquoted.

Mr. Roy: Now that you're married, Claude, you're not supposed to be aggressive.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Albert, let me tell you, I have a peaceful mind, even dealing with you, I can assure you of that.

Mr. Roy: Claude, can I ask you a question?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Ask the question. If it's what I think it's going to be—no, I am not of the same—oh, I won't say it, Albert; obviously, we'd wind up in the wrong place in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. minister answer the first question, thank you.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes, I'll come back to answering the question.

We do have some reports that would indicate the potential we derive from the trade missions sent abroad. They are taken over a period of three years at intervals of six months, being a report from each of the corporations involved in the mission.

Mr. S. Smith: Do I take it that the minister is quite satisfied with the studies he has been receiving month by month, or semi-annually or whatever, and intends to continue this programme on behalf of Ontario? Or does he agree with the quotation, attributed to the Treasurer, saying that the only reason for that programme was, "when we got into that there was a strong feeling that an industry thinking of coming to Canada was going to be given every incentive to go any place but Ontario"?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: First of all, I understand the leader of the Liberal Party has said the quotation was attributed to the Treasurer, and, in my discussion with him yesterday, he did not make the statement. Let me go one step further to say that the Treasurer is aware of the productivity of these missions. We also see very clearly the potential in expanding the trade opportunities, in looking for new ventures of capital investment in this country from foreign lands; that's the area where we'll be directing our efforts. I have said to the member of the Liberal Party, who happens to be the critic in this field, that this is the area we'll be working on and concentrating on more over the next 12 months.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: Regarding the minister's Cara venture this afternoon to export grains to the United States, how much is that costing and how many jobs are going to result?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: First of all, I take it that what the member's referring to is the conference that we have going on at the Cara Inn at this very moment—

Mr. Sargent: To export grains?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: —which is being held in conjunction with the Consulting Engineers of Ontario and the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. If there's one area that is lacking in this government—and not only in Ontario but in Canada—it is in co-ordinating the industrial efforts to look for new opportunities in foreign lands. We in Canada have not been able to put together turnkey projects that have been beneficial for this province, and indeed for the economy of Canada.

Mr. Sargent: Sure you have.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: What we are attempting to do today is to get a better understanding by the professional people in Ontario, along with my ministry—and may I also say that the federal government is represented at this conference—in the hope that we can find a better understanding so that we can co-ordinate the professional services in seeking out foreign opportunities and rewarding this province with new jobs and new business for industry. It will not be accomplished—and I am very emphatic about this—because for too

long it has been kicked about at the federal and provincial levels; for too long we have allowed the private sector to wander off and be very competitive unto themselves in foreign markets—

Mr. Foulds: Where's your feeling for free enterprise?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: —rather than somebody being the catalyst in the country of Canada in bringing those professions together so that we can secure them.

Mr. Nixon: You tell us what you thought. The Treasurer's not going to like that either.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I think the Urban Transportation Development Corporation, in its efforts in the Venezuela contract, is a very fair example of what we can achieve.

Mr. Ferrier: Don't you believe in free enterprise?

Mr. Sargent: How are you doing in Venezuela?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It doesn't mean to say we're going to win every contract, but at least Canada will have a very positive position, with a one-price position, and not be competitive unto ourselves.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has the floor.

RAYBESTOS-MANHATTAN

Ms. Sandeman: A question for the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Have the directives which were issued to Raybestos-Manhattan after the high levels of asbestos fibres were recorded there in November been carried out; and have the affected areas and the affected personnel yet been retested?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the affected areas were retested last week and the inspection was carried out. I have not seen the report but I shall get the results and report on it to this House.

Ms. Sandeman: Supplementary: In the view of the fact that the union were never made aware of the last test results, could the minister assure me that they will be made aware of the directives, any action that follows and the new test results?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It's the policy of the ministry to provide that information to both the employer and the employees in those situations, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Laughren: Since when?

An hon. member: That's a joke.

An hon. member: Then why don't you do it?

ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Reed: I have a question for the Minister of Energy: Now that the President of the United States has underlined the gravity of his country's energy situation, and recognizing that Ontario shares many of our neighbour's specific problems in this regard, is the minister now prepared to change his position and call for an all-out research and development programme to bring on stream a significant renewable energy component before the end of the century, and not after as stated in his policy paper of last week?

Mr. S. Smith: And to drive a mid-size car?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I gather that by now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has had an opportunity to read the energy future report.

Mr. Sargent: We can't; we couldn't understand you.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I think that report indicates very clearly the position of this province in terms of our energy future. It's a report, I think, that was echoed in many regards by President Carter in his television address last night.

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, come on!

Mr. Roy: He copied it.

Mr. S. Smith: He must have seen your statement.

Mr. Nixon: He doesn't make a move without consulting you.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're wasting valuable time. The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Now we've got a comedian.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: What would you do?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I didn't say that I had given President Carter an advance copy, I didn't indicate that.

Mr. Roy: Did he pick up the phone?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: What did he-all say to you?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I suppose there is a grapevine, but I must confess that I didn't see that he got an advance copy of it.

Mr. Roy: You are starting to talk like Trudeau, with your hands.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Then maybe I'll meet more with your favour.

Mr. Roy: You may.

Mr. Warner: You are getting worse every day.

Mr. Ruston: Ask him to resign.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In terms of research and development, as members know we are very dedicated to that.

Mr. Sargent: You have got your Premier embarrassed.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: We have hoped to participate more fully in the federal government's programme. Again, as members know, it is spending about $138 million a year in research and development. About three-quarters of that is actually in the nuclear area—

Mr. Bullbrook: Can't we get a straight answer from him?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —and Ontario's benefitting in a very minor way from that overall research and development effort. We are concerned, of course, that it's Ontario's consumers who are paying very big dollars in terms of prices for oil and natural gas, and that more of that money should go into research and development. I agree with the member there, if he concurs that more money should be going into research and development.

Mr. S. Smith: This is a form of punishment for asking a question.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Certainly in my budget we are pursuing further projects. I think members are acquainted with a number of the projects that we have going for us in Ontario.

Mr. Bullbrook: Don't let anybody ask for a supplementary.

Hon. B. Stephenson: That will teach you.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I think members will become more acquainted, of course, with the positive programme that we do have. We are committed, I think I've made that clear in terms and emphasis.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're wasting time here.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't say who.

Hon. J. R. Smith: This is an important question.

Mr. Moffatt: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Just one moment please. When we ask a general question we're going to get a general answer, I might point out.

Hon. J. R. Smith: A good answer.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Has the hon. minister completed that question?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: No, not quite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We should not ask a question of this nature in the first place, nor should the answer contain a complete discussion of anything. That should be left for some—

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Members are straying too far afield. Will the hon. minister bring his answer to a conclusion then, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: All right. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it's a—

Mr. Ruston: Just read the last paragraph, Jim.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member for Durham East have a point of order?

Mr. Moffatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is, could we have the lights turned out while the minister makes his statement?

Mr. Speaker: The answer is no and that is not a point of order. That's further wasting of time.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're still wasting time. Order. The hon. minister, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I do hope that both energy critics are serious about this, because it is a matter of great concern and gravity—

Mr. Sargent: Did you really talk to Jimmy Carter?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —not only to the province of Ontario but to Canada. I want the hon. member to know that we are pursuing even more vigorously the areas of renewable energy sources, and I'd be very happy to develop that more fully at some other time.

Mr. Speaker: We'll allow one supplementary.

Mr. Reed: Does that mean the answer is yes or no?

Mr. Ferris: Maybe.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Was that a supplementary? I didn't hear it.

Mr. Reed: Yes, that was my supplementary.

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That question elicits a rather lengthy response—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might mail it.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very serious problem. I don't think it should be treated lightly.

Mr. Speaker: It is a very serious problem.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are taking too much time on this question. There are many more questions to be asked. I don't know what that particular supplementary was, but is there a brief answer to it?

Mr. Roy: Yes or no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will get on then.

Mr. di Santo: I have a further supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: This is a final supplementary.

Mr. di Santo: Final supplementary. In the effort to develop other sources of energy, can the minister tell us: 1. To whom will the technology developed with the Syncrude plant go, and what part will go to the province of Ontario? 2. Will he take a public position on the northern pipeline which will cost a lot to the province of Ontario as well?

Mr. Speaker: I think we are getting into specific questions here. Order, please. The next question.

HIGHWAY 61

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications with regard to the recent tender call for work on Highway 61 in Thunder Bay, 7.9 miles easterly from Highway 130: Inasmuch as this highway was reconstructed in 1970 and that deterioration was noticeable within the first two years following construction, would the minister undertake a comprehensive soils investigation of all the frost boils and shifts in the roadbed to see if the appropriate backfill was used in the reconstruction of 1970?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: Good boy. Way to go, Jim.

Mr. Angus: A very quick supplementary, Mr. Speaker, very short; we thank you. Would the minister also have his staff examine the inspection records to see what kind of instructions were issued to the field staff regarding the type of backfill that was to be used?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am not personally aware of all the figures and the dates the hon. member is quoting regarding this particular situation. If the facts as he states them are correct, certainly I will look into the matter and get the answers to those questions. I would be equally as concerned as he is if a road is having to be repaired as extensively as this one is in such a short period of time, and I want to know the reason why.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If the minister's investigation finds the terms of the first contract were not adequately met, can he recover the costs of the rebuilding from the original contractor in 1970 and will he attempt to do so?

Hon. Mr. Snow: That I would have to look into. I would doubt that very much. There is a certain guarantee period on any work, but once the final takeover of a job occurs, once our inspectors give it final approval, I don't think we can go back eight or 10 years and expect the contractor to be responsible. But I will certainly look into the matter.

ESSEX COUNTY FRENCH SCHOOL

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education and I would like the Minister of Government Services to listen: Is the minister aware that the teachers' college located in Windsor, which was built about 10 years ago and designed at that time to be used eventually as a secondary school, might be available for a possible site for the French-language secondary school? Is the minister also aware that the building is owned by Government Services and that the present lessee, the University of Windsor, would like to move back closer to the campus?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am aware the building is there and that it at present is either being leased by or belongs to the University of Windsor. It is the faculty of education; it is not a vacant building. I think there is very little likelihood this government has any capital money for the University of Windsor to build any new buildings of that nature. It is a possibility that if the building were vacant, it would become the French-language school for the area after the member has an opportunity, with the rest of us here, to vote for the bill we have in this Legislature. If it is available then, he can come and talk to me about it.

Mr. Ruston: Supplementary: Since the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) made a recent statement about how he wants to save money, it seems to me that if the University of Windsor feels it can do with much smaller facilities, to move back in its own area so that its cost of operations would be less, would be a logical thing to do.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The point then is for the University of Windsor to come to us and say we can have that building back and that it will give it to us. It would then have to be considered by the French-language advisory committees of the Essex and the Windsor school boards. If they found it was a suitable facility for a unique, French-language secondary school, it could possibly be used, if they wish. But I would suggest the likelihood is very remote, and I'm sure the possibility has been thought of before.

Mr. Burr: Supplementary: Has the minister explored the possibility that Massey Secondary School in Windsor could be used for this purpose, inasmuch as it has a great many big classrooms? Essex county students were withdrawn from that building, which had been originally designed to accommodate Essex county secondary school students.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As my friend knows, it hasn't really been the duty of the minister to explore all these possibilities; it has been the responsibility of the elected Essex County Public School Board.

Mr. Breithaupt: Perhaps they would be happy to look at them now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would have to assume they have done all these things and have investigated all these possibilities, working in conjunction with their French-language advisory committee, and for one reason or another have not come up with any acceptable solution to this problem. Therefore, unfortunately, we find it here with us today and this week.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary: Would the minister ensure that they explore this?

Mr. Speaker: I said that was the final supplementary.

Mr. Shore: Get another location.

Mr. Roy: It may save the minister some money, and he's not smart enough to know it.

IMMUNIZATION PROGRAMMES

Mr. Philip: A question for the Minister of Health: In the light of recent increases in such diseases as diphtheria and measles, is the minister concerned about the recent action taken by the Peel regional health unit to discontinue the immunization programme in schools, and about other programmes similar to this that have been discontinued in the province? What action is the minister contemplating?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have met with the health unit in Peel on a number of occasions —at least half a dozen times in the last few months—and I think we're getting that problem resolved. What it comes down to is that, according to the last report I had, the unit cost of the immunization programme being operated by the Peel health unit is higher

than what it would cost to have it administered in a doctor's office.

That, I suggest, is symptomatic of the fact that perhaps the public is apathetic or lethargic about the whole question of immunization. It does have to do with the volumes of immunization which we certainly encourage—the regular initial immunization and follow-up. That problem, I believe, is well in hand and being resolved between the staff in my ministry and the Peel health unit.

Mr. Philip: Supplementary: Accepting the fact that the cost per unit may be higher under OHIP, has the minister examined the incidences of those people who are not getting immunization, since there seems to be an increase in diseases in the province?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the hon. member were to look at the epidemiological reports, which do come out regularly and cover a wide range of diseases, all the way from such exotic things as typhus to measles, he would find that the facts bear that out. But certainly it is a concern that people tend to think that with advancements in the last 20 years a lot of these problems are solved, and of course they're not solved unless regular immunization and re-immunization are carried on.

INDUSTRIAL WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Gaunt: A question of the Minister of the Environment: Can the minister tell us what the policy of the government is regarding the disposal of liquid waste into disposal wells, in view of the fact that there are applications before the ministry to reopen two of these wells in the Sarnia area—the Tricil well in Moore township and the Thompson well in Petrolia?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The policy is that if there are any applications of that nature to open old wells, the ministry will appraise the applications. If there is any possibility that the wells can be utilized they would then, under the provisions of The Environmental Protection Act, go before the Environmental Assessment Board. There would be a public hearing and a decision would then be made whether or not those wells would be open again.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: Has the ministry made any advances with respect to promoting the recycling of these industrial wastes?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes. For example, the Tricil plant in Mississauga is involved in recycling spent fuels such as waste oil and toxic materials of that kind.

TRAINING SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. Davidson: A question to the Minister of Correctional Services: Can the minister give us the rationale behind the terminating of the contracts of at least 16 teachers in the juvenile division of his ministry? Does he not feel that rather than terminating the teachers' contracts, there should be upgrading of existing programmes and support given in other areas?

Hon. Mr. Meen: There's been a marked reduction in the number of children in the training schools, to such an extent that we really did have to take a look at our whole picture of the number of students versus the number of teachers, and our present constraints in the juvenile division.

Teachers work under the Provincial Schools Authority, and their working conditions agreement calls for the notice of redundancy to be declared before March 31 of each year. If we had not taken this action, we would have been locked in for another year. Therefore, we did notify 16 teachers of the fact that, as we saw it, their positions were redundant.

But we would expect the Provincial Schools Authority, in negotiating with these teachers—and with others who have been made redundant—will take into consideration vacancies that will occur over the next few months because of the retirement of others from the system, which will mean that very few—possibly three or four—will, as my people expressed it, drop out the bottom. The rest of the 16 can be expected to find positions within the teaching service.

But we think the ratios as established with the declaration of redundancies and the readjustment of their positions will still provide the very best facility for these young people in the system.

Mr. Davidson: Can the minister then explain why, since only six months ago a recommendation was called for to put additional teaching staff in the Champlain school at Alfred, Ontario, it is now cutting back? The possibility of having to drop some of the existing subjects is there. Is the minister also aware of the fact that they may have to drop teaching at the elementary school level in that school, where at the present time they are teaching eight students?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I am not aware of any reduction in the provision of teaching in that school.

Mr. Foulds: It is happening all over the province.

Hon. Mr. Meen: There certainly has been a reduction in the number of students at the school, but I am not aware there has been any reduction in the provision of the courses to the students who are at the school.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A final supplementary from the member for Peterborough.

Ms. Sandeman: Could the minister tell us if he discussed the staff reductions with the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton), in view of the fact that on July 1 the staff of the trade schools will come under that minister's jurisdiction? It would seem wise that he would take part in discussions if he is to receive on that date a very depleted staff.

Mr. Moffatt: Nothing left.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The answer is yes, I did discuss this with the minister before these steps were taken in March. It was necessary that they be taken before the end of March, as I have already indicated. But that does not mean the Ministry of Community and Social Services, which will have the responsibility for this very important function beginning July 1, will be locked into any fixed position. The notices simply indicate redundancy, and if he sees fit to make adjustments in that position between now and September 1 when the teaching would recommence, then he has the full latitude to do so. All that we have done has been to advise the Provincial Schools Authority that in our opinion these positions are redundant.

[3:30]

OHTB BUS LICENCE

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I have a brief question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister assure the members of the House that he might consider sharing with us the report of the Highway Transport Board concerning the Greyhound-Gray Coach matter, which is currently under review by that board, at the time that it is presented to the cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member that I have not received the report that he refers to from the Highway Transport Board, and I don't believe it will be ready for a little while yet because of the—

Mr. MacDonald: That wasn't the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Snow: He's asking me to share with him a report which I don't have, I'm sorry.

Mr. S. Smith: The question was, will you make it public when you get it?

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, if I could clarify it for the minister, I asked, would he share it with us when it is available.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you phone Eddie Goodman and find out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why don't you phone him?

Mr. Foulds: He doesn't expect to be the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Yes, the answer was, will he share it—the question, that is.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this is a report that has been requested by cabinet to deal with the appeal on this particular case, and as soon as I receive the report I'll give that consideration.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Will the minister not agree that the knowledge that this particular report will be given public circulation as soon as it is completed might just happen to have some influence on the content of the report? Therefore, would he not agree to guarantee right now that the report will be made public as soon as he receives it?

Mr. MacDonald: He should.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. member that assurance at this moment. I can assure him the report will be made public, but I can't give him the assurance it will be made public the moment I receive it.

Mr. Deans: Freedom of information.

Mr. S. Smith: That's a publicly financed board, it's a quasi-judicial body.

ALEXANDER JACQUES

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health having just recently left the House, I will instead address this question to the Minister of Labour. Would the minister investigate personally and immediately with the Minister of Health why the Ministry of Health continually refuses to find and offer light duty employment to one Alexander Jacques from the Oshawa area— a former employee of the ambulance services branch, now with a 20 per cent disability rating due to a back injury incurred with that ambulance branch—when there do exist light duty, even driving positions right within that same ambulance branch? Will she investigate why, with Mr. Jacques being impressively and articulately bilingual French-English, this particular talent is not being put to use in the area of the extension of health services in the French language across Ontario, as recommended by Monsieur Dubois in his recent report. Pas des Problèmes?, released five months ago?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. Nixon: I will look into it.

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, that's unbelievable. Write him a letter.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. I guess he's gone.

Mr. S. Smith: Ask the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch).

Mr. Speaker: We'll hear the member for Erie then.

INJURED PERSONS' BENEFITS

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. During the Ministry of Labour estimates, the standing resources development committee on December 14, 1976, adopted a resolution that directed the government, through the Workmen's Compensation Board, to carry out a study of all the benefits available to injured persons for the goal of integrating all the present programmes of assistance to provide a measure of means of economic security to the injured employee and survivors' benefits. Can the minister indicate to the Legislature what progress has been made in that study area, and can the minister inform the members when the report will be completed and available for government action?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the study is under way, as I reported to this House, I think, earlier, and I anticipate we will be having a preliminary report early in June. That is the date which has been given to me by the consultant group and by the committee. Whether that will be the complete report or not, I can't tell you, Mr. Speaker, but I would predict we will have at least an interim report by that time.

CUSTOM AGGREGATES

Mr. Mackenzie: A question of the Minister of Labour: Does the minister agree with the actions of a company, Custom Aggregates, which has a quarry at Aberfoyle and which has brought in a security company and eight security employees from the province of Quebec under a six-month licence to escort strike-breakers through the picket lines daily at that quarry? Does she consider this compatible with bargaining in good faith, which we are trying to establish under The Labour Relations Act? Would the minister intervene in this situation?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I suggested yesterday to the hon. member that I would try to find out all of the information I could about this situation and that is precisely what I am doing at the moment. When I have that information, I will be pleased to respond to the member's question.

COST OF HOSPITAL STAY

Mr. Spence: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Is the minister aware that in my community one of my constituents had a son in retardation facilities and he was billed for $33,045.50 for less than three years' stay in Cedar Springs Hospital? Is it the policy of the government to charge parents for their son or daughter in those facilities?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I am not aware of that incident but I certainly will bring it to the attention of the Minister of Community and Social Services and will report back to the member as quickly as possible.

Mr. Good: It happens all the time with the special care. They even put mortgages on the family home to pay those bills.

PRICES AT HIGHWAY SERVICE CENTRES

Ms. Bryden: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Since the government is reported to have dropped the rentals charged to the oil companies operating the service centres along Highways 400 and 401 by $1 million a year, can the minister tell us if all of this $1 million is being passed on to the consumers in lower gasoline prices? Or, if not all, what percentage is each company passing on in the next year?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I made a statement in the House last fall relating to this matter, stating that the ministry would be eliminating the special federal tax and extra increases in the price of fuel from the sales of the oil companies when establishing the rental rate for the premises. This was only to be done, and I am sure only has been done, when the full amount of that reduction is passed on to the motorist. I understand the reduction in the price of gasoline at the service centres on our major highways has been reduced by varying amounts from two cents to nine cents per gallon.

Ms. Bryden: Supplementary: Would the minister be willing to table for us a statement showing how much each oil company has dropped the price since the new rental agreement and how much additional funds out of this $1 million is going to the oil companies?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I will just have to say that there are now additional funds from the $1 million going to the oil companies because the leases on these oil company premises are calculated on a percentage of their sales. When we have reduced the calculation on that sale it is not included in calculating the rent, and that is only done when that amount is passed on. But I will get the hon. member a list of the prices—as much as I can get—that were charged before and after. The reason for the difference between the two cents and the nine cents is that there is a considerable difference in the percentage paid by the oil companies on different stations, mainly because of different locations and because of the tenders that were submitted when the awards were made some years ago.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what instruction do you give your attendants pertaining to the lights for the television cameras?

Mr. Speaker: There are still camera people there. They have a right to turn the machine on as and when they please. They usually leave about this time so I imagine that the hon. members will soon be relieved.

Mr. Nixon: Could we amend the instruction so the last cameraman out turns out the lights?

Mr. Speaker: I don't know whether I'd trust the cameraman for that, but there is a gentleman assigned for that purpose.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Your point of order?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, it has always been a concern of mine that the government at its behest, or of its own will, can have its cabinet ministers give ministerial statements ad infinitum as long as they want to. How do you measure the fact that we have an hour for question period and the ministers can get up—possibly before an election—and can read into the record all the statements they want to, and you sit there and let them—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is nothing out of order so it is not a point of order. But, just to answer the hon. member's point of information—I believe; not a point of order—there is a request that long answers, for instance, be delivered as ministerial statements and we have insisted on that. At least some of those statements this afternoon—the first couple of them at least—were the answer to a series of questions. So we are doing exactly as the House has requested.

Mr. Sargent: On a further point of order.

Mr. Speaker: No. Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has no point of order in that respect.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: What is your point of order then?

Mr. Sargent: My point of order is this: Where do you draw the line on how many ministerial statements there will be?

Mr. Speaker: No, that is not a point of order. There is no way the Speaker can dictate or decide how many statements shall be given.

REPORT

Mrs. Campbell from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

City of Ottawa;

City of Toronto.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES ACT

Mr. Deans, on behalf of Mr. Lewis, moved first reading of Bill 38, An Act respecting Toxic and Hazardous Substances.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is:

1. To require that every new substance or new process be tested for toxic or hazardous characteristics by an independent research organization before it is introduced into the work place;

2. To enable the Minister of Labour to require any substance or process already in use to be tested for toxic or hazardous characteristics by any independent research organization when the effect on the health of the employee is in question;

3. Where toxic or hazardous characteristics are found through the testing procedures, the minister can prohibit, severely limit or place conditions on its introduction;

4. To require an annual audit of the use by amount of toxic or hazardous substances and mixtures in each work place.

DISCRIMINATORY BUSINESS PRACTICES PROHIBITION ACT

Mr. Grossman moved first reading of Bill 39, An Act to prohibit Discrimination in Business Transactions.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Singer: Is that a government bill or a private member's bill?

Mr. Grossman: Private member's.

Mr. Singer: A private member's bill with a cabinet minister seconding it.

Mr. Deans: It would have a better chance of success if it happened the other way around.

Mr. Singer: If it catches fire, then they believed it all the time.

[3:45]

Mr. Grossman: This bill is designed to protect the business against discrimination in its business dealings on the basis of the race, creed, colour, marital status, nationality, ancestry or place of origin of its directors, shareholders and personnel. The protection against these types of discrimination is also extended to individual persons working in a business environment.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might take a moment before the orders of the day to draw to the attention of the hon. members the presence in the gallery to my right of a former distinguished member of the Legislature and colleague of ours for many years, Mr. William Stewart.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, with respect to that matter, surely the gentleman isn't a former distinguished member, he is a distinguished former member.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I accept the correction in good faith.

Mr. Speaker: Correction noted.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day again, I wish to table the answers to questions 26 and 27, and the interim answers to questions 25 and 28 standing on the notice paper. (See appendix, page 673.)

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the orders, the House leader asked me to make the following statement concerning the estimates scheduling. Since today is budget day and since consideration of estimates will begin later this week, I think this might be an appropriate time to indicate, pursuant to the new rules, the amount of time the House leaders have agreed on for each set of estimates.

In the House as agreed the committee of supply will sit Monday afternoons and Friday mornings, or about four hours a week. The sequence will begin May 2, with the

Solicitor General, 20 hours; then the Attorney General, 20 hours; then Consumer and Commercial Relations, 20 hours—which would take us into the fall—then Correctional Services, 12 hours; then the Provincial Secretariat for Justice, 10 hours.

In the standing resources development committee there are up to three meetings a week possible for estimates, or about seven and a half hours. The estimates volume for this policy field will not be tabled until Thursday of this week. The estimates of the Ministry of Housing, 25 hours, will be first and can begin on Friday; then Energy, 15 hours; Labour, 15 hours; Industry and Tourism, 15 hours; Agriculture and Food, 20 hours. At this time we should be into the fall, with Environment, 20 hours; Natural Resources, 25 hours; Resources Development Secretariat, five hours; Transportation and Communications, 25 hours; and Northern Affairs—the allocation to this ministry will be resolved when we return in the fall.

The standing committee on social development, under the fixed schedule of meetings agreed by the parties, can meet up to three times a week on estimates, or about eight hours a week. The Social Development Secretariat is first with 12 hours, which could begin Monday, April 25; then Education, 22 hours; Colleges and Universities, 10 hours; Community and Social Services, 20 hours; and in the fall we will have Health, 20 hours, and, last but not least, Culture and Recreation, 15 hours.

The standing committee on general government may meet up to three times a week with eight hours available. There is an agreement that we will start with the estimates of the Treasury, which will have 20 hours at the committee; then the Ministry of Government Services, 20 hours; Revenue, six hours; Management Board, three hours; Office of the Assembly, 10 hours; Office of the Provincial Auditor, five hours. By then we would be into the fall, with the Ombudsman for nine hours and the Premier, cabinet and Lieutenant Governor's estimates to conclude.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved second reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief opening statement in view of the limited time available for debate. I just want to point out to the members of the House that this bill is essentially a continuation of the existing legislation—

Mr. Singer: How much time do you need? Debate it for a week?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —the principles and the purposes of which have already been extensively discussed in the Legislature, in meetings of many kinds around the province and through the media.

It's essential that ample time be available for the provisions of the bill when passed to be advertised so that landlords, tenants and rent review staff will have ample opportunity to become familiar with those changes which are in the bill. These changes have been before the House now for a week and should be well known to all of us.

Mr. Singer: Therefore, let's not debate it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: During the life of the present legislation, many landlords have matched the length of leases and other tenancy agreements with the time periods in the Act. As a result, a large number of tenancies will be renewed on August 1, requiring landlords to serve the mandatory 90-day notice for an increase by May 1 at the latest. Those tenants who wish to appeal increases through the rent review process or to terminate their tenancies because of the rent increases are also subject to the same time strictures.

I will be moving two minor amendments to the bill, one of which will restore to the bill the requirement for written reasons, as now provided in section 7, subsection 3 of the Act.

I'm keeping my introductory comments deliberately brief, in order to provide as much of the limited time available for the members—

Mr. Singer: There's as much time available as we need.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —so that they may debate the principle of the bill.

Mr. Singer: We can go on for days on this.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The need for the effective use of the time available to us must be obvious to all members.

Mr. Singer: What is this "time available" nonsense?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Don't you understand the problem?

Mr. Breithaupt: I wish to ask a question. I was not aware that the time was limited in any particular way.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear in my opening remarks that there are certain time strictures in the bill.

Mr. Singer: Well, that's your fault.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have debated the bill at some length before this and—

Mr. Singer: When?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —May 1 is a very critical date in this whole legislative process.

Mr. Singer: You don't like debates.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No. Debate as much as you want.

Mr. Singer: You don't like the bill.

Mr. Good: And you said you wouldn't be minister when this happened.

Mr. Singer: That's right. So, let's have a short debate—not to bother you too much.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: We'll bother you as much as we need to.

Mr. Good: How come you're still minister?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Can we have a little order before the hon. member for Oshawa commences his remarks?

Mr. Singer: Tell the minister not to be so silly.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Breaugh: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Level with us.

Mr. Breaugh: I join with all parties in this House in welcoming this long-awaited announcement. I think we would be remiss if we didn't state at the outset that we certainly do support in principle the extension of this rent review legislation as being a very necessary and desirable thing. I think we would be remiss, too, if we didn't make mention of the rather concerted effort that has been made over the last three or four months to support and not support, extend and not extend, extend in some version and extend in some other version, and recognize the difficulties that it has placed on landlords and tenants—the uncertainty.

Though I wouldn't be one to welcome the minister's resignation as an amendment, I think the minister's statements really did not do a great deal for anybody involved in this process during the time when the government was making that initial decision to extend the rent review. I think, too, that a basic problem in the very principle of this extension is the uncertainty involved.

I would like to take some time to point out some of the difficulties that are inherent in this particular bill. It is obviously a necessary programme to be extended, because the problem still exists; it has not been rectified a great deal, though it has been modified somewhat. So we will support this bill in principle, and I would like to outline—because I think it's necessary—that there should be a review of this particular Act. Some of the problems that are inherent in the rent review legislation have, at least, been acknowledged in this extension bill; but not all of them. Not all of them. When we go through clause by clause, we would hope in proposing amendments that we would be able to deal with some of those things, and that there would be support given, either by the minister himself or by the Liberal Party, for some very serious problems that have not really been properly acknowledged in this particular extension bill.

It is appropriate that we review in some detail, the problems that have been inherent in The Rent Review Act itself. I would like to quote a gentleman named Brian Bucknall who did work for the Rent Review Board on one occasion. I understand that he had the temerity to make some criticisms of it and does not work for it any more. But I think his criticisms are particularly valid. May I quote a couple of passages from his rather learned paper on this particular programme?

He states: "While many of the policies embodied in the rent review programme are open to debate, there are two fundamental assumptions which, from both the substantive and administrative point of view, shape and misshape the whole scheme. The first of these assumptions was, it was noted previously, that rent control could be a temporary measure, that a two-year life span for the whole programme was acceptable, and that the administrative structure required by the programme could be assembled, have its work completed and be disassembled within 18 months. Obviously, the decision to have a

temporary scheme had no foundation in economic theory and it can only be regarded as the political response of a disaffected government to a programme which it disliked.

"The other assumption was that the rent review programme could be established and administered wholly separate from the general law of residential tenancies. Rent control is, in theory, inseparable from a regime of security of tenure."

I think that it is a very valid point, that the temporary nature of the programme has caused great problems on all sides. It really is a matter of "When will we invest? Now? Or will we wait until after the scheme is ended? And now, with an extension, how far will this extension go?" Are we dealing with a permanent government programme or one that is temporary? Will that programme change, should the government change substantively, whether the same political party returns to power after the next general election or not?

I want to quote a couple of other small comments from Mr. Bucknall's paper, because I do think it is probably the definitive comment of rent review in Ontario.

"Again, it must be emphasized that the prospect of acquiring and training a competent staff for this most complex regulatory scheme was hopelessly compromised from the outset by the decision to make the entire programme temporary. Neither serious recruitment nor effective training could be undertaken where the whole effort was to dissolve in just a few months' time.

"The draftsman of the new legislation may have been guilty of an excessive enthusiasm for prescribed forms. The programme came into being graced with no less than 12 forms which had to be used at one time or another in the rent review process. In some cases, the forms were drafted in a rather casual manner and had to be amended."

There, in a nutshell, is the problem of the principle that we've been dealing with in this rent control legislation. It is the principle of temporary legislation that adds an air of unease about it; and it runs right through the entire programme—from personnel who are involved in the rent review programme to the kind of response that is made in the terms of an administrative technique and to the kind of problems that are encountered by those people who actually try to function within the programme, whether they be landlords or tenants. That uncertainty, that air of the temporary that pervades the entire programme, causes most of its difficulties.

Let me point out some areas that I suggest need substantial improvement. In the first place, I think we have to address ourselves to that temporary problem. I really cannot see the basis for an automatic termination date of the programme. Surely the programme is a valid one until such time as the shortage of rental accommodation has been solved in some way or another. I fail to see how anyone at this time, and least of all this government, could prognosticate a date or pick a time out of the air when that could be done. Surely this legislation should be legislation to establish a rent review programme that works until such time as the programme is no longer needed; and then the government, of course, has an undeniable case to bring before this House in legislation ending the programme. But so far as anyone can see, there are no solutions available or in operation now that will solve the problem.

The Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) did announce some incentives for new rental accommodation. Those particular programmes have not worked, by his own admission, in any of the areas where rental accommodation is a particularly vexing problem; and there is very little indication that the kinds of programmes being advanced by the government now will actually do the job. They are an attempt, but there is no assurance, by any stretch of the imagination, that the rent problem in Metro Toronto and the larger urban centres in Ontario will have been solved by the time this bill terminates. So the provision for an automatic termination date makes no sense to this party at all and we would make some suggestions in that regard.

I want to move to a second and major point. The principle of this particular bill is tied very closely to the federal anti-inflation programme, even though there is a rather strange relationship at work here. The original bill, hon members will recall, was presented to this House and conceived before there was a federal anti-inflation programme. The minister responsible, in his statements concerning the rent review programme in Ontario, always managed to make reference to a federal anti-inflation programme and then promptly says: **"But this bill is not tied** to that programme." I would accept one way or the other: Either it is a part of that programme or it isn't. But I have great difficulty in accepting the notion that it is for some purposes and it is not for others.

[4:00]

Surely, as we have seen in rent review programmes in other jurisdictions, there

comes a time to review the guideline—accepting that it is a guideline and not a fixed amount, accepting that it is open to some kind of judgement. But surely in this instance, in this province, we would now say, this provincial government being rather firmly and proudly, I might add, attached to the federal anti-inflation programme, that it would respond accordingly for rents—that it would say if the federal anti-inflation programme in its first year of operation accepted eight per cent as a magic number, as an allowable increase, then surely in the second year it would also say it would follow the same guidelines, that it would say six per cent. There are arguments that can be made, whether it's six in British Columbia—recently they have struck the magic number of seven per cent. But I find it difficult to—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Ten in Manitoba.

Mr. Breaugh: That's fine. I would find it very difficult in this province with this government to find a rationale for saying that we would not go to that six per cent number. Certainly if there is one, that would be an interesting thing to see. And certainly since we are talking about a guideline, not necessarily a fixed rule, one that could be exceeded on a cost pass-through basis which almost everyone involved in the programme does accept, it would not be an undue hardship on anyone to make the six per cent the guideline.

I don't see that response in this, yet that's an underlying principle in this bill, I think, that it is attached to, related very carefully to, the federal anti-inflation programme which aspires to have in its second year a six per cent maximum. It is not reflected in this bill, and I really think we need some clarification on that. Obviously we are proposing that we go to a six per cent guideline. Those may be open to arguments, that's true, but I would like to see the rationale behind that and I don't. I would propose that when we get to that stage in discussing this particular bill that we will move that amendment.

A third area, and a major one that is not involved in this particular bill that I think has to be, stems from an emerging consensus on both sides of the issue, from both landlords and tenants, that the matter of going back before a rent review officer three and four times and sometimes more to deal with the same apartment building, to look at the same numbers, is nonsensical. The minister said very clearly in his opening statement the other day that an attempt was made to streamline this process. Everyone that I have talked to, whether they are landlords or tenants, agree that it makes no sense to go back three and four times to look at the same set of numbers for a different unit in the same building.

There appears to me to be a clearly emerging consensus there that you could look at an annual building review. The landlord would arrive at the rent review officer with his facts and figures for this building, for this year, and that it could be handled wisely and judiciously. Yes, there are some difficulties but this rent review programme has faced difficulties before. In its early days it had a lot of confusion about it and in some measure at least has managed to struggle out from underneath that.

So the concept of an annual building review seems to me to be the most logical one from anybody's point of view—from a cost saving point of view, from an aggravation point of view, from an administrative point of view, from a paper-work point of view, from a wise and judicial use of the rent review officers and all of the facilities that they have in the province of Ontario now. The concept of doing the building once a year seems to make a good deal of sense for everybody.

The argument can be made, of course, that a landlord can do that now under existing legislation. But it is not being done. I would hope that when we do the clause by clause debate, the amendment we will propose to provide for the annual building review on a regular basis would be accepted on all sides. There may be some argument about the details of it, and the mechanics, but I think that that concept has to be embodied. Frankly, of all the things that you could do with the rent review programme, that one single thing would probably do more towards cleaning up the administration, providing all parties with a fair and equitable hearing, and taking out of it the animosity that exists.

There are some other things that need to be done but of all the ones that I can think of and of all the people that I have talked to, there seems to be a clear consensus that that's a workable idea and one that ought to be embodied in this legislation. If we are going to review this legislation and extend it, now is the time to do that.

Let me point out a couple of other small areas—they are not small areas, they are matters of some grave concern to a number of people, but they don't require major amendments to the legislation. Let me point out that if we move to something that would

allow a registration of the rent of all the units in a building, not a complicated procedure—and I must say in this rent review process a number of very complicated things have been attempted; this is not that complicated; in fact, most of those numbers are on file—that would serve everyone's purpose, I think, to a good end.

It would provide for a number of the landlords a good survey, for one thing, of what rents are being charged and are being allowed by the rent review agency across their municipality, across the province of Ontario. It would facilitate tenants when they go to appear before a rental officer. It is simply a matter of getting together publicly accessible facts, indisputable ones—a registry, if you like. I don't think that is a difficult concept to accomplish; I think it is a worthwhile one. I think, frankly, that it's a very simple step that would accomplish a great deal for all involved.

Let me put to you, Mr. Speaker, a couple of areas that I'm sure the minister is aware of, and which I think he wouldn't need to be really unduly pushed to get around to. This matter of proper notice that's contained in the legislation—which, again, goes right back to the principle of the bill. Is this a judicial process, or is this something like a quasi-judicial process, or what kind of a process it it?

I fail to see how somebody can waive his rights unconsciously. Surely the legislation is written so that if proper notice is given and the tenant or whoever appears before the rent review officer raises the issue, that's extremely valid and that's provided for in the legislation. But how do you lose your rights by saying nothing?

I think those rights are enshrined in the previous legislation and ought to be enshrined in this legislation. I am aware of the problem that did exist, but proper notice really has to be given before the hearing can be proceeded with and that strikes me as a very simple matter. The first question the rent review officer ask is, "Has there been proper notice given?" and the onus is on neither the landlord nor the tenant, but on the person that we, as a government, appoint to look after that particular hearing.

It seems to me a very logical thing that his first question would be, "Has proper notice been given?" That raises the issue, clarifies the stance and is not going to cost anybody a lot of money or a lot of time or a lot of aggravation. If that were written into this legislation I think it would solve problems for a great many people.

Those are, very quickly, some of the major areas. Let me deal now with some of the things that have been brought before me, as housing critic for this party, and before the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) when he was housing critic, that I think have to be at least discussed when we are discussing the principle of this legislation.

There is this matter of the regulations and of the guidebook and of the bulletins that were put out. Tenants in particular—and I think from the landlords that I have talked to, to the landlords as well—find that a particularly aggravating process. Understanding the traditions of the House, it's one thing as a legislator to understand that the minister probably ought to retain the right to make regulations from time to time, that underneath that the staff that's working in the administration probably has to have some leeway to publish guidebooks—the mysterious, secret guidebook—or to send out bulletins to clarify particular issues.

But the basic problem is, you see, that that's the guts of the programme. Whatever we put in legislation here, whatever principles we adopt here, are good or bad depending on how the programme works afterwards. By and large, it works on the regulations that are published and gazetted, on the guidebooks that are put out, even though most people don't see them, and on the bulletins that are published by the rent review board itself.

There is a problem that I have with that. I admit, quite frankly, that any government would probably need that kind of leeway, that it would probably want to retain that even if we were the government and we were proposing this kind of legislation. The ironic thing, as an example, in discussing the matter with some people from the Metro Tenants Federation last evening, is that they were very happy with the kind of advisory agency that Manitoba uses, but it is difficult to say how you enshrine that in law because you really are talking about (a) the principle of the bill itself and (b) the policies and practices of the government of the day.

Perhaps in one jurisdiction they are more attracted to the government than they would be in this jurisdiction. Perhaps they are happier with the tone and tenor of the guidelines that are put out. Perhaps they are more in tune with those people who administer the same kind of a programme in another jurisdiction.

It's a difficult one—and I don't propose that we run off into committee in an at-

tempt to set up some other advisory body, but I did think it important enough to bring it up when we discussed the principle of this legislation. Because, in many instances, I feel, and a number of other people do, the principle of the legislation, the purpose of it all, was definitely thwarted by the regulations, the guidelines and the bulletins that were put out. I think even the minister would be prepared to agree that on occasion that has happened. It's a matter of some debate among landlords and tenants as to how frequently that happened, but without question there were some really serious problems that emerged, essentially around that issue of what happens after the minister writes the legislation, after he establishes the principle of the thing, and after he gets all his amendments approved. When it then goes into operation, what happens? There is a serious problem there. I am afraid we do have to go back to a government reluctant to put in this kind of legislation, for starters, and a minister, frankly and openly, reluctant to administer such a programme.

Given that kind of after-the-legislation tenor or atmosphere, it becomes understandable why there were difficulties in the administration of the rent review programme. There were those who said in the early days —and, frankly, I shared the thought quite often—that the whole thing was set up afterwards in terms of its administration and regulations and guidelines and bulletins, that after putting the legislation through the House, the government then set about to make sure that it could never work and that it would strangle itself. That early feeling seems to have modified somewhat, at least in my view.

But I really have to put to the minister and to the government that there is a prevailing feeling that there are great difficulties there; that this government has backed into this legislation; that the administration suffers greatly in terms of morale, in terms of production and in terms of efficiency because everyone really gets the impression that while there's a programme at work here, some legislation under way, the government is implementing legislation that really in its heart of hearts it didn't want to do. There are arguments on both sides of that coin but I think that is a problem. I wish, quite frankly, we could somehow in the legislation write the spirit of the thing with a great fervour that would carry over after the legislation is passed to see that the thing does work in subsequent days.

There are some other matters. There is the matter of written decisions, of providing a reasonably accurate account of why a rent review officer made the decision he did. I would understand in the early days when there was a backlog, when things were hot and heavy, when there was a good deal of confusion, when the forms weren't even printed and sometimes misinformation was given out by rental offices themselves, the officer really couldn't contemplate providing a satisfactory written response or a written reason for the decision.

I think, though, that that day has passed and that that now could be done, that that's a perfectly sensible and feasible thing that would establish some rationale, some pattern and some frames of reference for people when they go before the rent review officer. I think that that could be done from my conversations with those people who worked as rental officers who now say that that could be done and from those people who appear before rent review hearings who think that that would be of great assistance to them. That could be done and it wouldn't be at this stage of the game an impossible task at all. It would serve some great purpose for most people.

I have some difficulties with the idea of the principle of discontinuing service. I understand the previous problem of saying that that is a rent increase and now saying that if they discontinue a service of course the tenant can always run off to the rental officer later on. There are some grave problems with that. I would say, quite frankly, in discussing the principle of this bill, that that's one area where there have been some rather serious problems—not with a lot of landlords perhaps but certainly with some that I'm aware of. Being disgruntled and a bit unhappy by times and, I suppose, to be quite fair about it all, a bit confused by the whole process, they turn around to strike back and see in what areas they could get back at their tenant.

In my riding we have had a couple of unfortunate incidents, that I know the minister is aware of, where a landlord perhaps had some difficulty understanding the legislation and understanding why his guys did it to him and took some rather untimely actions, some of which may have been justified and some of which undoubtedly were not justified, not the least of which was the discontinuing of some services.

I think the minister has to address himself to that because part and parcel of this concept, this principle of rent review, is that when one rents an apartment he gets it as it was when he went in there. The dish-

washer works, the laundry room works and they do clean the snow from the drive in the winter. In the case of the sauna, the swimming pool or whatever it was that attracted a person there in the first place, whatever it was that got him to the position where he was prepared to pay that kind of rent in the first instance, they don't start shutting down all those facilities. Quite frankly, that is an area that is a problem and certainly a source of aggravation to tenants, and I don't really think it's a satisfactory answer for any landlord. At least the ones I've talked to are unhappy about that.

[4:15]

Quite frankly, in my riding most of the landlords with whom I have discussed the matter are quite proud of running good buildings; they make the effort to keep their places clean and to keep them reasonably well maintained. They're not happy about spending money that doesn't turn a profit afterwards, but a number of them do have pride in their properties. A number of them, in particular those who are local owners, are extremely proud of the kind of place that they run. They like to keep it clean. They like, frankly, to keep their tenants happy. They want them to be happy where they are; they don't want them grumbling all the time. They don't like the kind of complaints that we get in other situations where a landlord doesn't quite respond to that degree.

There is the difficulty of reopening hearings. I think we also have to discuss the matter of the rent review board itself and how it responds, because after that point, in looking at the principle of the first legislation that we investigated in this House, there was this idea that there would be a final appeal for both parties through a rent review board.

Unfortunately, the feeling that I get is that the kind of atmosphere in which people operate is such that they tend to think now that the rent review board is not really an appeal process for the tenant. It is supposed to be that, but they feel that in practice it hasn't turned out to be that; it's the place the landlord goes. If he's a big landlord, if he's got the time, the talent, the money and the expertise to appeal, off he goes to the rent review board.

The general feeling, to be specific about it, is that the rent review board is the place that the landlord goes if he feels he didn't get a happy hearing at the local level. That has to be changed somewhat. There are some problems with that, very frankly. Perhaps it is personnel. Perhaps it goes back to the kind of comment made by Brian Bucknall, which I read into the record initially, that when the programme is temporary in nature and seems to be a programme that was accepted with great reluctance on the part of the government, that establishes kind of a milieu in which the whole programme operates and it would be rather difficult for tenants to think that they are always getting a fair shake.

Quite frankly, a couple of landlords with whom I have discussed the matter don't feel they're getting much of a shake out of it either. They feel the programme itself is rather shaky, and that speaks to my initial point about it being temporary in nature and the kind of problems that are associated with that temporariness.

There is kind of a smell of bias about it all, that it's a reluctant thing, an unwanted creature that it's not ever going to work extremely well because no one really wants it ever to work extremely well. Of course, if we address ourselves specifically to the principle of the bill, we would have to say yes, we want this legislation to work as well as it can, accepting that there will be hiccups along the line, that it will not always work smoothly and that not everyone will be happy. But surely there ought to be an overriding consideration that we want this legislation to work as effectively as it can. And that's lacking.

I'm not sure that we can get rid of the nature of the bias. In particular, I'm not sure that we can get rid of that when the minister seems to persist in making statements about his reluctance about the programme itself. Frankly, I wish he would either stay silent on that matter or make some rather carefully worded statements in support of the programme. That does seem to be a problem on both sides.

From the landlords' point of view—at least the ones that I've discussed it with—we might say that some of them are withholding capital. Most of them are saying to me, "We're not sure what's going to happen in a year and half from now or whenever termination dates might be adjusted to. After all, we looked at it as a temporary programme once. We thought that if we waited it out for 18 months, and we wanted to invest some money in apartments at the end of 18 months, we could zap it in and there would be no controls." There are no controls now on new units and nothing contemplated to change that. But it's that kind of air of uncertainty which flows through this

entire programme, that is causing the problem. Eighteen months ago they thought it would only go for 18 months, and now we're talking about an extension already. What are we going to do when this one expires? Come back with another extension?

Wouldn't people be better off if we were to say the programme is in place until it is no longer needed? Wouldn't that do a number of things for us? Wouldn't that clearly establish the principle of the legislation, for starters? Wouldn't that clearly establish that for someone who wanted to take a job as a rent review officer, or someone who wanted to fill a position on the rent review board, there would be some permanence there; that it's worth establishing some part of your life to work for this mechanism and to make this kind of legislation successful administratively and in a number of other terms? That would go in great measure, I would say, to answer the problem that the minister addressed himself to in his opening statement about the uncertainty of starts in rental accommodation. I think, too, although perhaps it is a bit off the mark in specifics, it is not off the mark in terms of the principles of the legislation, that little problem that emerged about whether or not people in public housing are in or out of rent review.

There have been people evicted because they got caught in the backlog. And it is true to say, I suppose, that if you looked at it from a strictly legal sense they should have put the money in a bank in a separate account, and if they were out, okay, they would have had the money in a little pot. But people at that income level don't do that kind of thing. They are worried about frivolous items like clothes for the kids and food for the table. So if an extra few bucks show up in the monthly budget that means that some kid gets a new pair of shoes or a raincoat or a winter jacket, or the family eats a little better that month than they did the previous month.

I am a little disappointed that the minister has not seen fit—I am not suggesting it ought to be enshrined in legislation in any way—to deal with that problem, to solve it. Of course, part of our difficulty here is that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) is dealing with this legislation as opposed to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes). That split, that small shift, that shoving off to another ministry, causes problems all over the place, not the least of which is this one.

I suppose from the government's point of view it provides an opportunity to do a small shuffle and to get rid of a problem by giving it to somebody else; but from the tenants' point of view, and particularly from public housing tenants' point of view, they got caught in a trap that was not of their own making. It was unreal to expect them to be able to deal with that situation and some of them suffered rather atrocious consequences not of their own making. Frankly, I am rather disappointed that the government did not see fit to at least make a short statement to indicate to local housing authorities, or just to the House at large, that they intend to forgive and forget, to understand that some innocent people got caught in a small bit of legislative byplay that hurt them, and that the government would be prepared now to readdress itself to that problem and to see that that doesn't occur again.

There is this problem which I don't think was addressed properly in the initial legislation, although there was considerable discussion about it. No one is quite sure at the hearing level what is going on.

Is this a court? Well it is not a court.

How informal is it? Do we have to put things in writing? What can we see? What can't we see? What can we say? What can't we say? Because, you see, I don't think that particular approach was clarified.

In some ways the rent review programme functions in a very officious way. You have to fill out all these forms. You have to get somebody appointed if you want them to represent you. There is a proper form to fill out.

In other ways, though, it is not a very official thing; it is not a very judicial process. It can be someone sitting with two or three people. It can be someone sitting with 300 people; and, of course, when the 300 show up the rent review officer does not exactly know how to deal with that situation.

So I think there needs to be some clarification on exactly what we are doing here, and in being a little more precise about what kind of a hearing it will be—what are the rules of that game, what is the aura that surrounds that situation.

One would think after 18 months that the programme would have settled in. It probably has in a number of areas, the problem is that there are some inconsistencies from one to the next.

In a couple of the hearings that I have been at it has been a rather informal affair. It struck me that in those situations, with the small number of people in attendance, what started out to be accomplished was in

fact accomplished, though some of the informality of it all tended to let it get a little sloppy and some of the detail tended to get lost in the mess.

There were some problems of landlords, for example, being allowed to bring in information after the hearing which they didn't have at the hearing for starters. Now some hearing officers said, "Whatever you have on the table at the time of the hearing, that is what we allow." But some said, "Well, if you want to drop it around to my office next Tuesday I'll take a look at that."

That is a problem. What are the rules of the game? Is this a situation where when you walk in and, okay, there are normal rules of order applying, but more important than that, do you have to put the stuff on the table there? If the ministry is allowing the landlord, as an example, to come around three days later and present new information that the tenant doesn't see and can't argue with, that strikes me as being unfair. There seems to be a need at least to have the minister, in his directions to these personnel who carry out these hearings, straighten that out.

There seem to be different sets of rules at play in different hearings. I know that in some of the areas surrounding my own riding there are different rent review officers hearing cases.

In Metro Toronto there are certainly many different rent review officers hearing cases, and some of them are beginning to establish reputations as being easy to some and not easy to others. Some are establishing the idea that they give tenants a fair hearing; some are getting the reputation that they really don't listen to the tenants, they want to listen to the landlords. Some are taking the approach that this is really an accounting procedure as opposed to a hearing of two sides of a situation; and that the real function of the rent review officer is, after the hearing is all over, he takes the landlord's books away and somewhere in private makes his decision, consulting, I suppose, the great secret guide book along the way.

It's a problem of consistency. It is also a problem of information, of what information is provided. I frankly don't see why we couldn't do a very simple thing like asking the landlord and the tenant when they supply information to the rent review officer to simply supply it in three copies; one of which is for the rent review officer, one of which is for the tenant involved and one of which is for the landlord himself.

Of course, if you went to a building by building situation and you allowed them annual building review, that seems to simplify the process even further. Maybe hinging on that one concept are a number of solutions to administrative problems that we've got.

I certainly don't think it's a sensible proposition, though it seems to have been worked out in many rent review offices, that you charge people for duplicating things, or that initially you wouldn't let them duplicate things and you made them write it all out. That seems to have kind of worked itself out. It strikes me a simple solution in the final aspect is to simply have people file three copies. It seems to me to be quite a reasonable thing. It poses difficulties for some, that's true; but not for everyone and not insurmountable difficulties, and it seems to me that it would also stop some problems.

Let me point out another area that is mentioned in the principle of this bill and which was mentioned again in the statement the minister read when he introduced the legislation in the House. That is the relationship between this rent review programme and The Landlord and Tenant Act, because it is related. You are talking about the same people; you are talking about the laws of the same government and the same province in this nation. They are related, without question.

What's missing is some mechanism to allow a tenant to get his rights under The Landlord and Tenant Act. By the same token, it lacks some easy mechanism, some workable mechanism, to allow the landlord to see that his rights as a landlord are fulfilled.

In my own area we have the rather fortunate situation of an individual who was hired by the region of Durham to function as a housing registry officer who advises both landlords and tenants on their rights and their responsibilities. He facilitates that process; he enjoys an excellent reputation in the community and solves a number of problems for a number of people.

Incidentally, he started, in the beginning, to serve the needs of people who needed some kind of housing accommodation, but he functions as much for the landlords as he does for the tenants and that simple mechanism seems to make a lot of sense.

It has been suggested in many quarters that a rent review officer could serve some of those functions. I do understand the argument that he can't be all things to all people and that he can't police nine Acts instead of one, but it does strike me that the government has got to address itself to that problem. There are people who have rights, both land-

lords and tenants, who are having their rights abused because they are not aware of what they are, because there is no real mechanism that they can use to see that those rights are fulfilled.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by just running through those areas we would like to focus on and on which we will move amendments when we get to clause by clause, just so that the minister is clear on our position.

We agree with the principle of the bill without question. We also agree that it needs to be extended. We do think that an automatic termination date associated with the rent review programme really doesn't make sense, and that this programme should continue in force until the rental housing market conditions are no longer under the kind of pressure they are under now.

We think, too, that the maximum rent increase permitted without appeal to the rent review process should be reduced from eight per cent to six per cent to make it consistent with the anti-inflation programme.

We think the legislation should allow for one hearing to be held for each building for each 12-month period, that the hearing deal in advance with all leases due to expire in that year and that the officers' orders come into effect as the lease expires. That all landlords should be required to register the rents of all units in a building each year with the rent review officer, that this information be publicly accessible at all times and that the rent review officers be responsible for ensuring that proper notice has been given to the tenants before proceeding with the rent review hearing.

[4:30]

Mr. Speaker, we will continue, there are several members who want to speak to the principle of this particular bill. We will be moving amendments when we get to clause by clause, but I want to reiterate that we support the principle of the bill; and we in turn anticipate some support from the minister himself on a number of the points that I have raised and that other members will raise. Thank you.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, in making a few remarks in reference to this amendment, I think first of all this is the first opportunity I've had to review legislation under the new rules of the House and I want to thank the minister for the compendium of background information. I certainly found it helpful while reviewing the legislation.

I should begin by saying that we in this party certainly are in support of the principle which extends the previous legislation. We have had discussions with many landlord and tenant groups and there certainly are a number of areas that we feel should have more consideration by the minister and possibly be amended during the committee session.

We still realize that the number of Ontario citizens who are tenants is increasing very steadily. I'd like to remind the House that in 1975 over 35 per cent of all Ontario households rented shelter. I'm positive that in many urban areas the majority of housing units which are rented rather than owned has increased substantially since that time.

In looking over some of the statistics of the dwelling starts in what they call the "apartment and other" category, this seems to have been declining steadily over the last few years. As a consequence the vacancy rate still is extremely low in many Ontario urban areas. The last figures I was able to come up with were the nine selected Ontario metropolitan areas, which were referred to by CMHC in the October, 1976, survey, when Thunder Bay had 0.2 per cent vacancy, Toronto one per cent, St. Catharines and Niagara 1.2 per cent, Sudbury 1.2 per cent, London 1.3 per cent, Ottawa 1.9 per cent—

Mr. Shore: Where are you getting that 1.3 per cent?

Mr. Edighoffer: I told you, weren't you listening?

Mr. Kerrio: He got it from you when you were on our side.

Mr. Singer: It was in your speech, the one in which you talked about the budget.

Mr. Kerrio: Did you change your figures when you went over there?

Mr. Edighoffer: Windsor 2.2 per cent, Kitchener 2.6 per cent and Hamilton 2.9 per cent.

An hon. member: Where's the Minister of Housing?

Interjections.

Mr. Edighoffer: Many housing experts suggest, of course, that a vacancy rate of approximately four per cent is necessary to ensure relative freedom of choice for tenants. Listening to a number of landlords from areas throughout Ontario, it's been drawn to my attention that at the present time in the Kichener-Waterloo area the vacancy rate is

now close to that four per cent. I'd like to suggest to the minister that this area should be watched very carefully over the next six to 12 months and much can be learned for the eventual decontrolling of rents under this legislation.

I also want to recall to the minister's mind that the minister stated, at the time when this legislation was introduced, and I quote: "This bill is designed to take care of a situation that is here with us now. It is not conceived to be long term. We have a termination clause in the bill. The purpose of the termination clause is to emphasize that we consider this to be a short-term necessity as part of the overall endeavour of the people of this country to fight inflation."

The rate of inflation really has not decreased, and we have before us this amendment, which we in the Liberal Party have discussed fully. The extension of the rent review legislation should correspond with the scheduled termination of the anti-inflation programme.

The first section in this amendment sets out the rate increase at eight per cent or "such lesser percentage amount as may be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council." We in this party have stated on many occasions that it is not reasonable to leave such decisions to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We feel that in this particular case it should be spelled out in the Act what really will take place between now and the end of 1978.

I would like to refer to the Throne Speech of March 29, when it stated:

"Ontario's commitment to the AIB is also coupled with a commitment to ensure basic protection from unacceptable high costs for the citizens of our province. The rent control programme, initiated in 1975, will be continued until the scheduled end of the anti-inflation programme, and legislation to this effect will be presented to the House."

The legislation is now before us, and the section near the end of the bill sets out and extends the date to December 31, 1978. The AIB guidelines, which were set out and which the province agreed to, were, I believe, 10 per cent for October 1975 to October 1976, eight per cent for October 1976 to October 1977, and six per cent from October 1977 until the termination of the programme. As this legislation is now tied in with the AIB guidelines—or so it has been intimated on many occasions—it is most important that section 1(1) of the bill be related to the guidelines.

As I stated earlier, we in this caucus feel that this future percentage change of rent increase should be spelled out in the legislation. I want to inform the minister that when we come to committee I will be proposing an amendment that would truly relate this bill to the AIB guidelines and would reduce the rate of increase to six per cent in October 1977 or at such times as the AIB guidelines are reduced.

I might also say a word about that past performance of the rent review board and officers. I suppose I should compliment them, as the expenditures for their programme were much less than expected.

Mr. Kerrio: They overestimated.

Mr. Edighoffer: The information given to me by the minister certainly showed that the expense was not as much as estimated. However, when we look at the figures and the operation of the rent review board and when we look at the decrease in the rent requested and the rent granted, we see that the average saving to the tenant was approximately $15.74. When one figures this out in relation to the number of units that went before the board, it may be considered that it is still fairly costly to administer this programme.

There are many other changes in the legislation, and I would have to say that a number of specific sections incorporate a number of new and amended provisions to provide, I hope, better administration of the programme. These certainly can't be opposed as long as they bring about more efficient administration.

We in this party feel, of course, it's important to make sure that any rent increase granted during the period of the Act remains in force for a 12-month period. It's important to allow for new hearings by the Residential Review Board in order to correct errors and also hear appeals by parties unable to attend an original hearing.

The previous speaker referred to section 5 and the discontinuance of service or a privilege or an item, which would not be considered an increase in rent. I know we discussed this very carefully and I would appreciate it if the minister would spell out, to some effect, what might take place in accordance with section 5.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: On a point of order. In order to avoid repetitive debate on this matter, I should point out that discontinuation of a service is considered to be an increase in rent; it is not considered to be an increase in rent for the purposes of the 12-

month period. I think that should be clarified, rather than have this point repeated over and over again. It is considered, and always has been considered, an increase in rent by the rent review officer.

Mr. Edighoffer: Thanks, I'm glad the minister clarified that.

This amendment, of course, changes section 10 which increases the penalty—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no point of order.

Mr. Deans: The minister rose on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The minister rose on a point of information, and it was truly out of order because second reading isn't the time for an exchange of questions and answers across the floor. I permitted it just to facilitate an orderly discussion on the principle of this bill. Any further elucidation will have to wait until the minister winds up.

Mr. Deans: That's what happened by allowing it. It was money he was referring to. I don't understand it at all.

Mr. Singer: Then get up and make a speech about it later.

Mr. Deans: Do you understand it?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Perth has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Why don't you get yourself in order for a change?

Mr. Good: Yes, exactly.

Mr. Deans: Did you understand what he said?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Deans: No, of course not.

Mr. Singer: Get yourself in order. You are the great interpreter of the rules.

Mr. Edighoffer: Thank you for controlling the members, Mr. Speaker.

I'd just like to make a comment on section 10, which is the penalty clause increasing the penalty for a corporation. I see nothing wrong with this. I notice one word is taken out of that section, and the word is "knowingly." I hope this will not create hardship for new Canadians who as yet have difficulty with the language.

Section 8(2) sets out regulatory powers to permit the levying of fees, when necessary, to recover the cost of providing copies of documents. I think that's probably what this is, but I'd certainly like the minister to clarify this in his final remarks, to let us know what further powers we are giving to the regulations.

Basically, we in this party agree in principle with this legislation. As I stated earlier, I'll be presenting an amendment when this comes to committee to bring this in line with the AIB guidelines. I know that many other members, particularly urban members from this caucus, will have comments on other sections of the bill.

Mr. McCague: How about Harry there, he'll lose a lot of money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Warner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kerrio: Why don't you resign?

Mr. Warner: I've never heard that suggestion before from anyone.

An hon. member: He's cost a lot of money, hasn't he?

Mr. Warner: Saving the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take part in the discussion of this bill and will try to do so in a non-provocative fashion. I address my comments to the minister of consumer and corporate protection.

[4:45]

Mr. Shore: Address them to the Chair.

Mr. Kerrio: Isn't the Minister of Housing interested in this discussion?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Warner: I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shore: You catch on fast.

Mr. Warner: Yes. Now that I have the title straightened out, perhaps the minister can straighten out the function.

Mr. Shore: Get yourself straightened out a little too.

Mr. Warner: I appreciate the fact that the bill is here. It is rather late, it should have been dealt with earlier.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When? This is the first day you could deal with it. Tell me when you could have done it earlier?

Mr. Warner: Those suggestions were put forward early in December.

Mr. Singer: We convened on March 29.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Ask your House leader.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Mr. Warner: If the minister will recall, we asked several times that the legislation be put forward before the House adjourned in December—

Mr. Shore: Have you got anything constructive to say?

Mr. Warner: —so that groups out there who are tenants and who are owners would have an opportunity to look at what was being proposed and have some meaningful dialogue before the eleventh hour approached, but it wasn't done. We listened—I listened anyway to a very thoughtful presentation put forward by the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), who outlined in a speech somewhere around December 15 or 16—

Mr. Shore: He got demoted.

Mr. Warner: —a considerable number of important and useful suggestions as to how the rent review process could be improved, and again reiterated that we should have something to work on before the end of April. Obviously this is before the end of April but it certainly isn't going to give enough time to have the type of in-depth dialogue there should be.

The minister has given us some suggestions as to how to improve the system. There are quite a few more that are missing, an awful lot more. I would like, in a very objective way, to sketch out for him some of the problems I have encountered and some of my observations in working with tenants, not only in my riding in Scarborough but in various parts of Metro.

I know the minister had problems in bringing in The Rent Review Act. I know he ended up with people who were to administer it as review officers who in a lot of cases didn't know what they were doing.

In Scarborough we went through several rent review officers. A couple of them, I understand, had to be told to leave. I don't know if one would call it fired or not, but they were told to vacate the premises. They were doing some strange and unusual things which were not entirely their fault. The training probably was inadequate.

I don't know why the ministry had automatically to go and drag in real estate agents to operate the programme but that appears to be what was necessary in its view. I think there could have been a better way to bring that about. The most common complaint I have had from tenants has been that they don't understand why people in the same building end up at different rent review hearings and why theere has to be so much paper work.

Why is it necessary, where there are 100 apartments in a building and everyone in there decides to go to rent review, to end up with 10,000 sheets of paper passing hands? Why is that necessary? I have never heard an adequate explanation as to why that's necessary. It seems to me that there are ways of simplifying the process. One of the ways is to have one hearing for the entire building, one hearing for the 12 months, and consider all of the apartments at the same time.

The basic flaw in the programme, as pointed out by tenants to me, was that we weren't dealing with the base rent. We didn't know what base figure we were starting at. Those older buildings with the mortgage cleared off had, I would presume, substantially less cost to meet in relationship to new buildings or buildings that had gone up within the last five years.

There was no accommodation for that because we are basing the rent review on the present figure. If it is $250 now, then we are talking about what percentage above $250? We are not looking at the real cost of the unit, and not getting back and saying to the guy: "What's the size of your mortgage and what kind of refinancing have you done and why? And if that refinancing is not legitimate, then we are going to exclude that portion." Let's get down to the real base cost so that in fact if the rent had been $250 before rent review, after it could have been reduced to below $250.

I found one particular set of apartments in my riding where they had paid off the mortgage. There was no mortgage and they could have reduced the rents below the level being charged and still have made a good profit. They were obviously making a pretty excessive profit. But the rent review officer couldn't deal with that. All he could deal with was the percentage that was being asked above the given base rent at that point.

I think that's a flaw, and it's not attended to in this legislation either. That's unfortunate because at some point in time we have to get to the real cost.

The other question that came up quite frequently from tenants was why is it that if someone else who's in the same size apartment as I am—if it's a two-bedroom and they've got a two-bedroom—that we have different rents? Why is it that someone else is paying $80 or $100 a month less for the same kind of apartment that I have? How does that happen; and why can't the rent review process level that out? Bring him up a bit or me down a bit; or in some way level it out so that all of those one-bedrooms or all of those two-bedrooms in that building end up at the same price.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It wasn't done before rent review, why do it now?

Mr. Warner: You know, that's your leadership problem; if you can't straighten that out that's your problem.

Interjection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The minister doesn't have the floor. He'll have an opportunity later on.

Mr. Warner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Get a handle on that minister.

Mr. Warner: When we discuss the rent review and the rental situation in Metro Toronto I think it's important to realize how many people it is we're talking about, because we don't really have affordable housing for most of the people who live in Metro. Almost a million people are living in some form of rental accommodation in the city. That's a lot of people, who will be living in apartments or in rental accommodation most of their lives. Unlike 15 years ago, the average family with a single wage earner cannot get affordable housing. It happened 15 years ago for a person on an average income; it doesn't happen today. Unless this government does something about it, or there's a change in government, it's not going to happen in the future.

So those people are going to be living in rented accommodation for most of their lives. The question, obviously, is what is this government going to do to help that situation. What kind of protection will those tenants have? Not just in terms of rent review, but in terms of tenant rights. Rent review could be very well looked at as a protection of a tenants' right, the right to live without fear of going into debt, based on regular income that goes up by a certain small set amount, particularly during the anti-inflation programme. Yet what kind of protection does he or she have?

What you're saying to me in this bill is that in a year and a half from now the rental accommodation problem in Metro Toronto is going to be solved. Therefore, you can dissolve rent review and leave it to the whims of the free market and everything will be fine.

You know as well as I that everything is not going to be fine. I'm quite willing to bet, and I would imagine that you would as well —silently, not in front of Hansard—that rental accommodation will not be available in large numbers and there won't be a large vacancy rate a year and a half from now. If I'm wrong, terrific; that's the leadership of this government and if that leadership is going to prove me wrong—that there will be lots of affordable rental accommodation in this city—terrific, you've done your job. And obviously we've done ours in prodding you to action, and I appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's right, you win no matter what happens.

Mr. Warner: Okay, let's get back to the problem then—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Get back to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Warner: That's right, right on. The principle of this bill is that it expires in approximately a year and a half, give or take a month or so.

Mr. Shore: Just before you.

Mr. Warner: If the member wants to speak to his own weaknesses, that's fine.

Mr. Moffatt: You will expire long before that, Marvin.

Mr. Shore: Have some fun there.

Mr. Moffatt: You will expire long before that.

Mr. Warner: What I am saying to the minister is that that is inappropriate and it's not realistic, because the rental situation in Metro Toronto is not going to be cleared up in a year and a half. Those tenants who are going to remain in rental accommodation for many, many years, are going to be left without protection—proper protection.

Why does it not make sense to the minister that the protection for tenants should remain so long as there is a vacancy problem, so long as we do not have the proper kind of vacancy rate? Why doesn't he consider that to be reasonable? I don't know and perhaps he can give us an answer.

Unless there are some answers, I'll tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, that most of those one million people in Metro Toronto who are in rental accommodations will be left without protection after December 31, 1978, goes by and at the whim and vagaries of that free market system—

Mr. Shore: Use your scare tactics—keep going. Scare me.

Mr. Warner: —and we will be back in the same kind—

An hon. member: Postpone the scare.

Mr. Nixon: Where do you stand on rent control, Marvin?

Mr. Shore: Start early—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I can recognize the hon. member for London North at a later time.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I have scared the member for London North—

Mr. Shore: You didn't scare me at all.

Mr. Mackenzie: You woke him up.

Mr. Warner: Is the member for London North finished? If not now, he will be.

Mr. Nixon: Are you going to vote for this bill, Marvin?

Mr. Warner: I'd like to know how the minister then reconciles the situation that will occur following December 31, 1978, with what went on before the government brought in The Rent Review Act. How is it that the situation following December 31, 1978, is going to be any different from what was in place before the government brought in any form of rent review? What kind of magic thing is going to happen between now and then that will make the situation any different?

Mr. Singer: You don't know the answer to that one? They hope to have some more seats over there. That's what will make everything possible.

Mr. Warner: They may or may not end up with more seats, but we're not going to end up with more apartments—

Mr. Singer: Well, that's what they are gambling on at the moment.

Mr. Warner: —and that's the problem. The minister knows it and I know it, but he is not prepared to do anything about it in this particular bill. That is what is so very annoying.

No one in this House believes for a moment that every landlord out there is some sort of pirate—not all of them. The minister knows as well as we do that many of those pirates out there were identified—they were identified by his government during the rent review hearings. There were landlords who were brought into line and they were told, "You are asking excessive rents and you have to roll them back." That's the case; that's what happened, and the minister has the documentation for it.

I sat in on those hearings, as I am sure all of us did at one point or another, and I heard the rent review officer order those rollbacks. In one particular building, the rent review officer told the landlord, "No increase. Your increase is so excessive you don't even deserve an increase at all," and ordered that there be no increase. So this government realizes there are pirates out there, the same way we do.

Now where have they all gone? Will they not be there in 1978? Will they not resurface on January 1, 1979? They certainly will and they'll be out there in full force. And who's going to protect the tenants against these pirates? Who? Tell me. Not the government, obviously, because it has decided that the end of December its responsibility for protecting the tenants of Ontario is ended. I say that's wrong.

Mr. Shore: You have got the most warped mind there is.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Have you ever read the Speech from the Throne? Try it some time, it might help. Read the rest of it.

Mr. Warner: An interesting document; fascinating, yes. You're going to move all this into The Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Shore: You've got a warped mind.

Mr. Warner: There's an interesting one to ponder.

Mr. Martel: Like playing Mickey Mouse.

Mr. Warner: Perhaps the minister in his response could indicate whether or not it is reasonable to take some form of rent review protection for tenants for the period

beyond December 31, 1978, and move it into The Landlord and Tenant Act. I'd be interested in hearing his thoughts on that. It would be a good way to handle some of the problems.

[5:00]

When we get down to another principle of the bill which talks about the precise kind of increase that should be allowed—and the minister has grabbed at the figure of eight per cent—obviously we question why. We've heard both from the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) and the Liberal spokesman—

Mr. Riddell: The member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer).

Mr. Samis: The squire of Perth, the entrepreneur.

Mr. Warner: —the gentleman member from Perth who spoke so nicely, that it's more appropriate to have six per cent. Since we have all been told by this government that the cost of living has gone down, and since we've been told by this government that it believes in the anti-inflation programme and that it wishes to mirror the federal government as much as possible, particularly where it involves Ottawa taking over its responsibilities, then it only makes good and reasonable sense to accept six per cent instead of eight. If the minister has some argument as to why that should not occur, I would be very happy to hear it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: What's the point of a compendium? Did the member read it?

Mr. Warner: I read everything that you send over, not everything makes sense.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Let the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) read it to him.

Mr. Moffatt: As the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations said, only wages are controlled at six per cent.

Mr. Ferrier: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere has the floor.

Mr. Warner: Thank you. I guess what is most disturbing about this bill, particularly in light of what went before it and the attitudes of the government prior to any bill about rent review, is—and I don't mean this in any sort of mean way or vindictive way—

Mr. Shore: Not you!

Mr. Singer: He said it. I don't know why you are so worried.

Mr. Warner: —that I really don't think that the minister's heart's in it, I really don't.

Mr. Nixon: I suspect the member for London North isn't really keen about it.

Mr. Singer: He never was.

Mr. Nixon: Without giving away caucus secrets.

Mr. Shore: It's the best piece of legislation.

Mr. Warner: Perhaps he would rather be minister of beer in the ball park, I don't know, but I don't think the minister's heart is in this whole business. I really don't think he has the protection of tenants at heart. He would like somehow to think that the whole thing could be done without any effort, that somehow the free-market system is going to take care of all those people out there; tenants won't have problems and we can do away with this. I have the feeling if we didn't have any anti-inflation programme around, if the federal government had decided to do away with it, we wouldn't even have this in here now. This government would let the tenants struggle individually and in small groups against those corporate giants Meridian and Cadillac.

Mr. Shore: What have the corporate giants done?

Mr. Moffatt: The member for London North is going to get a promotion. He is going to be parliamentary secretary to the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea).

Mr. Warner: Perhaps the member for London North should have someone read him the financial statements of Cadillac and Meridian and then tell me whether they're corporate giants or not.

Mr. Shore: Once you learn how to read, you might learn something about rent review. What about unions? Aren't they big giants?

Mr. Samis: Stand in line.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the member for London North try to keep quiet just for a few minutes?

Mr. Warner: Thank you. It seems to me that the minister, in addition to including the six per cent in there and deciding that we should not automatically terminate The

Rent Review Act, should ensure that we could handle all of the appeals for one building in one calendar year. Take the expiry dates, the one that are coming up and the ones that have occurred, and let's deal with them in one hearing at one time.

He could also ensure that during that process the tenants would have the same advantage that the landlords have. The process he went through in producing a nice little book for the landlords, telling them how to go about rent review, could be done for the tenants. I don't think that's unreasonable, but if the minister thinks it's unreasonable I'd like to hear his argument on that score.

Appeal procedure, quite frankly, was always a mystery to me. I couldn't understand why things that were not allowed at the hearing were allowed at the appeal, and why the course of events that took place at the hearing to give the officer some notion as to what had happened got turned around at the appeal and why it had to be so awkward for tenants to take part.

When the landlord wants to go to an appeal, he doesn't even have to show up as long as he sends a lawyer and an accountant; and he can take that sum of money, whatever it is they charge him for their services, and enter it into the review process as an allowable expense. The tenant, in order to have a valid case, has to appear and in many cases takes time off from work. Is his loss of salary deducted from the rent increase or accommodated in any way? No, it doesn't happen.

Mr. Drea: Oh, come on.

Mr. Warner: The landlord can deduct the expenses of the accountant and the lawyer, but the tenant takes a half a day off work at his expense and there is no credit. The minister hasn't covered that.

Mr. Drea: Come on. You never went to one of the hearings and you know it.

Mr. Warner: By the time we are finished, I say to the minister, we are still going to have many of the built-in inequities that were there before.

And they can be solved. There is no great magic to it. The ministers of the government keep telling us they are brilliant bureaucrats, that they know how to organize and streamline things. All right; here's a chance to prove it. Let them show us how they can streamline this system to cut down on the paperwork, to make it more accessible for the tenants, to better inform the tenants of their rights, obligations and responsibilities, and how the government is going to cut down on the cost. And let them show us how they are going to get a more equitable distribution of those people who are rent review officers so that they don't have to drag in every real estate agent they can find, but rather they can use other people in the community.

There is one situation in particular on which I would like some clarification from the minister. Maybe it was that the people I talked to didn't have the authority to tell me this, but in one particular review case I attended I was impressed with the rent review officer because he said, "I am not sure of the validity of these stories. I am going to inspect the building." He did that; he inspected the building personally. When he was finished, he made his deliberation and came up with a settlement that was agreeable to the tenants. They felt that the rent review officer had done a good job and that he was being fair and objective. I did too.

The question is, is this the normal practice? Is this something that is extraordinary for this particular rent review officer to do? Or is it something that the rent review officer should do if, in his judgement, the facts given by both sides are not clear or he is not convinced that they are clear? Should he then feel himself compelled to personally investigate the building, the books and so on?

I don't know. I never got an answer. I would appreciate hearing from the minister if that is an acceptable kind of procedure and should be written into the rules for the rent review officer.

Problems which cropped up through the rent review process in some cases turned out to be problems where neither I nor anyone else could deal with the owner, because the government does not say that the owner must identify himself. What the government has said in the rent review process is that the property manager, the owner and/or the property manager, or some person designated to be in charge of the building, shall place his or her name and telephone number in some conspicuous spot in the building. What that means for many of the corporate giants, is that they never have to put down the owner's name—only that of the property manager.

I realize, as the minister pointed out before when we dealt with the first Act, that what we are dealing with primarily is rent review and not landlord and tenant problems; somehow you want those separated. But try as you may, when the tenants come into the

hearing, they feel aggravated over their rents because of a series of problems that are related to The Landlord and Tenant Act. They say: "Maybe I wouldn't object so much to the increase in rent if the buildings were kept up properly." But the rent review officer can't deal with that. That is not his job. He is dealing with the figures connected with rent review. So, then they turn to me, as their member—as they have turned to other members—and say: "How do we go about getting the building fixed up properly?"

Well, the first thing we should do is get hold of the owner. There is no owner's name. It's property manager; some real estate company is handling it and they won't disclose who the owner is; they will only say: "We will get it fixed up in due course." The phrase sounds familiar.

I wonder if it is entirely unreasonable for us to ask if the minister could include in the bill that the owner's name be put on the building so that we know who the owner is. Then, if there are problems to be followed up regarding The Landlord and Tenant Act, that are not the responsibility of the ministry, we can follow them up. We will know who the owner is and we can go through that procedure.

Quite frankly I really do think that rent review is part of The Landlord and Tenant Act and at some point, if the government wishes to have a termination date it should seriously consider working rent review into the landlord and tenant process so that there is one set of rules, one Act, one person who is responsible for the whole business. By this means, when a tenant has a problem, whether it's his or her rent, his or her building that is not kept up, or whatever, it can be dealt with in one straightforward, simple manner. It isn't done now and I think it can be. Perhaps the minister will have some suggestions as to how that kind of protection will be extended to tenants.

In conclusion, while I support the principle of the bill, because it is better than nothing and it does afford some protection over the next 18 to 20 months, I am really disappointed that this government does not see as its obligation and responsibility the protection of tenants forever; that it will not protect tenants against one single gouging landlord. When those incidents occur in 1979, people are going to have to stand in this House—maybe the minister, as the official opposition critic—and ask the government to do something about it.

Mr. Singer: I want to add a few words in this debate. But before getting into it, I wonder what kind of thinking was going through the minister's mind when he suggested that we had a very limited time to debate this bill. He then proceeded to build up some rather unusual time limit of May 1, suggesting that something has to happen then and something has to happen on another day.

I recognize that the minister doesn't enjoy the democratic process. He doesn't enjoy the ordinary rules of debate applying to him. He doesn't enjoy allowing members of this Legislature to have a full and appropriate say on a very important piece of legislation. Nor is he prepared to explain the hoops that he and his colleagues jumped through before they introduced this legislation as a result of their being a minority government in the first place.

You remember, Mr. Speaker, what happened during the closing weeks of the campaign in 1975 when the minister and his colleagues, particularly his leader, had five different positions on 10 different days, insofar as what they were going to do relating to rent control.

Mr. Shore: Your heart's not in it, Vern.

Mr. Singer: You remember that?

Mr. Drea: That's when you were beat.

Mr. Mackenzie: You didn't do so well either.

Mr. Singer: The end result after the noses were counted and the seats were allocated was that to stay in power at all, the government had to bring in some kind of rent review control. And they did it with as much ill grace as was possible. The present minister said if he had to be associated with it any longer he'd resign. By his words you can tell how serious he was, because he's still here—he hasn't resigned.

[5:15]

The Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) who had it for a while, obviously has a stronger voice in the cabinet caucus than this minister does, because that minister managed to pass the buck to this minister. So now we have this minister who, with ill grace, brings in this amendment because there still is a minority House, and because still they don't want to go to the people recognizing that they are making no provision to protect tenants.

In this municipality of Metropolitan Toronto—what is it?—50 per cent of the residents

live in apartments and as a result of what happened in the last election to the Conservative representation they just can't afford to arouse the ire of all of those people as they would do if they allowed rent controls to expire.

The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere wondered why there's an expiration date on this. The suggestion was, I think, pretty obvious that hopefully if they call an election shortly, they think they're going to have more seats. Then, if they get enough seats, they'll have the majority of the House and then they can allow the legislation to expire. That's the master plan, but hopefully the people of Ontario are not going to allow those people to bring into effect that master plan at all.

Mr. Drea: You won't be here.

Mr. Singer: Sure it is, no question about it.

Mr. Martel: That's what it is.

Mr. Drea: You won't be here.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would think that in casting this legislation, there should have been some realization in some quarters at least that all portions of the province of Ontario are not the same. There are some sections of the province where rent control is not needed or rent review procedures are not needed.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: Where there is a sufficient vacancy incidence such controls are not needed. In talking to some of my colleagues, they tell me that in some of the areas of this province that situation does in fact prevail. Surely it would have made sense, rather than having blanket legislation to cover the whole province, that this would be tied in some way in relation to vacancy rates. CMHC publishes regularly a vacancy rate, and it is reasonably regarded that when the vacancy rate gets to be four per cent that the open market in fact does carry on, and there is competition, and rents are controlled in that way.

Mr. Shore: Four?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Four?

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: It would have made sense. Mr. Speaker—to me at least—if the government had provided that where the vacancy rate has stayed say at a four per cent level for six months that that area could in fact be excused from having that kind of review. But where the vacancy rate exists at one per cent or less, as it does now in Metropolitan Toronto, certainly the tenants who are going to be affected by the abandonment of controls or review have to be protected. And they have to be protected for two reasons. One is because of the chaos their living conditions would then be under, and the other is because of the dismal failure this government has shown in its ability to get rental housing accommodation put on the market at affordable prices.

Mr. Good: Right, that's the problem.

Mr. Singer: We had a gesture the other day from the Minister of Housing who says that this government is now going to give $600 in a grant to people who build rental units in certain areas which are ascertained by applying certain criteria. That's not a bad step. That's a step in the right direction. But why has it taken so long?

Surely the government had to recognize a year ago, two years ago, five years ago, that there was a shortage of affordable housing—a shortage of rental accommodation. Surely the government should have moved then, not just at this hour—$600 a unit? Fine, good thing. But what about the red tape insofar as planning and development and rezoning are concerned? What about the cost of sewers, water mains, roads, those sort of things? What about those municipalities who can't afford to further burden their taxpayers by taxes on real estate to allow further development? When is the government going to do something about that? When is it going to unlock the road block that exists in front of building more housing accommodation and more rental accommodation? Those are the things it has to get at.

Until it does, I'm afraid I have to agree with those members of the official opposition that these controls have to stay. They have to stay where the incidence of vacancy is low enough to cause real concern and real hardship on the people who cannot get accommodation within their means. That's what the crux of the situation is.

Mr. Drea: All this from the lawyer of Gerhard Moog.

Mr. Singer: All the great speeches about free enterprise, competition in the marketplace and so on are meaningless—when we get one group who are unable to protect themselves and another group of people who want to take every advantage of a scarcity situation. Surely it is a job of this government to

protect people who are otherwise unable to protect themselves—

Mr. Drea: All this from the lawyer of Gerhard Moog.

Mr. Singer: —people of low income, people who are not employed, older people, people on fixed pensions and that sort of thing.

Interjection.

Mr. Singer: Those are the people who have to be protected, and the government has got to recognize that these people need protection as long as they are in this impossible situation existing in our big cities, existing in places like Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Drea: You're not on retainer from Gerhard Moog any more.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's as stupid a comment as you've made for some time.

Mr. Drea: Don't you push me.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Wilson Heights will continue.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One has to recognize that the system as it was set up has many flaws in it. Some of them have been outlined by the members who have already spoken—

Mr. Martel: Will you Tories get out of the gutter this week at all?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Wilson Heights will continue without all the interjections.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There has to be a recognition that the system as set up was set up in a hurry. It is a flawed system and it is a system that is weighted heavily in favour of the people who are best able to protect themselves, the wealthier people.

For instance, there has to be a system of availability of appropriate advice to the tenants. So often, when they come to the rent review officer or to the appeal board, they are met by accountants and lawyers who are familiar with cost accounting, who are familiar with taxes, assessments, costs, depreciation and that sort of thing. They step into a world that is completely strange to them, and they are compelled to try to cope with that kind of argument without any assistance at all.

Surely the ministry could make available lists of accounting firms and legal firms who would be prepared to take on this kind of advice for those people who have to go before the boards and provide it—not for free, but at reasonable cost. One has to recognize that when the giant fights with the pygmy, the pygmy needs some very substantial assistance. That assistance is not being given, and that is one of the sources of the greatest complaint that exists. When I've been to those hearings, and when I've talked to tenants in my riding, these are the things they're concerned about. They don't understand, and nobody bothers to explain to them. The rent review officer isn't able to explain it to them and hasn't got time. And certainly the landlord, who is asking for an increase in their rent, isn't anxious to explain it to them; nor is he able to make his advisers available to them. So that kind of thing should be done.

Mr. Drea: Yes, especially when he is a lawyer.

Mr. Singer: Can't you keep that nattering down to a low level, Mr. Speaker? It's disturbing, I suppose, to the Hansard people—

Mr. Shore: You can hear yourself that way.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member will continue. The Speaker can hear the hon. member quite well and will continue to listen to him.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that.

Mr. Drea: A retainer, as always.

Mr. Singer: The second thing that is of very grave importance is the availability of documents to the tenants. There has been all sorts of wrangling here in Metropolitan Toronto about whether or not the tenants are entitled to see the documents that are produced. Rather than allow them to be copied—and surely a system of providing copying machines for rental use to the tenants could be worked out.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It has been.

Mr. Singer: Oh, it hasn't been worked out. They still have to go in and copy out the documents in longhand. Yes, yes, yes.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No, no, no.

Mr. Singer: Let the minister come with me to some of the hearings in and around Metropolitan Toronto and he'll see that. Copying machines are not available and again the

tenants are under grave disability insofar as getting appropriate information is concerned.

Advice to tenants has already been touched on by one of the earlier participants in this debate. There is a booklet that provides explanations of the statute to landlords, but an appropriate document providing advice to tenants should be made available and it's most important that it be done.

On the question of notification. At the present time the party initiating an appeal hearing must obtain a list of people who are eligible to appear at the original rent review hearing and the party has to give personal notice to each of the people appearing. I guess I have to put on my glasses.

Once the appeal has been filed, the rent review office should take over the notification. The office has the facilities for making copies of notices, as well as having the lists of those to whom the notices should be sent. A very simple amendment, Mr. Speaker, and an amendment that the ministry could well initiate.

Concerning rent review and appeal board decisions as it is now legislated: A rent review decision applies to every tenant concerned with the hearing regardless of whether the tenant appeared at the hearing or not. However, to appeal a rent review decision, the tenant must have appeared at the original hearing. Once an appeal decision has been made, it applies only to the tenants who have appealed.

There is an amendment that purports to deal with it, but it has some peculiar language, "a valid reason," or something. What that, in fact, means is very hard to determine. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would be a little more explicit and try and be of a little more assistance to tenants without putting them through such complicated steps as to have to explain—what is the wording of the section?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You haven't read it before?

Mr. Singer: "Circumstances beyond his control." I don't know what the heck that means. Why should there not be an ability to the tenant, if he has any reasonable excuse, to be able to carry on—not just circumstances beyond his control, which allows subjective decision by the appeal officer? There should be built-in rights to the tenants to be able to get their full appeal hearing if they want to and not be tied in with this kind of red tape which they don't properly understand.

The question of flexible controls I've already dealt with. The availability of documents for professional assistance. Those are things, Mr. Speaker, that I think should be done and included in the statute.

I don't know if the minister happened to get to see the article, a rather good one, in the Toronto Star on April 16—that's last Saturday—dealing with the system that presently exists. It's rather a good summary and not particularly partisan. A couple of quotations from that article:

"If government is really interested in providing sufficient rental accommodation at an affordable price, it's going to have to provide the industry with support in the form of incentives."

I agree with that, and I've already commented on what the Minister of Housing said, but that's only the beginning. The government has to do all of those other things. We've been talking about them here for years and none of them are really being done.

"William Robbins, the executive director of Ontario's Residential Premises Rent Review Programme, said, 'The legislation was designed as a temporary measure to spread oil on the troubled waters' "—troubled waters? They're troubled election waters—" 'and to put a halt to the inflationary rent increases. As such, I think, it has been relatively fair'."

William Robbins talks as though those things have all been accomplished and the problem pretty well has gone away. But look at some of the statistics that Richard Conrad quotes: "More than 90 per cent of the 26,000 appeals on review decisions have been initiated by landlords and about 50 per cent of those have resulted in increases in rental." Surely that speaks more eloquently than anything else, Mr. Speaker, for the fact that the landlord has the very great advantage of going through the first hearing, the second hearing and, at least, in 50 per cent of the 26,000 appeal hearings, the landlord has been successful. That has to reinforce the argument that the tenants need more assistance than they're presently getting and the ministry has to make sure that that is, in fact, done.

[5:30]

Let me read at random a few other quotes out of this: "Tenant groups in Toronto also are pushing for the implementation of changes that would enable tenants to easily learn what legal maximum rental was for a particular unit. The incidence of illegal rents is increasing daily and if a rent review is continued, we feel that this is a major problem."

My colleague from Perth mentioned that earlier on.

"Robbins denies accusations that the Ontario programme has resulted in the creation of a bureaucratic mess."

I would like to hear from the minister. The minister's comments about the situation was something less than an expression of pleasure. I don't know whether he would admit there was a bureaucratic mess or whether he would agree with Robbins that it isn't a bureaucratic mess. But if these controls are going to be with us for a while, and I suspect at the pace we are building affordable housing and affordable rental units it is going to be much longer than the end of 1978, then the minister has got to put his bureaucratic house in order. He has got to understand what he is doing and get about it in a proper and a fair way.

"Sure, the Act is complicated," says Robbins, "but playing with rents is a serious and complicated business."

That's true but if it's a complicated Act, and Robbins says it's a complicated Act and so do the tenants who try to cope with it, then the minister in fairness has got to take steps to give explanatory pamphlets and books to those people who can't properly understand it. All of the tenants haven't got university education. All of them aren't used to reading statutes. All of them aren't used to a legal or quasi-legal kind of system that deals with their rights and can affect their economic well-being.

The minister has to deal with people on the basis that they can understand and he hasn't taken those steps. He has denied them explanatory pamphlets and he has denied them professional assistance. He sends them into those hearings really with one hand tied behind their back. That's what's unfair about this legislation as it presently exists and the minister has caught up very few of these things in the amendments he is bringing in.

There's the story. If the government is serious and not just paying lip service to this whole problem, if the government is seriously concerned—and I suggest it has got to be —about tenants' ability to cope with inflation and to cope with the very grave shortage of rental units of any kind in places like Metropolitan Toronto, then it should have a better Act than the one it's bringing in.

Yes, we have it here and it's going on at least until December 31, 1978. That's a step in the right direction and we will support it in principle. But I would hope that the minister will pay serious attention to the comments that have been levied about the present statute and the comments that have been made about the present administration and will try to introduce into this statute, before it gets too much further, appropriate amendments to take care of some of the most serious and obvious defects that the statute now has.

Ms. Gigantes: I would like to make a few comments in the course of this debate about the biggest landlord in North America and the worst landlord without a doubt in the province of Ontario. That's the Ontario Housing Corporation. When we go back and look over the history of rent review legislation in Ontario, there's one very very sad part to the history.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe this bill hasn't anything to do with the rental accommodation owned by Ontario Housing. Am I mistaken about that? No, it has not. It's not part of the bill.

Ms. Gigantes: It's precisely this lack I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I beg your pardon.

Ms. Gigantes: I would like to bring to your attention the fact that hundreds of thousands of people who live in Ontario Housing Corporation houses in the province of Ontario, run by the government of Ontario, do not have any protection under this Act. They were offered protection in the previous Act when it was first introduced.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That has nothing to do with the principle of this bill.

Ms. Gigantes: I believe it has.

Mr. Speaker: Irrespective of what is lacking, all the hon. member can do is bring in her own bill if she wants to promote that.

An hon. member: There are students, nurses and all sorts of people in public housing.

Mr. Martel: You can speak to what's missing in a bill.

Mr. Grande: The principle of the bill is rental accommodation and she should be allowed to speak!

Mr. Speaker: You can bring that up at other times or introduce your own bill. You can speak about it at the budget debate, it has been suggested. But it is not part of the principle of this bill and therefore it is out of order for any discussion at this time.

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, with your indulgence, what we're looking at now is a continuation—a bill to continue the legislation of rent review under which we've operated in Ontario since the last election. The original bill which was passed by this House included those hundreds of thousands of tenants who are tenants of Ontario Housing Corporation—

Mr. Speaker: I point out to the hon. member, and I'm sure she's quite aware, that that was omitted by a later amendment and, therefore, it is not part of this bill or the existing legislation. Therefore, it's out of order to discuss that particular matter at this time. There are other opportunities to present your viewpoint—I appreciate that. Just discuss this bill.

Ms. Gigantes: If I may then, I would like to talk about the administration of the previous bill which this bill does not follow up in all its measures. The administration of the previous bill went as follows: It covered Ontario Housing Corporation tenants—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That bill is no longer a bill, it's no longer legislation, therefore it is not proper to discuss it, I point out again. Will the hon. member please respect that?

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to address myself to what I feel is a lack in this bill.

Mr. Speaker: It's not debatable at this time. There's opportunity to—

Mr. Makarchuk: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is the order, and every hon. member knows that. The second reading is a discussion of the principle of this bill and has nothing to do with Ontario Housing Corporation. It's not amending that previous bill. I remember an original bill did include it; it was changed and, therefore, it is not existing legislation. This bill is amending the existing legislation—not what was originally introduced some many months ago. This is a proper interpretation of it, therefore it's out of order to discuss the matter of Ontario Housing rentals at this time. That's the last time I hope it's necessary to say that. You may present your viewpoints along those lines on another occasion, but not in discussing this bill, please.

Mr. Grande: I think you should insist.

Mr. Roy: Are we next?

Mr. Speaker: Are there further comments you wish to make on the principle of the bill?

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat baffled by your interpretation and—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The ruling is not debatable. I have repeated it three or four times and I'm sure that it's a correct ruling and, therefore, you are not allowed to discuss the matter of Ontario Housing.

Ms. Gigantes: I have to bow to your judgement, Mr. Speaker, and I regret that missed opportunity in which I hoped to be able to tell you about my feelings about the lack of coverage for the largest—

Mr. Speaker: I can't help it. Surely, I don't have to repeat myself again. You either discuss this bill or we'll have to call on the next speaker. If you wish to discuss this bill you may, but not something that's not before us.

The member for St. George may continue.

Mrs. Campbell: I too am pleased to join in this debate. I am very pleased, of course, that the government has seen fit to bow to the will of the opposition in this House, to extend the operation of this bill.

[Applause]

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You are reading Mike Cassidy.

Mr. Kerrio: We've got you working in the right direction, now we have to keep you going there.

Mr. Roy: Do you want us to quote your press clippings again, where you are going to resign?

Mrs. Campbell: It shows the value of a concerned opposition in our legislative process.

I am concerned that the date is a fixed date. I had hoped that with all of the ingenuity and all of the expertise of government we might have related the end of this legislation to a vacancy rate. A vacancy rate has been accepted in this country for many years and for many purposes, and I feel it is very sad that the minister can't relate to a vacancy rate—or that he doesn't apparently, understand a vacancy rate. However, the extension, as I say, is of vital importance to a great many people.

We have heard a discussion about the proposed eight per cent. So far as I am concerned, if the principle of this bill as the government has introduced it is to relate to the AIB, then of course we would, I assume, be following the guidelines of the AIB in their entirety, but I am a little puzzled that the government which cannot find a way to deal with vacancy rates—which would then tie it into AIB—doesn't follow the full procedure of tying it in completely to the AIB guidelines.

Mr. Reid: No co-ordination. They all operate in a vacuum.

Mrs. Campbell: Another thing that disturbs me is that in the principle of the total bills on rent review, we did see the government take a position which I applauded at the time—that was to relate the rent to the unit and not to the individual tenant. Yet there has been nothing here to protect the tenants from any kind of illegality which may arise, particularly in major cities, where tenants in a building do not tend to know one another very well. When one tenant moves out, a new tenant coming in is not able to ascertain the rent which was charged to the previous tenant. So, the principle of unit determination falls in part, because of the lack of any kind of system of registration of rent.

It does seem to me that if we are really anxious to avoid illegality, this is certainly one of the areas where there is a gap large enough to drive a truck through. In my view, we should have a registration system whereby a tenant may ascertain what the previous rent was.

I hear such plaintive notes from the other side. But if they're that plaintive, may I say that it makes one wonder as to just how real the concern is to ensure that there is no illegal increase once a tenant has moved out.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: He just has to ask the rent review officer a simple question.

An hon. member: They haven't got their heart in the bill.

Mrs. Campbell: Well, I know they don't.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for St. George has the floor.

Mrs. Campbell: I'm not, as my friend from Scarborough-Ellesmere suggested, unaware of their lack of real commitment. I am saying that even if the government only wants to make it appear that it has a commitment, that is the kind of gap that has to be plugged.

You know, there is this other thing. I've written a letter to the minister; I don't know whether he has received it yet. But I would like to point out the kinds of things that are happening today in the riding of St. George. I wrote to him about some limited dividend housing. There is no doubt that there are very real problems for the tenants in coming to grips with the accounting system.

[5:45]

Hon. Mr. Handleman: CMHC.

Mrs. Campbell: I don't know if the minister made an interjection; if he did, I didn't catch it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I just say it is the CMHC accounting system.

Mrs. Campbell: No, no, Mr. Speaker. The limited dividend housing is under rent review. What we're having to see is that these tenants, first of all, in an unaccountable fashion, although the tenants wish to appear as a group, are being denied this opportunity. They are meeting in small groups with rent review and of course they're immediately at a disadvantage. Because the landlord is there for each of these hearings. He has continuinty for each of these hearings, the tenants do not. And without assistance to them in the accounting system they are really facing an intolerable onus in the preparation of their case.

What makes it even worse in this particular case—if you can envisage an area which is known locally as St. James Town. Here you have one developer who owns massive apartments which are conventional apartments—he owns the two limited dividend properties, and he manages the Ontario Housing operation. As I pointed out to the minister, I did get a rough accounting which was presented to the people and right off the surface it was clearly indicated to me, and I am not an accountant, that the amounts indicated for landscaping, for example, must have been a sheer waste of money since there never was any landscaping.

It is quite possible in this sort of an operation for a mingling of accounts in such a way that the tenants are unable to really get through, without greater expertise than I have or than they have. In a case such as that, surely if one is committed to assist these tenants there should be available to them accountancy services in order that they may do a careful analysis of the different accounts.

I would like to say in fairness to the minister here that I also made that plea to Ottawa some time ago when the Hon. Mr. Danson was the minister. I pointed out that I felt it was an injustice to these people not to have that kind of assistance where you have one owner owning such a vast project of very different kinds of accommodation and managing Ontario Housing as well.

I think it's quite possible that the accounting is not something that any person can undertake unless that person is highly expert. So I have that appeal to the minister—that at least in those situations we might make a start in trying to assist tenants in these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that there are others who wish to speak. I will conclude at this point. I would love to talk much longer on this bill. Thank you.

Mr. Mackenzie: My remarks on this bill and the amendments are going to be very brief, but they do, I think, speak to the bill and to some of the shortcomings of the amendments in it that bother me a bit.

One of the things that we found to our dismay in the Hamilton area is that the rents that were originally claimed by the landlords—and they ran I guess on an average close to 20, 22 per cent, 25 per cent in some cases; I think the highest I got involved with was about 35 per cent—were rolled back in almost every case to the 10 to 12 per cent range.

I said at the time we were debating this bill previously that the problem, apart from the lack of housing which we all recognize, was a handful of the landlords in my city. I can almost name them to you. Half a dozen—unfortunately two or three of them major ones—that we are going to have the trouble with. It is surprising how often there is a relation to the trouble we have with the rents they are charging and the appeal processes that we have had and the number of calls we have had at the same time with the local inspectors or health boards. In one case we have a file about three feet long of problems in a series of four buildings.

One of the things that bothered me, and I got it to the appeal stage too, was the use made of the vacancy rate in some of these units. I could never understand it—it is one of the things that the rent review officers seem to jump on and cut back. But what happened with all of the sharpies, and I use the quote literally, was that they did appeal. Where they appealed the people, having had the original rent increase rolled back, were paying what it was rolled back to. We waited in many cases almost a year—eight or nine months was not uncommon—for the appeal boards. And what I found at the appeal boards was that the arguments that took place at the original hearing did not seem to carry any weight whatsoever—as a matter of fact they were ignored—and we ended up with the rents being rolled back up, in almost every case, within one or two dollars of the original amount.

I don't see the protection also that says that having waited eight, nine or 10 months especially where they paid what they thought was going to be close to the figure—the rent review officer's decision—why then when the appeal board raised it and they found they were behind a good chunk of money, these same people get a letter immediately ordering them to "pay up or we will give you notice to get out." Certainly I don't see that kind of protection in the few amendments that are here, and I think it is one of the things that should have been in this particular bill.

I don't know how, as I said before, they could use the argument of the high vacancy rates on the cost side of it. I don't know what you'd do with this, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know how the minister will respond to it. My basic worry now is that I don't see in his amendments where once they went to the appeal—and it is not the tenants, it is the landlords in every case—there was no appeal to that decision. I did go along with my colleague from Wentworth (Mr. Deans) and talked to the appeals board chairman. He listened and I think gave us a reasonable hearing, although no satisfaction. But one of the arguments that we got from him was that it was "too bad I didn't really know that you were having these problems in advance." In many cases we didn't hear about the decisions until the tenants came to us following the appeals.

There is simply in this bill no protection for tenants in this kind of a situation. We did get a 35 per cent increase in the Jerome Court Apartments. We got up to 20 per cent in the whole Granville Delawanna complex, and there is not a lousier situation in Hamilton than in some of those apartments.

Mr. Shore: Who is we?

Mr. Mackenzie: I am talking about the people.

Mr. Shore: Oh I see.

Mr. Mackenzie: I try to represent them, Marvin, I didn't make my money on bankruptcies either.

I am really upset, Mr. Speaker, that the minister hasn't seen fit to take a look at this particular area of the bill. Certainly there should not be more than a six per cent increase. In most of those apartments there shouldn't be any increase at all. We should be setting a set figure and not allowing the eight per cent or above that on the appeal stage; I think we are beyond that stage now.

Mr. Speaker, I do wish, just on the basis of consideration of the tenants in these buildings, that the minister would take a look at this omission in his particular amendments to this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill?

Mr. Samis: I'll see if I can wrap up my remarks in the very brief amount of time allotted. May I say, first of all, I wholeheartedly support the introduction of this legislation. Frankly, I don't see where the government had any real choice in the matter, with the AIB being continued. I recall quite vividly—in 1975, I think it was—how this government embraced the introduction of the AIB; the way they supported it sort of reminded me of the fervour of Moose Dupont in the frenzy of a head-hunt in front of the Maple Leafs net.

When this legislation is passed by this House, and as expeditiously as possible, I would hope this minister would make a commitment to both the tenants and the landlords of this province that he won't go around the province bad-mouthing the bill or saying it can't work or saying it just doesn't solve the problem that we are trying to cope with.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It doesn't.

Mr. Samis: I hope he will keep quiet and try to make the best of the bill we have until its date of expiration, instead of continually saying, as the minister responsible, this doesn't really solve the problem. We all know it is a temporary measure, but I think it is incumbent upon him as a minister of the Crown administering this legislation, to make it work as well as possible, and not to go around demeaning it merits.

My colleague from Scarborough-Ellesmere has already questioned the fervour and the enthusiasm that the minister has for the bill, and I think it is pretty obvious how little he does have. But the minister should support what the Legislature does pass; and I assume this will have support from all three parties. I think he is obliged to uphold the consent and the virtually unanimous support that this bill will get in the Legislature.

I don't see rent review as the final or ultimate solution to the overall problem of the shortage of rental accommodation, and that essentially is the problem. When the controls disappear, obviously we will have to confront it in a more basic form, namely the supply available.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Now.

Mr. Samis: The government has made an initial step, and that obviously deserves support. But I don't agree, within the purely federal Liberal context that John Turner always used to argue, that all you had to do was build more houses and that would solve the problem, because it obviously goes much deeper than that. The step the government took yesterday was one initiative. It won't solve the problem, but it is an initiative beyond just the freeze; and I would support that. I would say there are other initiatives that are needed to cope with the problem before 1978, when the controls come off.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Right. That's what the speech said.

Mr. Samis: One thing I personally would give serious consideration to is that when the controls do come off, there should be some form of lasting mechanism—not rent control, maybe not rent review—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Right. Tenant protection.

Mr. Samis: There will be a danger of some people exploiting the complete absence of controls, and I would suggest the minister give some consideration to the Quebec system of the rental commission.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Come on over here.

Mr. Samis: No, no; I wouldn't go that far. It's too drastic a step.

Mr. Shore: They may kick you out.

Mr. Samis: The rental commission does give a third agency that someone can refer to if they think they are being grossly exploited. I know the Tories have some philosophical objections, but I don't think we should go from rent review to complete laissez-faire. I would trust that this ministry would support some other form of legislation, when this bill expires, to protect those cases where there will be gouging. I think we both agree there will be some cases of that.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You'd better have a talk with them; you are making sense.

Mr. Shore: You better watch it; you are making sense.

Mr. Samis: I put no percentage on it. All I say, as the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) said, is that those people—

Mr. Moffatt: We recognize the sense.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cornwall will continue.

Mr. Samis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of percentages, with the AIB being so rigid and specifying an exact percentage, I would gladly support the amendment put forward by my colleague from Perth. Frankly, it surprises me a little bit. I know the Perth County Conspiracy is well known across this country, but I never thought the member for Perth would advocate such a rigid, statistical AIB definition of his party's policy.

Mr. Edighoffer: Are you qualified?

Mr. Samis: I am really pleased to see how specific the member has made his particular party's policy.

One thing that does concern me, Mr. Speaker, in the very brief amount of time left, is that regardless of the form of the legislation—I speak from the cases in my own particular riding—it disturbs me that there are still people in this province, regardless of the final form of this bill, who won't receive the benefits because they are intimidated by landlords. The landlord will say, "I am raising this percentage. Do what you want. But I am throwing you out if you go to rent review." These people are so easily intimidated, I think it's a matter of serious concern.

In wrapping up, Mr. Speaker, with the witching hour approaching, may I say I support the bill and I will gladly support the amendment offered by the member for Perth.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members who wish to speak to the bill?

Mr. Moffatt: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: All right. It being 6 o'clock, perhaps you might move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Moffatt moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 645.)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

25. Mr. Renwick—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Housing advise what total consideration in cash or otherwise was paid by Ontario Housing Corporation to Headway Corporation Limited, a private company incorporated under the laws of the province of Ontario, having its head office at the city of Thunder Bay in the district of Thunder Bay upon the conveyance by that corporation to Ontario Housing Corporation by deed dated November 20, 1972, registered as number 231048 in the registry office for the registry division of Frontenac (No. 13) as of 4:07 p.m. on November 30, 1972, of the land and premises in the city of Kingston in the county of Frontenac, being all of Blocks D, DD, H and HH, L, and M, on a plan registered in that registry office as plan 1592? Tabled April 6, 1977.

Interim answer by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes):

The answer to the above-noted question, (Question No. 25, Order Paper No. 7) will be time-consuming to prepare. My staff is at present working on the response, and upon completion, I will forward the answer to you.

26. Mr. Moffatt—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Revenue indicate what are the amounts of sales taxes or other taxes collected at the provincial level from the sale of (1) gasoline, (2) diesel fuel, (3) heating oil, for each of the years 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976? Tabled April 6, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener):

The revenue collected for the calendar years 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976 from the sale of gasoline and diesel fuel was:

	1973	1974	1975	1976
	$	$	$	$
Gasoline	458,791,023	489,173,928	502,818,712	505,716,164
Diesel fuel	68,824,766	77,323,008	74,137,507	77,325,948

These figures are for the calendar years as implicitly required by the question and do not coincide with published figures which are for government fiscal years.

Heating oil, that is middle distillate fuels used for the heating of industrial and commercial buildings and private dwellings, is not subject to provincial taxes.

27. Mr. Moffatt—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Ministry of Colleges and Universities indicate why: 1. Colleges and universities cannot have the same date of admission application; 2. If the dates of application are not coincidental, why are funds collected by one institution not refunded when the applicant is accepted by another college or university? Tabled April 6, 1977.

Answer by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Parrott):

Application Dates

Applications for early admission to universities from secondary school students are usually made in November and December, although most universities accept applications up to immediately prior to June 17, which is the date when offers of early admission are made. Universities having vacancies after this date accept applications well beyond it, sometimes into the summer. There is, therefore, no single deadline date for the university system as a whole, although the bulk of applications from secondary school students comes in November, December and January at roughly the same time as CAAT applications. A fee of $7 is charged to cover the cost of processing any number of applications through the Ontario Universities' Application Centre.

Similarly, there is no specific deadline for college applications. Ontario students may apply (without charge) to colleges from January 1 until immediately prior to March 15, which is the date when offers of admission are made.

Acceptance Dates

Offers of admission to university are not made before June 17. Admission is based mainly on the secondary school record; the mid-year grade 13 marks of students are key to the selection. The marks are forwarded to the universities in April and the universities then use six weeks to make the selection. According to the secondary school Headmasters' Council, April is the earliest opportunity by which schools can give the universities a reliable set of marks that are fully representative of the students' academic performance in grade 13. Some universities require a non-refundable deposit on tuition fees from applicants accepting offers of admission.

Offers of admission to colleges of applied arts and technology are made on March 15. The colleges use various selection criteria, such as interviews and personal tests, which require considerable lead time.

The Council of Regents and the Committee of College Presidents have given considerable attention to acceptance dates and have concluded that the March 15 date best serves the needs of the college system. All colleges require a non-refundable deposit on tuition fees from applicants accepting offers of admission.

It may be noted that the majority of secondary school counsellors wish to maintain the current practice of different acceptance dates for colleges and universities.

Refunds

The $7 application fee for universities is for the application service only and is therefore non-refundable. Application service costs in the colleges are borne by the institutions and are nil to applicants.

The non-refundable tuition deposits required by some universities and all colleges represent a commitment from prospective students. On the basis of this commitment such functions as planning, staffing and timetabling proceed in order to have programs operational for the students. This preparation—including application service costs in the colleges—represents a considerable investment which has been made on behalf of the student. If the student subsequently decides not to attend the institution, the deposit is retained and applied to costs incurred.

This does mean that, if a candidate applies to several colleges and universities, the non-refundable commitment is $7. If, however, the candidate accepts offers of admission at more than one institution, the deposits will be forfeited at all but one school.

The matter has been discussed by the college and university communities before and it appears that such instances are rare and do not warrant pressuring the two systems to a common set of dates. I would, however, be happy to discuss specific cases of hardship with the colleges and universities concerned.

28. Mr. Mackenzie—Inquiry of the ministry:

Will the Minister of Labour table the number of active files on the desk of each claims review officer at the Workmen's Compensation Board and the number of overtime hours that each claims review officer has worked over the last six months to March 31, 1977? Tabled April 7, 1977.

Interim answer by the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson):

This data is being assembled by the Workmen's Compensation Board and will be forwarded as soon as possible.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 19, 1977

Speaker's ruling re motion to adjourn 623

Point of privilege re Quebec issue, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Davis 623

Point of order re statement on children's authority, Mr. Lewis 625

Fire safety in correctional institutions, statement by Mr. Meen 626

Conditions at Don Jail, statement by Mr. Meen 627

Hospital and nursing home beds, statement by Mr. Timbrell 628

Road construction programme, statement by Mr. Snow 630

Hospital closings, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Dukszta, Mr. Sargent, Mr. McKessock 630

Point of order re hospital in Huron-Middlesex, Mr. Riddell 633

Reed Paper, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Reid 633

Conditions at Don Jail, questions of Mr. Meen and Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. S. Smith 635

Trade missions, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Sargent 636

Raybestos-Manhattan, questions of B. Stephenson: Ms. Sandeman 637

Energy development, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Reed, Mr. di Santo 637

Highway 61, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Angus, Mr. Foulds 639

Essex County French school, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Ruston, Mr. Burr 640

Immunization programmes, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Philip 640

Industrial waste disposal, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Gaunt 641

Training school teachers, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. Davidson, Ms. Sandeman 641

OHTB bus licence, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Cunningham, Mr. S. Smith 642

Alexander Jacques, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall 643

Injured persons' benefits, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Haggerty 643

Custom Aggregates, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Mackenzie 643

Cost of hospital stay, question of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Spence 643

Prices at highway service centres, questions of Mr. Snow: Ms. Bryden 643

Point of order re television facilities, Mr. Nixon 644

Point of information re ministerial statements, Mr. Sargent 644

Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mrs. Campbell 645

Toxic and Hazardous Substances Act, Mr. Lewis, first reading 645

Discriminatory Business Practices Prohibition Act, Mr. Grossman, first reading 645

Tabling answers and interim answers to questions Nos. 26, 27, 25, 28, Mr. Handleman 645

Estimates scheduling, Mr. Handleman 645

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, on second reading 646

Recess 672

Appendix, answers to written questions 673

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverdale NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
Meen, Hon. A. K.; Minister of Correctional Services (York East PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Nixon. R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)

Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Government Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)



No. 17

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 19, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 3

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Breithaupt: Stop while you're ahead.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Dispense.

BUDGET STATEMENT

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, before beginning my budget presentation tonight I would like, first of all, to acknowledge the presence in the House of my deputy minister, Mr. A. R. Dick; the Deputy Minister of Revenue, Dr. Terry Russell; and the Secretary of Management Board, Mr. William Anderson. These gentlemen, along with their excellent staffs, deserve full credit for their efforts in preparing the budget, writing it and making it happen. On behalf of my colleagues, the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener) and the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Auld), I'd like to express our collective and heartfelt thanks.

Mr. Breithaupt: Don't blame them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm also delighted that in your gallery tonight, sir, are three very distinguished gentlemen who are former Treasurers of this province—Mr. James Allan, Mr. Charles MacNaughton and Mr. John White.

Mr. Reid: They were BD—before deficits.

Mr. Breithaupt: They didn't have any deficits, as I recall.

Mr. Foulds: Is that a trinity or a triangle?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth budget that I've had the pleasure to present to this House as Treasurer.

Mr. Sargent: All deficits.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman on my right, despite any protestations that my own budget maker may have, and she is also in the gallery tonight, I might say I have every expectation of delivering at least five more in the service of this government.

Mr. S. Smith: A budget a day for the next week?

Mr. Breithaupt: Hope springs eternal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Applaud that.

Mr. Sweeney: The province couldn't afford it.

Mr. Laughren: There's something that you learners should learn, Jim.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On with the business.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the 1977 budget, which I am presenting tonight, will reduce Ontario's cash requirements by $311 million. This large reduction will be achieved by constraining the growth in our spending to nine per cent or $1.1 billion, while revenues will increase by 12.9 per cent or $1.4 billion. This responsible fiscal plan builds upon the gains of last year, uses our finances to maximum benefit and frees up resources for the private sector to ensure the continued prosperity of the Ontario economy.

The government has instituted tough measures over the past two years to reduce the growth of public spending in Ontario. These measures have been successful. I am pleased to repeat that our 1976-77 spending will actually come in $11 million below the original estimates, the first time since 1947 that this has been achieved. This demonstrates that government can cut costs, can set priorities, and can live within its means.

Mr. Roy: And can listen to advice.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My colleagues and I believe we must hold firm to this course of restraint spending, not just for 1977 but for the longer run as well. This budget extends the government's fiscal planning horizon beyond the traditional single year. It projects the revenue yield we can expect over the next three years without resorting to tax increases, and it sets out the spending limits we can afford if the budgetary deficit is to be

progressively reduced and ultimately eliminated. Our objective is to have the capacity to balance the Ontario budget by 1980-81. This is not an inflexible commitment—

Mr. Singer: No.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —indeed, economic conditions or social needs may make it inappropriate or even impossible to achieve this target by 1980-81. Still, we must make every effort to move steadfastly towards a balanced budget. That will require determined self-discipline—

Mr. Sargent: What do you mean, a balanced budget?

Hon. McKeough: —and day-to-day resistance against the temptation to spend and to borrow.

Mr. Sargent: Never in your life.

An hon. member: He's never balanced a budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Canada needs at this time a long-term solution to the very basic problems that have become impediments to our economic future. To focus exclusively on short-term remedies for fundamental ailments will lead us right back to the position we are in now—

Mr. Martel: How did you get there, then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —a condition of excess tax and debt burdens for Canada and Canadians—

Mr. Martel: What brought us to that position?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —compounded by a further weakening of our ability to match foreign competition.

Mr. Sargent: You put us there.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Higher tariff barriers and industrial subsidies are not the answer, nor are larger government expenditures. One has to be impressed with the wisdom of one respected politician who said recently, and I quote:—

Mr. Lewis: Suddenly respected.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —"We used to think that you could spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boosting government spending. I tell you, in all candour, that that option no longer exists, and that in so far as it ever did exist, it worked only by injecting bigger doses of inflation into the economy followed by higher levels of unemployment as the next step. That is the history of the last 20 years."

That statement was made by someone who is most familiar with the problems of public sector growth, the Rt. Hon. James Callaghan, Prime Minister of Britain's socialist government.

Mr. Martel: You just about choked on that word.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't ask, "Where is Britain?"

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Members will be aware that this government has given its maximum attention to tackling the longer-term challenges.

Mr. Sargent: It's a financial nightmare.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Somebody must have been buying.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: How did he make an evening session?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We remain convinced that the highest priority has to be allocated to a strategy for the 1980s and that this strategy should embrace in a comprehensive way the key aspects of our economic and social life. This is not the time to slide off into makeshift remedies because they will come back to haunt us and our children for many years.

What is needed is a determined effort to tackle the larger structural problems of achieving balanced growth with full employment and price stability. The basic issue before us is, after controls, what? If we are to successfully avoid the errors and difficulties of the past, we shall need to address four facts of fundamental importance to our prosperity.

First, governments must discipline themselves and avoid draining from the economy an unreasonably large portion of national and provincial resources. Second, we must improve the climate for investment in Canada. Third, we must persuade or influence industry in Ontario and Canada to concentrate its resources in those activities where we are able to compete in international markets.

Mr. Sargent: What are you doing about it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Fourth, in the labour market, we must de-emphasize the adversary environment of labour-management relations.

It is no accident that Canada's image as a place to do business has suffered somewhat in other industrial countries. We have badly tilted our economic and fiscal policies towards social overmanagement and let go the responsibility of encouraging the economic growth that feeds us.

In the past 10 years, we have seen programme after programme to redistribute income, which is perfectly valid and necessary, but we have seen not nearly enough effort at the national level to keep the economy alive and well to generate the income for such redistribution programmes. In my judgement, it has been a process of constant leeching on private sector initiatives that has brought us to a condition of virtual non-competitiveness in so many areas of our economy. The answer must lie in self-discipline across the whole public sector.

Mr. Lewis: That's sort of defiling the private sector.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the matter of achieving restraint, Ontario's record stands as an example for all governments in Canada. We have every intention of maintaining that posture for the future.

Mr. Foulds: Posture is right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is the only way we can pump resources into the private sector and permit free enterprise to move forward and generate the jobs and incomes we expect and need.

Mr. Sargent: There's more than $1 billion deficit. You owe $11 billion.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Go fly your airplane.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This government has made investment and free enterprise central concerns in all of its activities. Without profits, there is no investment; without investment, there are no new jobs, no productive and non-inflationary jobs. It's easy to create inflationary employment but quite another matter to create the conditions for productive jobs that increase the wealth of the nation and its people.

One of Canada's major priorities in marshalling its investment capacities must be that of increasing the level of equity funding in our industries. While I recognize and support the role of internal corporate financing of our large-scale industrial activities, I would like to see government, industry and the financial community take positive steps to substantially increase the role of small investors in our economy. It isn't enough to expect the public to be sensitive to the needs of the business climate in an abstract way. The average citizen needs and deserves to have a much greater opportunity to participate in the rewards of investment and economic growth. Only when more citizens have a direct stake through their own private investments can we hope to develop broadly based public understanding—

Mr. Reed: It took you a long time to figure that out.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —of the importance of investment and growth in a free economy.

Mr. Sargent: Sure you do.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In this regard, I am encouraged by the increase in the dividend tax credit announced in the recent federal budget.

Those who believe, as a matter of blind faith, that all business is bad, never, of course, see any connection between private sector investment and job creation.

Mr. Deans: Who believes that?

Hon. W. Newman: You sure don't.

Mr. Shore: The member for Wentworth should have been here this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the realities of several years of irresponsible and irrational criticism of everything businessmen do are coming home to us. Unfortunately, as is all too often the case, it is ordinary working people who suffer—those whose jobs rest on investment and healthy industries, not those whose pious rancour has driven investment from the marketplace.

[8:15]

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Other members will make their contributions later.

Mr. Deans: Thirty-four years in office.

Mr. Renwick: Thirty-four years and you are just telling us now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To assist the process of understanding profits and their essential contribution to the growth process, the government has established a committee to examine inflation accounting.

Mr. Lewis: That's wonderful.

Mr. MacDonald: We will write a book.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The recent federal budget acknowledges the importance of this area of concern by introducing some changes in the method of taxing inventories. I welcome this move as a positive contribution, but I think we have to go further and examine in considerable detail the adverse effects of inflation on business investment capabilities and job creation. Therefore, I am asking the inflation accounting committee to look at the recent federal tax changes and to assess their impact on investment in Ontario.

One of the largest single concerns in Canada's economic future is the matter of the government's role in financing the retirement incomes of the rapidly growing number of pensioners. Ontario has established programmes for supplementing the incomes of the elderly, in response to the difficulties many pensioners were experiencing with price inflation. However, the emergence in the public sector in recent times of indexed pensions at high levels of benefit, raises questions concerning the capacity of our economy to withstand the massive financial burdens implicit in these public pensions.

Accordingly, in the Speech from the Throne, the government has made known its intention to establish a royal commission to inquire into this matter. Since pension plans are a major source of investment savings for our economy, it is essential that we have a financially-sound pensions framework.

There are many industries in which we enjoy the benefits of world scale and a world level of productive efficiency. However, I am concerned that in a growing number of instances, we are being forced out of world markets and are losing our grip on domestic markets. Despite the fact that Canada is an industrial nation, we import far more manufactured products than we export. We have become a capital intensive economy, and I think we may be squandering our precious capital resources by fostering inefficient industries. Ontario's policy remains one of resisting subsidization and featherbedding.

Mr. Lewis: Featherbedding—what do you call the new ministry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Make sure that's in Hansard. You will eat those words, Stephen Lewis. I am going to enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is not a problem in Brampton.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Treasurer has the floor.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We want healthy, efficient and productive industries. I am convinced we could have more of them if we could achieve a change in our attitudes towards productivity and profits.

On the matter of the current negotiations in Geneva on international trade and tariff policies, I have to repeat Ontario's concern that the federal government is proceeding on the basis of no known strategy. It is clear that Canadian industries and Ontario manufacturers cannot be protected forever by high tariffs. Yet the day of tariff cuts gets closer and closer, with no sign from Ottawa that Canada will be ready with adjustment programmes which will enable our industries to roll with the punches.

I am not in favour of high tariffs. I think we can do better for our consumers, but we need a national policy with some vision of the economic future to help us see where we should be going. One of the key aspects of a national industrial policy must be to focus our efforts on those industries where Canadians have special skills and talents. As a beginning, I would like to see national policies which make full use of our unique talents in the following areas:

Automobiles: Over 120,000 Canadians earn their incomes in this highly productive industry, so Canada's role and share of the auto trade pact has to be a matter of great concern to us.

Steel: We have developed an efficient industry which deals effectively in world markets as well as being important as a source of growth in the domestic economy. We need to develop more consciously those industries and skills that can build on this industrial base.

Industrial Rationalization: We cannot afford, in many instances, with our relatively small market base, to have many firms competing in one sector. For this reason, my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), fully supported the recent industrial consolidation of our electrical appliance industry which was achieved through the merger of the major appliance divisions of General Steel Wares and Canadian General Electric to form the Canadian Appliance Manufacturing Company. We need to encourage more of that kind of rationalization. In doing so, we can rely on imports to provide effective price competition to the benefit of consumers and we can take full advantage of the economies of scale which industrial rationalization brings.

Energy and Resources Development: Canadian engineering talents and specialization

in the energy and resource industries have made us world famous. We can and should profit more from these attributes and attempt to restore the confidence of investors in these industries. That confidence has been badly shaken in recent years by conflicts over resource taxation, environmental matters and deterrents to foreign investment.

Transportation Policy: There can be no doubt that Canadian transportation costs are critical to the success of the economy. They are too high and the industry is characterized by a lack of effective competition. Government policies have to resolve this issue and the equally important issue of improved investment in the transportation facilities.

Agriculture: This is still one of Canada's richest assets, but we badly lack a national policy of income and price stabilization which is fair to both consumers and farmers, and, better still, builds up the base for increased exports.

Small Business: In the Speech from the Throne, the Ontario government announced a wide range of initiatives to reinforce and guarantee an expanded role for small business in the economy. This is a vital aspect of maintaining a creative and efficient industrial economy. These actions will complement moves to bolster the efficiency of medium and large businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I could name many other examples. It is worth noting that Canada has also achieved a world-wide reputation in other fields where scale and size are important, notably banking and finance, and construction and engineering. I don't believe we lack the skills or the commercial talents. Rather we seem too often to lack the will and the policy to fully utilize these talents and ambitions.

This budget continues to meet the challenges in the key areas of government restraint, investment and efficiency.

Mr. Sargent: Like what? Like what?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: A fourth aspect of our economic life which has to receive more attention in future years is that of moderating the atmosphere of confrontation in labour relations. The government's intentions were made explicit at the Partnership-for-Prosperity Conference—

Mr. Bullbrook: That's about time.

Mr. Sargent: What a bunch of nonsense.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —which was convened and chaired by the Premier, drawing together some 150 leaders and commentators from all aspects of Ontario life to discuss the problems of a post-controls economy. At that conference we released a study paper entitled Background to Decontrols which outlined the problems and policy options.

In the Speech from the Throne, the government put forward its views on the phasing out of controls and on the kind of consultative actions that would be necessary for a successful transition to a post-controls phase. We pointed out the need for a clear strategy to hold down inflation in the post-controls era, and the steps we would be taking as our contribution to this process. Budget paper D, which accompanies this statement, deals in some detail with the issues and options of decontrol.

Mr. Speaker, the responses to these four critical issues of national concern will be assembled and studied in a variety of ways. As part of that effort, Ontario is establishing follow-up working groups to the Partnership-for-Prosperity Conference to advise the government on practical approaches to monitoring the performance of prices, profits, wages and salaries in the post-control period.

Following the practice of recent years, I have engaged in extensive pre-budget discussions with representatives of many sectors of the economy. The advice I have received reflects a considerable range of opinion about economic prospects for 1977 and what constitutes appropriate fiscal policy. Many believe the economy should be stimulated, and just as many insist that inflation is still our number one problem. A few have even suggested that Ontario should jump in and do all those things which, in their opinion, the federal budget left undone. I have found these pre-budget consultations very informative, and would like to express my appreciation for this useful input.

For 1976 as a whole, despite some difficult obstacles, employment and real incomes continued to expand. I think there is every reason to be optimistic about the outlook for 1977. The United States economy, our own economy and those of the European Common Market, are all broadly balanced in the direction of expansion. The recent federal budget builds in considerable fiscal stimulation which, as I shall document later, will generate large increases in personal disposable incomes during the year.

The Ontario economy at this time is displaying signs of solid strength in several sectors—

Mr. Sargent: Sure it is.

Mr. Martel: What about the mines?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —which will produce positive results in terms of rising incomes and jobs as the year unfolds. For example, there is growing evidence that the large inventory of unsold housing is beginning to move well, and this is having an encouraging effect on the industry. Automobile production is running 10 per cent ahead of last year and sales are up more than double that rate.

Mr. Sargent: A billion and a half in debt—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Investment is beginning to turn around, assuming we maintain a stable and hospitable business environment. Government spending on capital projects in Ontario, including those of Ontario Hydro, will be higher. There are also significant investments in steel and petrochemical projects which, as they come into production, will establish world scale in those industries. These are most encouraging prospects which will be materially assisted by the drop in the external value of the Canadian dollar over the past four months. That will assist our exports and help tourism in Canada.

An hon. member: Tell us about Hydro.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I expect lower interest rates to help in the recovery. I have pointed out that each percentage point drop in interest rates saves Canadian consumers, over time, $1 billion a year. Thus, higher interest rates in our economy have to be a continuing concern to all of us. The answer, however, is not to drop interest rates in some arbitrary way. If inflation is not beaten, we cannot have lower interest rates without precipitating a flight of capital from Canada. Therefore, inflation must be a continuing and major concern.

In summary then, sir, my expectation for fiscal 1977 is that the annual rate of growth in the Ontario economy will move from four per cent a year in the first half to a rate of six per cent a year by the last half of the year. If prices, profits, wages and salaries get out of line with real productivity gains, however, the ability of the economy to expand will be drastically impaired. The rate of recovery will depend very directly on the restraint all participants in the economic process are prepared to contribute. Excessive demand from any part of the economy will take jobs away from our citizens. That is the simple and absolutely unavoidable fact of our economic life. There is no easy way out, and there can be no exceptions to the effort required of all of us.

The federal budget of March 31 provides needed stimulation to the economy. It reduces corporate and personal income taxes by $1 billion in 1977-78. In addition to these tax cuts, take-home pay of Canadians will rise by about $1 billion in 1977-78 as a result of indexation of the personal income tax. Some $900 million of these federal tax reductions will flow to Ontario businesses and individuals during the 1977-78 fiscal year. Ontario will contribute $130 million on top of this federal stimulus as its own share of the cost of indexing. In total, therefore, there is already built into the Ontario economy a fiscal stimulus in excess of $1 billion.

I would also point out to members that Ontario residents are now receiving their income tax refunds, including Ontario tax credits, for the 1976 taxation year. I estimate these payments will further boost purchasing power by well over $500 million immediately.

Mr. Sargent: Will they get that before election day?

Mr. Cassidy: Just like last year and the year before.

[8:30]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think the state of Ottawa's finances, which was revealed in the federal budget, underscores the wisdom of Ontario's decision, taken two years ago, to constrain spending and reduce the province's deficit. As a result of past excesses in spending, Ottawa's projected budgetary deficit for 1977-78 is a whopping $7.2 billion.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is only three times what yours is.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is an increase of almost $600 million over the previous year. By contrast, we have succeeded—with great determination I might add—in reducing our deficit substantially.

Before I turn to the details of my budget for 1977, I should briefly like to draw the attention of members to budget paper E, which outlines some essential statistics on federal fiscal redistribution in Canada.

Mr. Sargent: What about the government pension fund?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think members will find it an interesting first attempt on our part to distribute the revenue and expenditure of the government of Canada among the various provinces.

I am also tabling an analysis of interprovincial trade flows and the cost of tariffs to Canadian consumers. I should caution members that these are preliminary figures. Canada is seriously lacking in data of this kind, which has hampered reasoned debate on the costs and benefits of Confederation. I, for one, would like to see the federal government put the figures on the table so that all Canadians can see for themselves what every province pays and what it receives in return. While I do not profess, sir, to understand the technical aspects of these figures, I am convinced that they show Confederation to be a powerful and protective economic shield for all Canadians.

I would now like to turn to the government's expenditure plan for the coming year. The planned expenditure growth rate of nine per cent for 1977-78 marks the third consecutive year that a reduction in expenditure growth has been achieved. I would like to draw the members' attention to the fact that Ontario's expenditure growth rate for 1977-78 is one of the lowest among the provinces, and is below that of the federal government for the sixth consecutive year.

I am firmly convinced that this progressive reduction in expenditure growth rates is helping to restore a more appropriate balance of public and private sector activities. During this period of expenditure restraint the government has substantially reordered its priorities to meet pressing needs. For the information of members, I have included a table showing expenditure growth rates by policy field, which illustrates these changing priorities.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on November 23, 1976, I outlined the broad dimension of the government's 1977 spending plan. One of our key objectives was to minimize operating costs and overhead expenses so that more resources could be mobilized for job-creating investment projects. The 1977 spending plan meets this objective. It provides increased funding for the new Northern Affairs ministry, for water and sewage investment, for the OECA capital programme in the north; and it also includes increases for GWA, FDA and the blind and disabled benefits under GAINS.

An hon. member: It's about time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: An important element in the province's cost control programme is the elimination of unnecessary staffing positions. In 1977-78 the civil service complement will not increase. This means we will hold the reduction achieved over the past two years. We will meet additional manpower requirements in some programmes by redistributing our existing human resources. A new system of manpower control will be implemented this year which focuses on overall dollars. Full details will be provided by my colleague, the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Auld).

Mr. Foulds: That's called increasing unemployment.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government's financial assistance to local government for 1977 was announced last September 10. This was the earliest time ever, and fully three months earlier than the previous year. To accomplish this required a great deal of effort and co-operation from all ministries involved. I have received many local expressions of appreciation and assurances that this action helped greatly in local budgeting.

During the present year the government expects to transfer some $3.4 billion to local government, or more than triple the amount transferred during the 1969-1970 fiscal year. Counting the advance payments we mailed out in early April our assistance for 1977-1978 is up by 12.5 per cent over last year.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind our local governments that this 12.5 per cent increase in assistance is no way an indication of the end of the need to restrain spending. As I have said on many occasions, it is critical that we develop a leaner, more efficient public sector. There remains ample scope for further shake-out at the local government level.

The increases in property taxes in 1976 have eroded some of the benefits of our provincial actions to stabilize tax burdens. An accompanying table shows that property taxpayers are still relatively better off than in 1970 or 1972, but important ground was lost during 1976 when the average property tax rose to 2.5 per cent of household income.

Mr. Foulds: You can't have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The latter was due exclusively to the increase in education taxes.

As in previous years I am tabling a separate document today on the government's financial assistance to local government. As well, I would like to remind members that two important studies on local government matters, Blair and Mayo, have already been released and four others—Robarts, Archer, Comay and Stevenson—will be forthcoming in the next few months. These will be of critical impor-

tance in proceeding with orderly reforms of local government structure and finance.

Mr. Sargent: Just like the Blair report, eh?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The one written by you —the blur report.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: That's right John, get it going.

Mr. Sargent: You're a bunch of chickens over there, that's all you are.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is only in the eye of the beholder.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Within our limited resources for 1977 the government has placed its highest priority on creating jobs.

Mr. Lewis: Oh no, you haven't.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The job-creating initiatives must be selective and directed where they will have the biggest impact on unemployment. Before detailing these measures I would like to draw the attention of the members to budget paper A, entitled The Changing Character of Unemployment in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: A disgraceful budget.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: That is an opinion only of yours.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This paper continues the in-depth analysis of the Ontario labour market begun in budget paper D of my 1976 budget.

Mr. Martel: Few solutions though.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This 1977 paper indicates that for a variety of reasons the level of unemployment consistent with the provincial economy reaching its full employment performance has risen significantly since 1971.

Mr. Lewis: Consistent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Unemployment in Ontario has not been below four per cent since 1969.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Even in 1973 and 1974, during a period of high growth and rapid inflation, unemployment remained above the then accepted full employment norm. Budget paper A suggests that the full employment target for Ontario appropriate to the seventies is 5.3 per cent—

Some hon. members: Shame.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —up from three per cent some years ago.

Mr. Lewis: Do you know another jurisdiction in the western world that would permit that as a social objective—as an objective of government?

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. Treasurer has the floor at this moment. Order.

Mr. Renwick: You don't even understand.

Mr. Hodgson: Come down off that—

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you pack it up right now?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for York South does not have the floor.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of this change may be debated, but similar sentiments have been expressed by the governor of the Bank of Canada in his recent annual report and by the federal Minister of Finance in his recent budget. And it is interesting to note that—

Mr. Renwick: You never understood it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —the council of economic advisers and President Carter have accepted 4.9 per cent.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is an ad lib.

An hon. member: Come into the real world.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer has the floor. Thank you.

An hon. member: Do you feel better now, Darcy?

Mr. Renwick: Don't bastardize—

Mr. Cassidy: A disgrace to Ontario.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the major slowdown in non-residential construction—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. member for York South.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the major slow down in non-residential construction in Ontario during this past year has led to disproportionately higher unemployment among construction workers.

Mr. di Santo: Finally.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Unemployment in the construction industry is currently running in excess of 15 per cent.

Mr. Swart: I guess so.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To stimulate jobs and reinforce the vitality of this industry, we will accelerate provincial capital spending by $75 million in 1977-1978. This will generate almost 3,400 additional jobs and will provide a powerful stimulus to the construction industry.

The job creation package for the construction trades includes the acceleration of road and transit projects, sewage and water treatment plants; plus new funding for repairs and insulation of government and university buildings, health capital projects and agricultural infrastructure. Details of these projects and their job-creating potential will be made available by the ministries concerned. My colleague, the Minister of Housing, (Mr. Rhodes), has already announced plans to stimulate the rental housing industry. I would also like to inform members that I authorized Ontario Hydro to accelerate its capital construction programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which members opposite will oppose.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government has limited Hydro's capital borrowing to $1.5 billion annually—

Mr. MacDonald: You put it back last year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —during 1976, 1977 and 1978 because of our concern about the availability of capital funds. The province's success in reducing its own financing requirements, however, provides room to prudently expand Hydro's borrowing programme to $1.7 billion for 1978.

Mr. Cassidy: That's pretty weak.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This will allow Hydro to do more construction work this year and next year, thereby improving the employment prospects in that very important industry.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that no part of this authorized increase in borrowing is to be used by Hydro for operating purposes.

On the employment front, the most pressing priority is to do something quickly and effectively for our young people.

Mr. Cassidy: You are not doing it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: A large part of the high unemployment reported in the first three months of this year—

Mr. Kerrio: You are pointing in the right direction, Frank.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —falls within the 15 to 24 age group. I am concerned that these young people have been unfairly saddled with the economic problems that governments in Canada have not been able to resolve.

Mr. Bain: Your government.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If we have unemployment today, it is because we have an industrial cost structure that results in our industries not being able to compete abroad as they did in the past; and it is precisely because public spending has put Canadian taxes at a level unprecedented in North America that our industries are struggling to compete with productive and efficient industries around the world.

Mr. S. Smith: Sounds familiar.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For our young people we need two things: First, immediate help; second, the stimulus of a growing economy so that new investment can provide the ongoing economic growth and jobs they need to build their own lives, to raise their families and enjoy the same standard of living as we do.

Mr. Cassidy: What is this them and us stuff?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To provide further employment opportunities for youth, the Ontario government will implement a five point programme in 1977. The government will expand the regular summer replacement programme by 700 positions to a total of 10,000 jobs; expand the Experience programme by 2,350 jobs to a total of 11,492; increase the Ontario Career Action programme by 1,000 to 2,300 jobs; introduce a new programme to train 250 young people to assist the elderly and the handicapped to live more comfortably in their homes.

Mr. Foulds: Two hundred and fifty?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Full details of this programme will be announced by the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Breithaupt: There is a greater demand in any one riding.

Mr. Lewis: Two hundred and fifty jobs?

Mr. Sargent: You are a big spender, boy.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Finally, Mr. Speaker, we will introduce a new Ontario youth employment programme to provide employers of young people with a grant of $1 an hour towards the wages of summer employees.

Mr. Lewis: Summer employees.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This programme is expected to provide a 16-week subsidy—

Mr. Lewis: Sixteen weeks.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —for up to 20,000 young people at a cost of $10 million.

Mr. Breithaupt: The election will be over by then.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Details of the two new programmes are outlined in appendix B.

Mr. Lewis: Summer jobs?

[8:45]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Altogether, sir, these youth-oriented programmes should provide jobs and introductory training to the labour market for about 45,000 young people at a cost of $68 million.

Mr. Lewis: Summer jobs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This represents a funding increase of more than $20 million over last year, and better than twice the number of job opportunities for our energetic young people.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Let's go. Pull the plug, kid.

Mr. R. S. Smith: You wouldn't be over there if you had any.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What are you talking about? Go and raise some hair.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I mentioned earlier in my statement, the recent federal budget will have a significant effect on Ontario's revenue. In total, it will cause a reduction of $74 million in this fiscal year, $32 million in personal income tax and $42 million in corporation income tax. The taxpayers of Ontario will benefit directly from the province's decision to parallel these federal tax measures.

Within the economic objectives which the government has set for this year, I have decided upon a package of additional tax reductions amounting to $127 million to stimulate important sectors of the economy. I am proposing to balance this total revenue loss of $201 million by tax increases of $209 million in order to meet my financial target.

As a result of the new federal-provincial fiscal arrangements, the province's income tax rate increases to 44 per cent of federal basic income tax for the 1977 taxation year. The 44 per cent rate will ensure that, given the reduced federal base for calculating Ontario tax, the province will occupy the tax room vacated by the federal government. At the same time, taxpayers will be left virtually unaffected overall. This means that, other than in Alberta, Ontario's personal income tax rate remains the lowest of any province in Canada.

An hon. member: Including Manitoba.

Mr. Reid: Just deficits.

Mr. Cassidy: You never counted OHIP.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How about your raise, Mike?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The history of the new arrangements, the mechanics of this transfer of personal income tax room and the impact on filers are fully documented in budget paper B. I'm also taking this opportunity to table a staff research paper entitled, The Equity and Revenue Effects in Ontario of Personal Income Tax Reform: 1972-1975. This paper, which is No. 13 in the Ontario tax studies series, examines how reform of the personal income tax has worked in Ontario.

Let me now turn to the tax decreases contained in this budget. The new federal-provincial fiscal arrangements have implications for Ontario's personal income tax reduction. To ensure that the majority of Ontario tax filers who pay no federal tax are also free of provincial tax effective for the 1977 taxation year, Ontario income tax will no longer be payable by tax filers with less than $1,680 taxable income. This enrichment from the 1976 level of $1,540 will remove the Ontario tax liability for an additional 35,000 filers and will cost more than $3 million.

In the majority of circumstances it should mean that no Ontario tax will be payable where no federal tax is payable. In some cases, however, the new $50 federal tax

credit for children will remove federal tax liability, while Ontario liability will remain. In the near future I will be reviewing the viability of incorporating this provision in The Ontario Income Tax Act.

I am proposing a number of reductions to the retail sales tax effective midnight this day. Ontario has, over the past few years, increased the level of the retail sales tax exemption for prepared meals so that residents and visitors alike are able to purchase essential meals free of tax. At the same time, the levels chosen have ensured the continued generation of revenue from the more elaborate high-priced dinners.

Mr. Breithaupt: Like La Scala.

Mr. S. Smith: Winston's.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In continuation of this practice, I am proposing a further increase in the level of exemption to $6. This change ensures that all basic meals will be free of tax and should result in considerable benefit to the tourist trade, since the average vacationing family of four will enjoy a saving of about $2 a day.

An hon. member: That's for you, Claude.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now there's real leadership.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Second, I am proposing—

Mr. Reid: Is that all you've got to clap about?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: No, we get another dollar next year. Don't worry about it, Patrick, We get one this year, one next.

Mr. Samis: They can't afford the gas prices.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Second, I am proposing to exempt from sales taxation certain disposable items purchased by operators of hotels, motels and similar establishments for use in guest rooms. This tax has been an irritant to the trade and its removal will allow the industry to compete more effectively for the tourist and convention dollars.

Mr. Haggerty: What about municipalities?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These two tax actions should be of considerable benefit to Ontario's tourist industry, which is the province's second largest employer. Together these moves will cost the province $8 million in 1977-78.

Mr. Drea: What does the NDP think of that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Recognizing the importance of conserving energy, the government last year provided sales tax relief to retail purchasers of thermal insulation materials used for existing residences. To further encourage the conservation of energy, I am proposing an extension of this exemption to include thermal insulation materials for all buildings. In addition, I am proposing that other energy-conserving materials and equipment—for example, heat recovery units and solar cells—be added to the list of retail sales tax exemptions.

The potential saving on the purchase of a solar energy system is approximately $200 to $300. I estimate these new initiatives will provide a total tax saving to consumers of about $6 million in 1977-78. I am also proposing that the exemption from the sales tax on the price of admission to places of amusement be increased from 75 cents to $3.

Mr. Breithaupt: You're charging the people in the galleries?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is estimated that the tax saving to consumers will be around $10 million in 1977-78. This measure will simplify the procedures involved in administering this tax. It will also provide relief to the many thousands of charitable and non-profit organizations in Ontario and assist the promotion of public events such as agricultural fairs and exhibits in museums and art galleries.

Mr. Drea: Come on, Bob, take them off.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Small business continues to be one of the outstanding strengths of the Ontario economy and the province has a substantial number of programmes and incentives—

Mr. Drea: Your wife won't like you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —designed to encourage the development of this sector.

In keeping with this approach, I am proposing the following incentives to small business: increased compensation for tax collection activities; simplified capital tax compliance, and the establishment of venture investment corporations.

For tax collected on or after April 1, 1977, the level of compensation provided to retail vendors and appointed tobacco tax collectors

will be expanded from three per cent to four per cent, and the annual maximum will be increased from $500 to $700. This raises current levels by over one-third and means that the tax collection compensation paid to small businesses in Ontario is the highest provided by any province in Canada or any major US state. The cost of this improvement will be approximately $5 million for 1977-78.

Mr. Martel: That's going to help them a lot.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I recognize that filling out complex capital tax returns is a nuisance to most owners of small businesses. I therefore propose that in lieu of the regular capital tax rates, corporations with taxable paid-up capital in Ontario of up to $50,000 pay a flat rate of $50 and corporations with taxable paid-up capital in Ontario in excess of $50,000 and up to $100,000 pay a flat tax of $100. These corporations will receive a tax saving at a cost to the province of about $3 million. The filing of capital tax returns is thus greatly simplified for about 95,000 small Ontario corporations.

[Applause]

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Where are all those small business enthusiasts over there?

Hon. W. Newman: Where are they?

Mr. Breithaupt: Why did you put it in in the first place?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, members will recall that in the 1976 budget—

Mr. Kerrio: They weren't there in the first place.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —I introduced legislation for first reading only which proposes that special venture investment corporations be established to provide risk capital to small businesses in Ontario. A deferral of corporation income taxes was proposed as an incentive to encourage the deployment of risk capital into these small corporations. The purpose of this legislation was to encourage and facilitate discussion of the concept with the federal government and the private sector. The discussion resulted in a revised version of the VIC legislation which was tabled with my November economic statement.

The recent federal budget introduced one provision respecting the tax treatment of investments in venture investment corporations. This allows Ontario to proceed with VICs. Therefore, I will introduce tonight The Venture Investment Corporations Registration Act with the intention of having the system in place and operating before the end of 1977. The complementary tax amendment to The Corporations Tax Act will be introduced later in the year by my colleague, the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener). Details of this proposal are provided in appendix A to this statement.

It is my hope that the VIC programme will substantially encourage the development of small business in this province. The capital tax relief for small business and the programmes recently announced by other ministries, such as the elimination of the annual corporation filing requirement and the expansion of the Ontario Development Corporation's services, demonstrate this government's firm belief in a strong and growing small business sector in this province.

Mr. Sargent: A big help that will be.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There's more to come.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the past year the provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan have abandoned the succession duty field. As a result, only Manitoba, Quebec and Ontario now levy succession duties and gift taxes. We have reviewed this matter carefully and have concluded that our own statutes should remain in force. They add a valuable degree of equity to the province's tax structure. However, it is the government of Ontario's policy to have these taxes paid by those who can best afford to do so.

Mr. Kerrio: What an actor!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The 1975 budget went a considerable way toward ensuring this goal by exempting from duty all estates valued at less than $250,000. As a further move toward concentrating the burden of death taxes on large estates and to allow for the upward valuation in assets which occurs over time, I am proposing that the basic level below which no duty is payable be increased to $300,000, effective in respect of deaths occurring on or after April 20, 1977.

An hon. member: One more day.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Okay, the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) can go now.

Mr. Cassidy: You can all go, every one of you.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As long as you're the opposition, we will be here forever.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: At the same time, the province of Ontario recognizes its long-

term commitment to phase out succession duty when the capital gains tax matures. At the present time, and indeed in the foreseeable future, the level of capital gains revenue will not be an adequate replacement for revenue lost by vacating the succession duty field. Therefore, the government has decided instead to fully remove any element of double taxation by integrating succession duty and capital gains tax through a credit mechanism. I am proposing that, effective in respect of deaths occurring on or after April 20, 1977, capital gains tax arising as a result of death will be eligible to be treated as a credit against succession duties. It is expected that this credit mechanism will result in ever-increasing reductions in succession duty over time as the value of capital assets increases and The Succession Duty Act is amended periodically to recognize the effects of inflation.

In addition, the current requirements of affidavits from all beneficiaries will be replaced by a simplified return submitted by the executor of the estate. The accessibility of beneficiaries to the assets of the estate will also be made easier.

Mr. Nixon: What will happen to the lawyers?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As well the Ministry of Revenue will be operating regional counter service in respect of succession duties in the near future, which will enable small estates to be processed promptly and have their assets cleared quickly.

Mr. Sargent: You are a gift horse without blinkers.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To complement these changes to The Succession Duty Act and to permit the distribution of assets prior to death, the gift tax is also amended. For 1977 and subsequent years, gifts of up to $10,000 per recipient and $50,000 per donor per year will be exempt from gift tax. This represents a doubling of the allowances which were available for 1976.

Mr. Roy: Hurray!

Mr. Cassidy: That won't benefit your average Ontarian.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Treasurer.

Mr. MacDonald: Let's adjourn to the Albany Club. This should be celebrated.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They'll celebrate it less there than they did in Saskatchewan which abolished succession duties. That's a great Tory province out there.

Mr. Breithaupt: They have no estates.

[9:00]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer will get on with his statement.

Mr. Breithaupt: They have done it in Cuba, too, but not by choice.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am proposing that, effective today, The Land Transfer Tax Act be substantially amended, in terms of its tax treatment of non-resident individuals and corporations to encourage productive foreign investment.

Currently, all land transferred to non-residents attracts the high 20 per cent rate of tax. I am proposing to tax only agricultural and recreational land—restricted land—at this high rate. Specifically, any transfer to a non-resident individual or corporation of land that is "zoned" or "assessed" as commercial, industrial or residential is to be taxable at the normal low rate of land transfer tax.

Mr. Nixon: What took you so long?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The substantial difference between the new legislation and the existing Act is in the treatment of non-resident industry. The latter forced legitimate industrial or commercial enterprises through a deferral process that, with changing economic conditions, has proven to be unnecessary and inappropriate. The new proposal does away with deferrals where the non-resident transferee is purchasing "unrestricted" land. The procedures for deferrals of tax are carried over from the old Act, where the non-resident purchases restricted land for the purpose of commercial, industrial or residential development and resale, or for the purpose of establishing, expanding or relocating an active commercial or industrial enterprise.

The government remains committed to its policy of discouraging non-productive speculative activities. However, I am proposing two necessary changes to The Land Speculation Tax Act. The current provision for a reduction in taxable value with respect to investment properties completely eliminates tax over a 10-year period. This provision has

required a longer than desirable commitment by non-residents who wished to buy investment properties in Ontario. Consequently, a substantial pool of capital, normally available to resident developers, has dried up. I am, therefore, proposing to halve the reduction period from 10 to five years, by doubling the reduction value to 20 per cent per annum.

A second proposal permits farmers to rent out their farm properties without forfeiting the 10 per cent per annum reduction in taxable value permitted to farm property. Whereas the previous provision deemed the rental period as being an interruption in the farming period, the new provision allows for the rental period to equal three years or less in the 10-year period without loss of the reduction. However, the rental period may not exceed two years immediately prior to disposition. This proposal gives farmers time to decide whether or not to sell their farm properties without opening the door to full-fledged speculation by non bona fide farmers.

Mr. Cassidy: Half-fledged speculation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You farmers over there should be in support.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer has the floor. Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In addition to the relaxation of the treatment of farms and investment properties, The Land Speculation Tax Act parallels the changes to The Land Transfer Tax Act. It is my hope that these significant changes to the land transfer and land speculation taxes will further encourage job-creating investment.

Mr. Lewis: Both the taxes were irrelevant.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I should note my satisfaction that the federal Minister of Finance, in his recent budget, has changed the treatment of capital gains taxation to allow the rollover of capital gains when funds realized from the sale of business and farming assets are reinvested in similar assets.

In addition to the tax reductions I have just detailed, I am proposing the following long-term measures, in the interests of federal-provincial tax harmony and to maintain Ontario's competitive position:

Continuation of the manufacturing and processing fast write-off for an indefinite period. This measure will cost the province approximately $80 million in a full year;

Paralleling the three per cent inventory valuation adjustment which was announced in the federal government's March 31, 1977, budget at a cost to this province in fiscal 1977-1978 of $40 million. This is an interim measure at both the federal and provincial levels, pending the recommendations of committees which are now examining the tax aspects of inflation accounting;

Adopting the federal 25 per cent resource allowance for oil and gas companies and replacing our present automatic depletion system with earned depletion for these companies. In addition, I propose to parallel the incentive for frontier oil and gas exploration announced in the latest federal budget. I estimate that the revenue loss to Ontario from these changes will be about $6 million annually.

The recent federal budget also contained major changes to the taxation of insurance companies. The implications and revenue effects of these changes will have to be carefully examined before any decision can be made concerning Ontario's taxation of this sector, bearing in mind the competitive position of Canadian insurance companies in the United States market.

The cost to the province of the above tax reductions is $201 million. To offset this revenue loss and to keep to the deficit target, I am proposing to raise an approximately equivalent amount through tax increases.

I am proposing to raise additional revenue of $58 million from cigarettes, cigars and cut tobacco.

An hon. member: That's pipes.

Mr. Reid: No clapping there.

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, shame, not cigars. You certainly know how to hurt a fellow. What will you smoke in your full-sized car now?

Mr. Bullbrook: Are you going to that cut tobacco again?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The tax on cigarettes will be increased by five cents per package of 20 cigarettes.

Mr. S. Smith: Is that mid-size cigars?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The tax on cigars, which is applicable on the retail price will be doubled.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did the Premier buy any extras today?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't buy one today.

Mr. Bullbrook: You didn't? I'll give you one tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Thus, the tax on a 25 cent cigar will increase from five cents to 10 cents. The tax on cut tobacco will also be doubled from 2.5 cents per half ounce on the old avoirdupois basis—

Mr. Martel: Say that again?

An hon. member: So much for the bilingual policy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Shall I say that again?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Treasurer is getting personal for the first time tonight.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is my concession to my colleague from Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle).

Mr. Martel: Will you say that again, Darcy?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The tax on cut tobacco will also be doubled from 2.5 cents per half ounce on the old avoirdupois basis—

Interjections.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's not even a good plug.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to the equivalent of five cents per half ounce on the new metric basis.

Mr. Bounsall: What about chewing tobacco?

Mr. Breithaupt: That's hardly a cheek full.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Government road-related expenditure is growing faster than revenue derived from road users. Consequently, in order to restore a reasonable balance between expenditure and revenue, I am proposing to increase the registration fees for passenger cars, commercial vehicles, motorcycles and buses.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Effective for the 1978 registration year, the annual registration fees for passenger cars will be increased as follows: four cylinders from $23 to $30; six cylinders from $32 to $45, and eight cylinders from $40 to $60.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Additionally, the fee for passenger cars registered for the first time and equipped with an engine having a displacement in excess of 6,500 cubic centimetres—

Mr. Lewis: This had better not be an election budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —397 cubic inches—will be $80. The annual registration fee for motorcycles will be increased by $5—

Mr. Lewis: Now the Premier might change his car.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —while the fee for snowmobiles will remain unchanged.

The annual registration fees for commercial vehicles, farm trucks and buses will be raised by adding a flat $22 to each weight class and by raising these news levels by nine per cent. In respect of smaller commercial vehicles, this measure will adjust the fee to the same level as the fee now proposed for eight-cylinder passenger cars. A large majority of these small commercial vehicles are equipped with eight-cylinder engines and their weight is also comparable to an eight-cylinder passenger car.

The fee increase will raise $78 million in 1977-78. This new, more progressive fee structure encourages energy conservation.

Mr. Deans: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In identifying the need to raise registration fees, however, it is also recognized that the operation of a passenger car in northern Ontario involves substantial costs over and above those experienced in the southern part of the province.

Mr. Breaugh: Leo wins again.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These costs are the direct consequence of greater distances travelled, the effect of climatic conditions on mileage, and sometimes higher gasoline and oil prices.

Mr. Martel: Sometimes?

Mr. Lewis: It's about time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's hear the good news.

Mr. Reid: That's as objective as you can get.

Mr. Nixon: So much for impartiality.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am, therefore, pleased to propose that, effective for the 1978 registration year, registration fees be reduced

to $10 for all passenger cars and motorcycles registered north of the French River.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Let's hear it.

Mr. Lewis: I applauded.

Mr. Breithaupt: But I don't think it will win you a riding.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Another blow struck for the north by the NDP.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: By this measure, all bona fide residents of the area will receive a saving equivalent to five cents per gallon of gasoline—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Scarborough West is not one of them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —based on an average annual distance travelled of 10,000 miles.

Mr. Lewis: But the oil companies should be paying that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The total saving to northern Ontario residents is approximately $12 million in 1977-78.

Mr. Speaker, to improve taxpayer compliance under The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, I propose that by July 1 of this year all sellers and distributors of diesel fuel, home heating oil, furnace oil and similar products be registered with the Ministry of Revenue. Users of taxable middle distillate fuels will also be registered. I would like to point out that all the other provinces have in place systems to minimize avoidance of fuel taxes. I estimate that Ontario's tighter enforcement will generate $10 million in 1977-78.

For some time, the Ontario government has been advocating the use of refillable soft drink containers and seeking ways to discourage the use of non-refillable throwaway containers. The government has two basic objectives: to reduce the volume of solid waste in Ontario and to conserve energy resources wasted in the production of throwaway convenience containers. In support of these objectives, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) has announced a ban on the sale of non-refillable bottles in Ontario, effective April 1, 1978. Cans for carbonated soft drinks are an equally important contributor to the problem, hence action to limit the use of cans is also necessary.

I am proposing that a tax of five cents per can be imposed on the consumer who chooses to buy soft drinks in cans, effective June 1, 1977. For ease of administration, this tax will be collected at the manufacturers' and importers' level. Inventory will be taken at all levels on that date. The tax will be included in the retail selling price, thus attracting retail sales tax as well.

It is my hope that this environmental tax, which will apply equally to canned carbonated soft drinks manufactured in Ontario or imported into the province, will be combined with a concerted effort on the part of soft drink producers—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where is the applause from you environmentalists over there?

Mr. Drea: Stand up. Come on, stand up.

Mr. Cassidy: It is the only good thing in the budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to substantially reduce the proportion of soft drinks sold in cans. Since consumer buying habits do not change overnight, however, the $25 million which is estimated to be collected in the first year will assist in the funding of major environmental projects. Grants will be available to municipalities and citizen groups for the construction and operation of collection and recycling depots. In addition, there will be increased support for municipal reclamation facilities across the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where are all the environmentalists across the floor?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Finally, I have decided that the most appropriate way to secure the balance of revenue needed is to increase the paid-up capital tax on large corporations. Accordingly, I am proposing that the paid-up capital tax on corporations be increased by 50 per cent for fiscal years ending after April 19, 1977. The new general rate of capital tax will be three-tenths of one per cent. For banks, the new rate will be three-fifths of one per cent. I estimate that this increase will generate an additional $68 million gross revenue in a full year and $55 million in the 1977-78 fiscal year.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's cosmetic at best. That's a drop in their bucket and you know it, an absolute drop in their bucket.

[9:15]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For corporations paying income tax the burden of this increase is not unduly onerous, since the paid-up capital tax is deductible in calculating taxable income. This feature enhances the overall equity of the corporation tax system. The

$209 million in tax increases I have just proposed constitutes a fair and balanced increase for the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: In your view.

Mr. Martel: Especially for the unemployed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This budget achieves a pronounced strengthening in the province's financial health, as reflected in the $311 million improvement in our net cash requirements to a two-year low of $1.077 billion.

Mr. Lewis: Of estimated revenue.

Mr. Cassidy: Your figures are not to be relied on.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Moreover, the financial plan for 1977 reduces our budgetary deficit from $1.279 billion in 1976-77 to $992 million. Non-public borrowing will be more than adequate to meet Ontario's financing needs.

Mr. Cassidy: That's what you said last year.

Mr. Reid: Before supplementary estimates.

Mr. Breithaupt: You will break a billion.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This fiscal plan means that for the second consecutive year Ontario will not need to borrow in the public capital markets on its own account. In looking ahead, achievement of a balanced budget by 1980-81 would mean the virtual elimination of the province's reliance on non-public borrowing as well.

Mr. Roy: You haven't had a surplus yet.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This would greatly enhance our fiscal flexibility. It would permit Ontario's surplus non-public funds to be deployed for major private and public investment projects, such as Ontario Hydro, thereby restoring a more appropriate balance between government and private sector demands on the finite resources of the capital markets. Budget paper C examines Ontario's revenue growth potential and discusses the implications for expenditures of this balanced budget target.

Mr. Bullbrook: You have drained the capital markets for a decade.

Mr. Roy: You have yet to have a surplus.

Mr. Sargent: What do you mean a capital budget target?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do you know what you remind me of over there?

Mr. Sargent: What are you talking about? You don't know what you're talking about. Read it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. Treasurer continue with his statement, please?

Mr. Sargent: The colour of your handkerchief is about the colour of the budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They're nothing more than the parliamentary equivalent of the Gong Show over there; that's what you remind me of.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order—

Mr. Breithaupt: If it was the Gong Show the bell would have rung long ago.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. The hon. Treasurer has the floor.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This budget carries forward the sound management of our economic and fiscal resources. It demonstrates clearly the ability of the government of William Grenville Davis to effectively manage the affairs of this province.

Mr. Breithaupt: I thought they only used the middle name in an obituary.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It meets our most immediate and pressing needs by funding a large number of new jobs in the construction industry and for our young people—

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and it proposes a financing plan that reduces the government's claim on the provincial economy.

Mr. Cassidy: Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As a further expression of our sound management practices, this budget also addresses the longer-term problems—

Mr. Warner: If this is the best you can do, you should resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Treasurer.

An hon. member: Read that again.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will be glad to repeat it. I liked those words, Mr. Speaker.

As a further expression of our sound management practices—

Mr. Martel: Where?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —this budget also addresses the longer-term problems of economic policy by establishing a fiscal strategy for balancing the budget by 1980-81.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He will be here to do it too, I can tell you. I've got news for you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I believe that this responsible strategy will provide the stability and bolster the confidence our economy needs for continued growth and prosperity.

The government of this province has also demonstrated its concern for those in our society who are less fortunate and who deserve to share fully in the benefits of economic growth and our unparalleled abundance.

Mr. Cassidy: Like the 316,000 unemployed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have assisted youth. We have provided housing. We have developed a plan of workmen's compensation, admittedly not perfect, but which is better than any other.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have created, sir, a system of public services unequalled on this continent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Or in Cuba.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: GAINS and a host of other social service programmes have enhanced the security and dignity of our senior citizens. We have, with some success, spread new economic opportunities to all parts of the province.

Mr. Cassidy: New opportunities to be unemployed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And we have provided the hospitals, the schools, the libraries, the recreational facilities, the day nurseries and the cultural amenities—the quality of life that makes Ontario the envy of our American neighbours.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sir, with this impressive record of leadership and with our grasp of the realities of economic life, I look forward with confidence to the challenges of 1977 and succeeding years.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is called the last hurrah.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: This is a terrible budget, Mr. Speaker, but I shall have more words to say about it on Monday.

Mr. Cassidy moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 40, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 41, An Act to amend The Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to.

SUCCESSION DUTY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 42, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Amendment Act.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 43, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

VENTURE INVESTMENT CORPORATIONS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 44, An Act respecting the Registration of Venture Investment Corporations.

Motion agreed to.

TOBACCO TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 45, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 46, An Act to provide Employment Opportunities for Youth in Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener moved first reading of Bill 47, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

LAND TRANSFER TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener moved first reading of Bill 48, An Act to amend The Land Transfer Tax Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

LAND SPECULATION TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener moved first reading of Bill 49, An Act to amend the Land Speculation Tax Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

[9:30]

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener moved first reading of Bill 50, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

GIFT TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener moved first reading of Bill 51, An Act to amend The Gift Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener moved first reading of Bill 52, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

ENVIRONMENTAL TAX ACT

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener moved first reading of Bill 53, An Act to impose a Tax on certain Pollutants of the Environment in Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, as proposed in the Treasurer's budget, this bill imposes on the consumer of canned, carbonated soft drinks in Ontario a tax of five cents on the purchase of each can of carbonated soft drink. The tax is to be collected by those who fill the cans with carbonated soft drinks in Ontario or who import canned carbonated soft drinks into Ontario. As stated in the Treasurer's budget, the revenue from this tax is intended to assist the funding of major environmental projects and the construction and operation, by municipalities or community organizations, of collection depots and recycling or reclamation facilities.

In addition to providing for the imposition and collection of the tax on the consumer of a canned, carbonated soft drink, this bill will also provide the administrative provisions usual in other revenue statutes of the province.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Davis, the House adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 19, 1977

Notice of Motion No. 3, Mr. McKeough 681

Budget statement, Mr. McKeough 681

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cassidy, agreed to 698

Income Tax Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 698

Ontario Unconditional Grants Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 698

Succession Duty Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 698

Ontario Loan Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 698

Venture Investment Corporations Registration Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 698

Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 698

Ontario Youth Employment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 699

Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 699

Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 699

Land Speculation Tax Amendment Act, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 699

Corporations Tax Amendment Act, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 699

Gift Tax Amendment Act, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 699

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Amendment Act, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 699

Environmental Tax Act, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 699

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to 699

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L., Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)



No. 18

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, April 21, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand, Pauline M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1978, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, April 21, 1977.

DEATH OF MAJOR G. R. SOAME, CD.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Just while you are standing, I regret to inform the House of the death on Wednesday of our former Sergeant-at-Arms, Major G. R. Soame, CD.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved, seconded by Mr. Deans, that the House note with profound regret the passing of Major G. R. Soame, CD, Sergeant-at-Arms of the Ontario Legislature from February, 1972, to October, 1976, and that the House do now observe one minute of silence in his memory.

Motion agreed to.

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: Just before we embark upon the procedures for the afternoon, I am sure that all hon. members will wish to welcome a distinguished visitor to our Legislature, the Treasurer and former Premier of New South Wales, Australia, the Hon. J. B. Renshaw. Mr. Renshaw is seated in the Speaker's gallery.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

JUBILEE MEDALLIONS

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House the minting of medallions for students of Ontario commemorating the silver jubilee of Her Majesty's reign has been completed. The medallions, both in English and French, are now being forwarded to schools for presentation to their students on May 20, as suggested by my colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells). I am sure that the members are making arrangements with their local educational officials to participate in the presentation ceremonies.

For the members of this House, the silver jubilee medallions have been encased in Lucite forms and they were placed on your desks this afternoon. Should any member prefer to have the medallion in French, I will be very pleased to make arrangements for them to receive it.

COURT OF APPEAL

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I would like to place today before the assembly the report of the Attorney General's committee on the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

This committee was appointed by myself in the fall of 1975 to examine the exercise of the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Ontario as a means of meeting the appellate needs of the province and, if necessary, to formulate a more effective means of discharging the appellate function.

The committee recommends an increase in size and a radical restructuring of the Ontario Court of Appeal by creating two separate divisions of that court; one division to hear appeals generally and the other division to hear appeals involving legal issues of general public importance. These recommendations would involve major legislative change.

The committee recommends a number of changes in the administrative organization of the work of the Court of Appeal and makes a number of recommendations on practice and procedures which could be effected without legislation.

In the course of its study the committee distributed a questionnaire to every member of

the Law Society of Upper Canada and had extensive discussions with all segments of the legal community.

The committee states that the aims of its recommendations are to provide speedy justice for the participants in litigation and to provide sound jurisprudence for Ontario.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to express my gratitude to the members of the committee for the considerable time, effort and thought that they have put into this study. The chairman of the committee was Mr. Justice Arthur Kelly, formerly of the Ontario Court of Appeal, and the members were Mr. Robert Carter, Mr. Brendan O'Brien, Mr. Clay M. Powell and Mr. James M. Tory. They have made a most important contribution to this government's continuing work of improving Ontario's legal system.

The report contains more than 59 recommendations and my ministry is now considering them.

LAND SPECULATION TAX EXEMPTION

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am tabling today a copy of the order in council appointing the Hon. Mr. Justice John David Cromarty to conduct a public inquiry into the exemption granted under the provisions of The Land Speculation Tax Act, to Ronto Development.

The terms of reference for the inquiry read as follows:

"To inquire as to whether any undue or improper influence was brought to bear from any source or whether there was any other impropriety of any kind in respect of the decision by the government to grant an exemption, under the provisions of The Land Speculation Tax Act, 1974, to the partnership carrying on business as Ronto Development Company; and to report thereon and to make such recommendations to the Lieutenant Governor in Council as he may deem fit."

The purpose of this inquiry is to respond to the innuendo that has arisen during the debate and discussion—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear!

Mr. Breithaupt: You were doing well until then.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —that has centred on the aforementioned exemption, both in the public accounts committee and in this Legislature.

Mr. Cunningham: Whitewash!

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Such innuendo has, without question, created doubts in the public mind that must be resolved clearly and unequivocally.

It has been suggested by members of the opposition, I understand, that any such inquiry should also review the ministerial procedures that were followed in this instance as well as the decision.

Mr. Bullbrook: You are wrong. That wasn't the understanding.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: In our opinion, it is not an appropriate matter for a judicial inquiry since it would involve a member of the judiciary in what could clearly be an exercise in the second-guessing of a ministerial decision.

Mr. Nixon: Then why shouldn't a select committee deal with it?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The proper forum for that type of exercise—

Mr. Lewis: Louder!

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —is obviously this Legislature and/or the standing committees which have been created for just such purposes.

Mr. Bullbrook: That isn't what we suggested at all, and you shouldn't be allowed to do it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Should opposition members wish to pursue further the matter of procedures, as well as the ultimate decision of the cabinet to grant the exemption, through a standing committee of this Legislature, there would certainly be no objection from this side of the House.

Mr. S. Smith: Why didn't you do it in the first place?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I give that assurance, even though it must be observed that there has been ample opportunity already, in the public accounts committee, to ask all of the relevant questions which now, for reasons which I quite frankly find difficult to understand—

Mr. Reid: We didn't get any relevant answers.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —some would want to impose on the judicial inquiry.

Mr. Lewis: We don't mind your concerns.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: In conclusion, the government is anxious that the public should have all of the relevant information as well as all of the necessary assurances that relate to the exemption granted to Ronto Development Company, and we are taking this step today as a clear indication that we are willing to pursue all necessary and appropriate paths to ensure that this is the case.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of order.

Mr. Deans: On a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Point of privilege?

Mr. Deans: My point of privilege, sir, is that having been the member who moved in the public accounts committee that the entire matter be referred to a judicial inquiry, I take great exception to the suggestion by the Attorney General that innuendo, on the part of anyone in this party at least, had any bearing on the decision of the government to conduct such a judicial inquiry.

I want to suggest to the Attorney General that this inquiry, with those terms of reference, cannot possibly find any wrongdoing since no one has suggested there was any. I want to suggest further that it would have been appropriate for such a judicial inquiry to have looked at whether or not the minister and the ministry had before it all of the relevant material necessary to come to a reasonable conclusion with regard to the exemption; that was all that was asked for.

I want to say further to you, sir, in conclusion, that it would make sense—and I'm sure it would be supported by others—that the public accounts committee, adequately staffed, should continue its review of the matter that was before it to come to the conclusion on the matters that the ministry has refused to deal with.

Mr. Bullbrook: There was no need for that statement. The Premier wasn't here for his statement, which was in error and provocative —and it didn't have to be.

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: I believe this is more properly a point of order. It's correcting an impression which seems to have been wrong.

Mr. S. Smith: On the same point—

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the hon. member for Hamilton West.

[2:15]

Mr. S. Smith: On the same point that was raised by the hon. member for Wentworth, I want to make it clear that the Liberal Party dissociates itself from this inquiry because, despite our respect for the learned judge, we believe that the judge's hands have been tied to avoid the real issues. What the Liberal Party has requested is that the terms of reference include whether the Minister of Revenue was correctly and adequately informed of all the facts; and if he had been correctly informed of all the facts, would there be in the public Treasury today an additional sum of money, be it $500,000 or $2 million.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is no substitute question.

Mr. Nixon: That's precisely it.

Mr. S. Smith: That is the question precisely. There is no suggestion of innuendo, no suggestion of criminality, no suggestion of wrongdoing—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Read what some of the members have said. Where is the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent)?

Mr. Speaker: Order; order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: —and I would like to inform the House that I shall be releasing a statement to the press in Ontario to make that very clear. These are straw men that the government is setting up—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on.

Mr. S. Smith: —in order to knock down and give themselves a pat on the back when they don't deserve it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are embarrassed beyond need.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Kerrio: Miffed again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The statement has been made—

Mr. Bullbrook: That's the problem. The statement was made, you allowed it.

Mr. Speaker: —and the points of order have been properly taken.

Mr. Bullbrook: It didn't have to be that—

Mr. Kerrio: You could have built houses with the money you allowed them on paper work.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CLASSIFIED DRIVER LICENCE EXEMPTION

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would like to announce today, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario regulation number 906/76 under The Highway Traffic Act pertaining to the classified driver licence requirements is to be amended.

My ministry has been approached by members of the farming community and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food—

Mr. Reid: And the member for Rainy River.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —who expressed concern that the requirements of the classified driver licensing system might impose restrictions on the farmer's freedom of action in assigning helpers or temporary employees to drive farm vehicles, for example during seeding or harvesting time.

Together with those interested groups, we studied every aspect of the problem and considered several options. One option emerged which we think will meet the main concerns of the farmers, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and MTC.

In the regulation, we speak of class D and class G motor vehicles. Class D includes motor vehicles which exceed 18,000 pounds gross vehicle weight provided any towed vehicles are not over 10,000 pounds. Class G refers to the licence required to drive cars, light trucks, et cetera, up to a registered gross vehicle weight of 18,000 pounds.

The amendment in effect deems a class D motor vehicle to be a class G motor vehicle if the vehicle is owned by a farmer and used for his personal transportation or the transportation of his farm products, supplies and equipment to and from his farm.

Under the existing regulation which deals with vehicle registration, the farmer's permit for the vehicle is marked "farm vehicle" by the ministry. And such a "farm vehicle" could now be driven on the highways by the farmer or his helpers holding a class G licence

I feel that this amendment to the regulation will provide a workable solution for the great majority of farmers, while maintaining control over drivers of the more complex class A vehicles such as tractor-trailers.

Mr. Riddell: Glad you listened to my suggestions.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Lewis: May I begin, Mr. Speaker, by putting a question to the Treasurer? In establishing a new unemployment norm of 5.3 per cent, has the Treasurer calculated the additional and continuing costs of social assistance and unemployment insurance benefits to the people of the province of Ontario to pay for the difference of more than 100,000 people who lie between the original three per cent and the present 5.3 per cent; and if indeed he has tabulated those costs, which one would assume he has done, does he not think that those dollars would be better used to create jobs than to pay people for being perpetually unemployed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, those calculations have not been done.

Mr. Deans: They have not been done?

Mr. Speaker: A question?

Mr. Lewis: I don't know how they haven't been done, but they haven't been done.

By way of a further supplementary then, can the Treasurer indicate rather more precisely the definition of people who would be involved in this perpetual unemployment syndrome that he has now adopted as social policy, beyond the generalized references in the budget paper to women, young people and those over the age of 54? Can he categorize it more explicitly for us than that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, no more than I would categorize—and what a cruel term that is—

Mr. Cassidy: You have done a lot of categorizing in this budget.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No more than I categorized—nor did I think the hon. member

categorized—the people who were in the three per cent full employment figure or three per cent unemployment. You don't categorize people that way.

An hon. member: You sound like the leader, Darcy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We're not accepting that that is an acceptable level of unemployment—

An hon. member: You already have.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —but I'm not going to categorize people in some bureaucratic and abstract way.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer has embodied in his budget paper the punishing and morally reprehensible categories of women as exploiters of unemployment insurance—as secondary earners—of youth as having no particular option or hope for continuing employment, and older people over the age of 54. Does the Treasurer not think it is now appropriate to show how particularly vulnerable certain groups will therefore be, such as workmen's compensation recipients seeking light work; single parent families; those presently on social allowance; those whom he classifies as permanently unemployable? Does he not understand that by categorizing people in his budget paper he has created no prospects for all of these vulnerable groups in society?

Mr. Deans: I don't think he understands.

An hon. member: He doesn't care.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the member refuses to recognize that there have been changes in the composition of and the participation in the Ontario, and I assume the Canadian, work force. The fact is that as recently as 1971 participation, for example by adult males, who are males of 15 years and over, was 79.5. That figure has not changed to 1976, when it was 79.6. During that period in time, for a whole variety of reasons, the participation by females in the work force has risen from 40.2 to 48.9.

Mr. Lewis: What's wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nothing is wrong with that.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think it is of some interest to members and to the public to examine how the work force has been made up and how it is changing. I am not, for one minute, accepting that 5.3 is an acceptable figure.

Mr. Lewis: You accepted it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have not accepted 5.3 as an acceptable level.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been asked and the hon. Treasurer is answering; now please, order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted if the hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: You are retreating now.

An hon. member: The budget's only two days old.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —could point out in the budget document, or in my statement since, where I have said that 5.3 per cent was an acceptable level of unemployment. I suppose there is no acceptable level of unemployment. The fact is that in 1976, the level of unemployment for prime age males from 25 to 54 was 3.4 per cent. I knew people in 1976 who were prime age males who were unemployed and it was unacceptable to them and it was unacceptable to me.

Mr. Lewis: And you do nothing about it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm not accepting—

Mr. Lewis: You have no policies, that is why you use this.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm not accepting a level of unemployment at three, at one, at 5.3, or at six. That is not the point of the exercise. Nor is the point of the exercise to go on playing politics with the unemployed people of this province.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Your point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, my point of order, Mr. Speaker, is far from playing politics with the issue, I was attempting to—

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Well let me state the point of order. I was attempting to convey to the Treasurer that his establishment of 5.3 per cent as a full employment norm is an excuse for the absence of job-creating policies, nothing less, nothing more; and he should understand it that way.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Just on response to the point of order, very briefly.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Responding to the point of order, let me say this: There is no excuse, there is no justifying the levels of unemployment in this province today. Some of us, and I think some people, are interested in trying to understand the facts; and again I say not play politics with unemployed men and women.

Mr. Deans: You have done it all along, you have always done it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is getting to be a debate. Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: No, on a point of order, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Your point of order.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order: The Treasurer has asked where did he say it. On page 12 of the budget, under job creation, he says categorically: "Even in 1973 and 1974, during a period of high growth and rapid inflation, unemployment remained above the then accepted full employment norm. Budget paper A suggests that the full employment target for Ontario appropriate for the 1970s is 5.3 per cent, up from three per cent—" and if it was acceptable then, the Treasurer clearly indicates that 5.3 is acceptable now.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think the record has been set straight. We will hear a supplementary. Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, this whole debate has been out of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On a point of order, nowhere am I saying that 5.3 per cent or three per cent or one per cent is an acceptable level of unemployment.

An hon. member: You are not going to weasel out of that one, Darcy.

Mr. S. Smith: This whole exchange has been for the benefit of the television cameras. It has all been out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. member: Where are the jobs?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that so-called point of order has been stretched far enough. We will have a supplementary question from the member for London Centre.

Mr. Peterson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker: Given his new definition of 5.3 per cent for full employment, could he tell us what that relates to, is that to the federal average? Why couldn't it have been four per cent or five per cent, or indeed six per cent; and is it the Treasurer's intention, if unemployment gets worse, to increase that next year to define away some of the problems? The second part of my supplementary is, doesn't the Treasurer think that the relevant numbers are the total number of unemployed, rather than this by and large totally meaningless debate that he has introduced with respect to three or five or six or whatever number he chooses.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, for the member's edification, that if he would read the budget paper he would find the rationale for 5.3. I don't propose to take the time of the House to repeat it to him today. It is fully explained in the paper how 5.3, rather than 3.3 or 6.3 was arrived at. It will be a good experience for the member to sit down and read it.

Mr. S. Smith: It's to make your failure look better, that's all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The second part of the member's question—

An hon. member: Get that on TV.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The second part of the member's question concerned whether numbers are more important. I couldn't agree with him more. Whether it's one person, 100,000 or 300,000, we are concerned on this side of the House and we are not going to go through the twisting that they go through over there.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Within this permanent army of more than 200,000 unemployed that the Treasurer proposes for Ontario, can he give us the target rates of unemployment for so-called prime aged males and for the three classes of secondary working groups?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's straying from the original question, I believe. That may be a good later question. The hon. Leader of the Opposition's further question.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Treasurer: Can he tell the House where he discovered that President Carter of the United States—can he show us the statement in which President Carter has ever announced that 4.9 per cent unemployment is a full employment norm? Would he like to show us the document? I assume he has it.

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that was the Council of Economic Advisers to President Carter; and I would refer the member to a very excellent article in this morning's paper by Wilfred List documenting a number of other sources.

What he also points out is that labour economists don't accept it; so I wouldn't expect the member to either understand or accept it.

Mr. Deans: Where is Carter's statement?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But the fact is that independent research is accepting a higher number than three. If the member wants to live in his cocoon and twist facts that's fine with us.

Mr. Deans: Did you make that up?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer said so assertively in the budget delivery that President Carter had made such a statement; I gather he's saying now that it isn't the case?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, as I believe I made clear the other night—I said it ad lib —I said that the Council of Economic Advisers—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It was not in the budget statement and the member knows it.

Mr. Lewis: You added it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I added it because you were interrupting me—so very rudely, I might say.

An hon. member: How do you expect him to concentrate when you're interrupting him?

Mr. Lewis: I apologize for distressing such a frail flower of an adult male.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Two people do not have the floor. Is the statement completed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if I could just answer the question—

Mr. Lewis: Are your petals wilting a bit, while I ask a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can give the member some figures.

Mr. S. Smith: I hope it isn't ad lib, I hope it's true.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Four point nine per cent is the full labour force, according to the Council of Economic Advisers; three per cent for prime age males of 25 to 54, is the level set by the Brookings Institution in a report which is coming out soon; 5.6 per cent is, of course, the rate which triggers the federal contribution to the unemployment insurance fund; 4.5 per cent was the figure used by the Economic Council of Canada in the 13th annual review, The Inflation Dilemma.

Mr. Lewis: It would be lower for Ontario.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Institute for Policy Analysis of the University of Toronto used a figure of 5.5 per cent. Those are just some of the numbers which 5.3 fits into—

Mr. Lewis: For Canada?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: — but if the member wants to go on using something that is 15 years old; something almost as bankrupt as his policy.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary: Since the Treasurer is in fact forecasting higher unemployment, growing at about five per cent and with job creation falling behind that, is it his ministry's intention to revise its full employment figures up?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. leader's question had to do with President Carter's so-called statement.

Mr. Peterson: This relates absolutely and directly, and I think you're being very uncharitable in this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, I really do.

Mr. Speaker: It relates to President Carter's statement? It is very difficult to hear when there are so many interjections. The original question, I remind the hon. member again, had to do with President Carter's alleged statement. I haven't detected the relationship; if here is one I'll hear the hon. member.

Mrs. Campbell: It's a point of order.

Mr. Peterson: In fairness, I will work President Carter into this question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We'll decide that.

Mr. Breithaupt: I am sure he will appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: His energy policy or his speech?

Mr. Peterson: All of it, eventually, depending on how much time we have.

Supplementary to the Treasurer: Since he is forecasting higher unemployment running ahead of job creation, does that mean then—so that we are clear on this side—that he will be revising his full employment figures up to match the more dismal figures that are appearing? Is there a possibility that it will be 5.6 per cent or six per cent next year? Is that what he is telling us?

Mr. Speaker: That is supplementary to the first question, not to number two. It is a good question for later.

Mr. Peterson: President Carter is very concerned about this too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

JOB CREATION

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Treasurer: Given the Treasurer's assertion in last year's budget that 116,000 new jobs would be created in Ontario in the calendar year 1976, can the Treasurer inform the House as to how many jobs were in fact created during the year under his administration?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'll get that number; I don't have it here. It's not under my administration. What utter nonsense, what utter nonsense!

Mr. Breithaupt: You said it was not going to happen.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's the private sector in this province that creates the jobs, not socialist governments and socialist opposition. What utter nonsense!

Mr. Lewis: That was the Liberal leader's question! Why is the Treasurer so rigid and inflexible all the time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are straying from a proper question period. The hon. member for Hamilton West with a supplementary to his question:

Mr. S. Smith: I have a supplementary. I recognize, of course, that the Treasurer denies any responsibility for the atmosphere when things go wrong in the private sector, but accepts responsibility when things go well in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question now.

Mr. S. Smith: But since he doesn't seem to know, and since we wouldn't want him to say anything ad lib, heaven forbid, I will tell him that his own officials say that only 76,000 jobs were created. This means a difference of 52 per cent between the reality and his prediction. I would ask him, therefore, why we should believe his predictions this year about employment when they were 52 per cent off last year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I made a speech the other day, and I would be glad to indicate the variation between what we forecast last year and what actually happened. Our one serious error was job creation, most of our other forecasts were on. There is no question that for a number of years the Ontario government, in the person of the Ontario Treasurer—not just me—has stuck his neck out and forecast figures, which the member's good friends in Ottawa have never done because they don't have the guts, they just don't have the courage.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now it is their fault.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Eakins: Ask Clark.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we get back to a more proper question period and not be quite so provocative on all sides? A supplementary for the member for Hamilton West first.

Mr. S. Smith: Since the Treasurer admits that his figures were in serious error last year —to use his own words, given ad lib—would the Treasurer tell us in what way his method for predicting the unemployment figures this year has changed from last year so that we can have more confidence and lend more credence to the figures this year?

Mr. Eakins: That's a fair question, Darcy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I have greater confidence in myself and less in the leader of the third party, and that allows me to think anything I want.

Mr. Ruston: Answer the question.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting good time here. We'll have the final supplemnetary from the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, in view of what the Treasurer just said, can he explain why it is that in this year's budget he did not put a figure on the number of jobs that he hopes will be created in the economy?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, we used, in the forecast—on page 41—we used percentages. There are many things not in my speech—aren't you glad? But I'm saving them for you, I really am.

PEEL TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. S. Smith: My question is for the Premier, if I may just attract his attention for a moment:

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is it my attention or the television you are after?

Mr. S. Smith: Since the Premier represents a Peel riding, could he make some comment regarding the Peel teachers' work-to-rule situation, especially in view of the fact that it is now reported that the teachers intend not to set final exams, that marks will be withheld and the mood has turned rather ugly? Could I ask him specifically would he consider intervening personally, as the students have asked him to do; and can he report on whether the Education Relations Commission have been requested to report immediately on this very unfortunate situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that the city of Brampton is a very important part of the board's activities, I obviously have a very personal interest. The fact that I also have one of my family in the secondary grades who has not received his examination results —which, probably for him, has not been such a bad thing, in his view; in his view—I emphasize that.

Mr. Peterson: Very much like his father.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't misunderstand me —or feel that I'm condoning what is going on —but it all depends on the individual attitude of one or two students. I hope that won't be widely reported.

Mr. Reid: You can count on it.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I should never have said it, I should never have said it; I can see it now.

Anyway, all facetiousness aside, the ERC has summoned both parties. They are meeting at 7 o'clock tonight, and either the minister or myself will keep the House fully informed as this matter progresses. The meeting is called for 7 this evening.

Mr. S. Smith: A brief supplementary: Would the Premier or the Minister of Education feel that their own presence in the situation could be helpful at this point?

Mr. Martel: Probably not.

An hon. member: Definitely not, knowing him.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Always.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can assure the hon. member if I felt at this moment that my presence would help, I would be there. Hopefully that occasion will not occur. I really think it is better that it proceed the way it is, with the meeting that has been arranged for this evening.

Mr. Ruston: Get Lorne.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary: Given the bitterness with which the students have expressed their opinion on this particular issue, regardless of what ERC recommends, is there some way the Premier could guarantee that the exam results and the career potential of these students would not be damaged by this particular situation? I'm concerned about the bitter feelings of the students.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned not only about the feelings of the students, I'm very concerned not just as a member but as a parent as to the actual potential effect on the students. I am opti-

mistic that if this matter can be resolved from a straight administrative point of view, the present difficulties can be sorted out immediately. The condition precedent to that, of course, is getting a resolution between the two parties. If that comes about—and I can't comment any further at this moment—if that happens, I can't speak for all the schools but in some I know the testing has in fact taken place and the marks are there. It's a question then of the reporting. This is, shall we say, the mid-term examinations. The escalation of the work to rule has been referring to "final examinations," to the extent that some of the schools allow students to finish—

Mr. S. Smith: Some schools still have those?

Hon. Mr. Wells: All schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, listen, I will say the ones I know have them. Perhaps in Hamilton they don't, but in Peel we do; I can't speak for Hamilton.

Anyway, to get back to the question, I really think, knowing a little bit about it, the problem can be solved if the broader problem is concluded in the very near future.

ENVIRONMENTAL TAX

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. Will the minister provide for the House the documentation—which I'm sure must have been available at the time the decision was made to place a five-cent tax on non-returnable pop cans—with regard to the impact of that tax on the employment picture in the industry producing the cans?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This bill, of course, will be debated some time in the near future, but in the meantime I would be happy to let the hon. member have any information, background studies, assessments, analyses, that led to that decision.

Mr. Deans: As a supplementary question, I wonder if the minister would be able, today in the House, to tell us what he meant when he said that he did not think the tax would affect the pop can industry substantially? What is his definition of "substantially," in relation to the pop can industry and employment as a result of this five-cent tax? How many jobs may be lost?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, my conclusion is, from the information I have, that there need not be any layoffs in the industry. The question was referring particularly to the steel industries in Hamilton. In our opinion, there need not be any layoffs as a result of the five-cent tax on pop cans.

Mr. Cunningham: Supplementary: Wouldn't the minister agree that, given the serious difficulties we're having with litter across the province of Ontario and the need to, in fact, emphasize recycling, a five-cent deposit wouldn't have been a better direction?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker. For one thing, as the hon. member knows, the retail outlets, stores, corner stores, are finding it difficult now to handle a greater increase in returnable bottles. There are complaints that they're not able to handle them, they haven't got the space or the manpower and things of that sort. If we placed a deposit on cans they would immediately have to handle empty cans. It is my understanding that of the three considerations that we had in respect to the can—whether they should be banned, whether there should be a tax or a deposit—it was felt that the tax would be less disruptive to the industry and this would give the government the opportunity to get into the whole programme of recycling, rather than depend on the industry itself to set up recycling depots.

Mr. S. Smith: You are wrong there, part of it should be a deposit.

[2:45]

AGRICULTURAL JOBS

Mr. Riddell: A question of the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister clarify for us, and give us details, of the types of jobs that are to be created in the agricultural sector as outlined in the budget, which indicated that new funding will be provided for job creation in the agriculture infrastructure?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) can supply those details. He is not here, but no doubt he will be.

WIRETAPPING CHARGE

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on April 6 the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) asked me about a case in Niagara Falls involving wiretapping and a telephone repairman. This is a rather complicated case, but I will attempt to set it out briefly in chronological order for the members.

Officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Niagara Falls had obtained valid

authorization and renewals for intercepting private communications in a residence in connection with investigation of various drug offences. During the course of this investigation, a Bell Canada employee had occasion to be at the residence in question to make some telephone repairs or installations. The resident of the home told the serviceman that he felt there was something wrong with the telephone and asked that it be checked out.

The serviceman investigated. He found an intercepting device under the rug in the premises and described the nature of the device, which was operational at the time, to the resident of the home. This was apparently in contravention of Bell Canada policy but is not a matter which concerns the criminal courts.

Monitoring officers of the RCMP shortly arrived on the scene armed with a warrant, which purported to permit a search for electronic devices apparently used in contravention of Part IV(i) of The Criminal Code, and retook possession of their device.

Mr. Foulds: You're kidding.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The RCMP officers then inquired of Alan Root, Crown attorney for the judicial district of Niagara South, as to whether a charge against the serviceman should be laid pursuant to the provisions of section 178.20(i) of The Criminal Code. Mr. Root was advised that this was possibly the second occasion upon which this particular Bell Canada employee had contravened Bell policy. The policy demands, apparently, that investigations concerning possible foreign devices on company lines are to be conducted by or under the authority of Bell Canada's security department. In light of this information, the Crown attorney requested that a brief be prepared in order to assist him in resolving whether a charge should be laid as requested by the RCMP.

After reviewing the completed brief, the Crown attorney concluded the Bell Canada serviceman had not contravened section 178.20(i) of The Criminal Code. The serviceman had disclosed the existence of an intercepting device, but he had not wilfully disclosed an intercepted private communication; or any part thereof; or the substance, meaning or purport thereof; or the existence thereof, in violation of section 178.20(i) of The Criminal Code.

As a result, the Crown attorney instructed that there was in fact no charge known to law contained in the information prepared by the officer, and thereby no reasonable and probable grounds upon which the officer could so swear. The officer was told by the Crown attorney that although he could not tell the officer not to swear the information, the officer would have to be satisfied in his own conscience, on reasonable and probable grounds, that an indictable offence had been committed before he could so swear an information. The Crown attorney also told the officer that if such an information was sworn, the Crown would seek a ruling from the court as to whether the information disclosed an offence known to law and would put his ruling on the subject to the trial tribunal.

On March 20, 1977, the charge came on for hearing before His Honour Judge Johnstone L. Roberts at the provincial court criminal division at Niagara Falls. The Crown attorney had discussed his position with the defence counsel, and in open court asked for a ruling upon the validity of the information sworn by the RCMP officer and made his submissions with respect to it. The judge agreed with the Crown attorney's position and as a result thereby quashed the information, thereby discharging the Bell Canada serviceman.

In addition to this information on the circumstances of this case, I have also asked officials of my ministry and the Crown attorney involved to prepare a report on why the RCMP took this course of action in this case, particularly in view of the advice given by our local Crown attorney.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary: Could the Attorney General advise us whether or not he has given instructions to the OPP and to the various forces throughout the province that they don't proceed in the manner that the RCMP did?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: It hasn't been necessary to give any such instructions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith: I have a brief supplementary, if I might. Is the Attorney General aware of whether the Bell Canada education of its servicemen is such that servicemen could reasonably be required not to divulge such wiretaps as they might discover, but that they have a clearly defined procedure by which to handle such matters?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't have any additional details with respect to the Bell Canada policy apart from what I have already indicated to members, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary? Well, I'll allow a final supplementary to the member for Erie.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister: Will he guarantee that there will be some provisions made through his ministry to the federal government that there will be some protection given to the employees? Bell Canada, as I understand it, are supposed to inform the employee of such a wiretap. In this particular case the employee was never notified.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the additional information with respect to any other circumstances that might be of assistance. Having once had the opportunity of reviewing that information, I think at that time I'll determine whether some specific representation should be made to the RCMP.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services with respect to an application for a judicial inquiry under section 3 of The Child Welfare Act received by him on April 6.

Given that the application brief for a public inquiry documents that a ward of the Peel Children's Aid Society was charged with a criminal offence as a result of his protesting isolation in an unheated, unlit, rat-infested garage; and given that the same ward was, in the words of a family court judge, being railroaded into training school by the Peel Children's Aid; and given, finally, that the application brief documents the destructive use of criminal justice procedures against Children's Aid Society wards, in violation both of the best interests of the children and of their legal and civil rights, including denial of treatment and of counsel, will the minister order a public inquiry under section 3 of the Act: (1) To examine the particulars; (2) to determine whether they typify the administration of The Child Welfare Act; and (3) to render a set of recommendations on the best interests versus the legal and civil rights of children in the care of Children's Aid Societies?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I confirm I have received such a request from a Mr. Wilson on April 6. Immediately upon receipt of that I asked my staff to review the material and to consult with me, and I have been in regular consultation with them over the past two weeks on the matter of the subject of the request.

Further, on my instruction my associate deputy minister has been in contact with Mr. Wilson. I was advised this morning that as of a couple of days ago a meeting has been set up for tomorrow to explore the matter further with Mr. Wilson personally. I can assure the member that the concerns raised by Mr. Wilson are concerns that are shared by those of us who are involved in the delivery of service to children in this province. As soon as we have had an opportunity to consult directly with him, I will then be in a much better position to determine what the most appropriate course of action is pursuant to his request.

Mr. McClellan: By way of supplementary, would the minister not agree that the ultimate responsibility for making Children's Aid Societies responsible and accountable for the care of children in Ontario is vested with the minister under the Act? Because of this and because this issue raises the question of the child welfare equivalent of malpractice, therefore would the minister not agree he must order a judicial inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, not until I have had an opportunity to examine the matter as thoroughly as I possibly can on the basis of the information presently available to me, both from my staff and from Mr. Wilson.

SALES TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. Edighoffer: I have a question for the Minister of Revenue. Will the minister indicate to the House whether or not definite action has been taken by the ministry to extend current sales tax exemption to include underground utility cables?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I'll report on this in a few days.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Edighoffer: By way of supplementary, I believe the minister wrote to the OMEA on March 8 suggesting that this exemption would take place. I had hoped that there would be a definite answer by now.

Mr. Speaker: So your question is?

Mr. Nixon: Why doesn't she know about it?

Mr. Edighoffer: I would like an answer, yes.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In answer to your question, you would like an answer, "yes."

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Peterson: I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the minister could have a standing response to all questions, "I have no idea, Mr. Speaker," and not take up the time of the House.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not supplementary to this question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member has more charity in him than that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Community and Social Services has answers to a question or two—I believe two answers. You may give them now. The hon. minister.

GROUP HOME REGULATIONS

Hon. Mr. Norton: First of all I have a response to the question raised on April 5 by the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt), at which time he asked a question related to the number of inspectors who were presently engaged in the inspection of children's homes and Children's Aid Societies in the province of Ontario.

I wish to advise him that there are at the present time 12 full-time inspectors and consultants to cover the institutions that he indicated in his question. In addition to this, there are other consultants used on a part-time basis who are concerned principally with financial matters and home economics relating to these homes.

The work of the provincial inspectors is heavily supplemented by Children's Aid workers who regularly visit children placed in residential care by the 50 societies across the province. If these workers identify problems within any one home, they are instructed to contact the provincial inspector for that area, or their head office here at Queen's Park.

Visits are made at least annually to children's boarding homes to do a formal inspection related to the renewal of registration. Many other visits are made to assist with programme development or to investigate complaints. In general, this level of staffing is believed to be adequate for the protection of the children concerned and the maintenance of programme standards. Of course, accidents will occur in any system, but these cases have not been the result, to my knowledge, of problems in provincial staff coverage to this time.

In addition, I have a response to a question of the same day from the hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) relating to another group of homes, those homes having fewer than five children. These homes are, of course, not subject to the requirements, at the present time, of The Children's Boarding Homes Act and other provincial legislation and we therefore do not have all of the information that the hon. member requests.

Despite the fact that these homes fall outside the requirements of the legislation, they are by no means left uninspected. Many Children's Aid Societies will not place children in an unregistered home and the exceptions are usually house parents whose work is well-known to the society and who have demonstrated their ability to care for children. They are visited regularly by Children's Aid workers and encouraged to provide all reasonable safety measures.

Furthermore, The Child Welfare Act, section 2, subsection 2(d) provides for the inspection by the province of any place in which a child in the care of the Children's Aid Society is placed. This means that even though the premises may not fall within the requirements of The Children's Boarding Homes Act, it may be inspected. The directions given the inspectors, if children in the care of the Children's Aid Societies are placed in these residences, are that they are to inspect.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: Could I ask the minister if he would clarify the date upon which the additional supervisors were engaged, since the information given to us by his ministry was that there were four and one-half such supervisors? We translated that to between four and five to make it more understandable to those reading the report.

[3:00]

Hon. Mr. Norton: Yes, I will. I don't have that information. I was not aware that there had been any added very recently, but I will check to see when the number became 12.

WOMEN IN LABOUR FORCE

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Treasurer. I wonder if he could provide a rationale for counting all

women as part of the secondary labour force of Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: That famous budget paper of yours.

Mr. Deans: Remember, the other night?

Mr. Lewis: Remember that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can't recall off the top of my head. I'll get the answer for the member.

Mr. Lewis: You certainly should.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is there a supplementary? Yes.

Ms. Gigantes: When the Treasurer is looking into this question to provide a rationale, I wonder if he would take into account the fact that there are 25,000 unemployed women in the province of Ontario who are either: 1. Single, and, therefore, self-supporting; or, 2. Single heads of families, and, therefore, having to support families; and would he take this into consideration when perhaps he thinks of redefining what the primary labour force of Ontario is?

Mr. Speaker: I understand the answer is "yes."

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Well, was the hon. member for Peterborough wishing to ask a supplementary? We'll allow the member for Peterborough with her supplementary.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, I was waiting for the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Further to the previous supplementary, would the Treasurer also take into account those women who do not appear on the unemployment rolls, but who were referred to by the previous Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor), those women currently receiving family benefits whom the minister wished to get back into the work force, by encouraging them with leaflets entitled It Pays To Work?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take into account the concerns of both Ms. on the other side.

Mr. Reid: Why not all three Ms.?

Mr. Lewis: That speaks to your definition in the budget paper and that's all wrong.

Mr. S. Smith: They're Ms.-able, that's what they are.

Mr. Reid: Two Ms. and one miss.

Mr. Breithaupt: This last miss is as good as a mile.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Since the Treasurer is now becoming aware of his definition of women as being secondary in the labour force, can he also give us the target rate of unemployment for secondary members of the labour force, which is included in the budget paper study but not given in specific detail?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no target rate. We have made a forecast of what unemployment, we think, will be.

Ms. Gigantes: Can you define the high employment norm?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have not broken that target rate down into classes.

GRANTS TO CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Concerning the grant payments to conservation authorities, including supplementary sums, for the fiscal year 1975-1976, could the minister confirm these figures: Central region, $20,318,974 or 64.71 per cent; southwestern region, $5,013,352 or 15.97 per cent; eastern region, $4,504,546 or 14.35 per cent; and the northern region, $1,562,866 or 4,97 per cent; for a total of $31,399,738? Could the minister give the Legislature some assurance that the government will reassess future allotments so that eastern and northern regions of Ontario will receive a more equitable consideration in the allocation of funds?

Interjection.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm not sure of the second decimal place in each case, but I'll be glad to check. The fact remains that I have met with the chairmen of the conservation authorities, all 38 of them, a week ago. I think if one looks at the requests from the various regions, each region always feels that it's getting less than the others in terms of its own share. I believe that the proportions are reasonably fair. At the same time, I'm quite willing, as a new minister, to look at them and see if they are fair.

I think one has to realize that those conservation authorities are in different stages

of development. Some, such as those along the Grand River, have had many years of experience and others are just beginning. I think one will find that mature conservation authorities have an altogether different type of programme and dollar demand than those that are just beginning, and therefore straight percentages never reflect the true picture.

Mr. Reid: They know how to get the money.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Secondly, the watersheds and their problems are not necessarily the same. Up in the Shield region, we don't have the basic problems of flooding in most areas that one does in the lowlands of southwestern Ontario. I think one has to take those into consideration.

Mr. Reid: You didn't give us any money for the Rainy River area.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It depends upon the area in general.

Interjections.

Mr. O'Neil: Supplementary: Considering that there is this disparity between the 64 per cent approximately for the central region and 14 per cent to the eastern region, is this the only criterion the minister follows on some of these things he has just mentioned; or are there other criteria?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Is what the only criterion?

Mr. O'Neil: The things the minister has just mentioned, or are there others?

Hon. F. S. Miller: There may well be. I don't pretend, after two months and 17 days, to be an expert yet.

Mr. Reid: You just found the office.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) knows a lot more about the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Speaker: We'll have one final supplementary on this. The member for Port Arthur.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Was the member out last night?

Mr. Foulds: No, I've got a migraine.

Does the minister consider that conservation authorities in central and Metropolitan Toronto areas and southwestern Ontario have a different set of priorities and definition of functions than do the conservation authorities in eastern and northern Ontario? Does he consider that proper? For example, does he consider it proper for the conservation authority in Metropolitan Toronto to have bought a golf course for several million dollars about four years ago?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't look into the past, I can only look into the future.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I only know that conservation authorities' grants and direction have been directed toward their primary function, that is flood control.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has the answer to a question asked previously.

DRG GLOBE ENVELOPES LIMITED

Hon. B. Stephenson: At the end of last week, the member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) asked me to reply to a question which he had asked in December. I noted at that time that I thought I had written the response. I had written the response but the hon. member feels that it should be responded to in the Legislature. Therefore, at his request, I am reading the response in the Legislature.

An hon. member: I hope it's not too long.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It's relatively brief. This matter was brought to our attention last fall with the result that the employment standards branch of this ministry conducted an audit of DRG Globe Envelopes Limited. I am advised that a petition was received from the employees of that company requesting a 15-minute break for an eating period, with the night shift to close down at 15 minutes prior to the regular shift close. As this petition was signed by almost 100 per cent of the employees in favour of the request, the director of employment standards approved the practice, according to section 22 of the Act. I note that the eating break is approved—and it is a 15-minute period and not a 10-minute eating break, as recorded in Hansard. This approval was granted on the condition that the employees involved are allowed sufficient time during each shift to attend to their personal hygiene requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief answer to another question asked by the leader of the third party last week.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

WOMEN CROWN EMPLOYEES

Hon. B. Stephenson: He asked how many of these members on the senior list in the government were women. The total number of individuals listed on the senior list, that is those at the level of executive director or higher, is 160, and of that total, five are women.

Mrs. Campbell: Great.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It is.

Mr. Lewis: From zero to five, that's quite a jump.

NIAGARA REGION OFFICIAL PLAN

Mr. Swart: I'd like to put a question to the Minister of Housing. As a result of the request by myself and several other individuals and organizations, will he confirm that he will refer the urban boundaries decision of the Niagara regional official plan to the Ontario Municipal Board for a ruling by it?

Mr. Riddell: The member didn't get a very good write-up on that, as I recall.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As I think I have already communicated to the hon. member, for those persons who do in fact have legitimate referral requests on that particular official plan, including the urban boundaries, to the Ontario Municipal Board, they shall certainly be so referred, there is no question about that. I believe he would agree that I have asked him to make sure that all of the information be made available that was required by the ministry for such a referral.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary: Given that the recent report of Peter Barnard Associates, which was commissioned by his ministry, shows a dramatic reduction in the estimated growth in the Peninsula, a requirement of only 8,000 acres for residential development compared to the 23,000 acres which are left in the plan; and given that the Niagara regional planners, in reports of March 23, confirmed these reduced requirements; will he, therefore, either on his own prior to referring to the Ontario Municipal Board, or in the request to the Municipal Board, assure that the growth boundaries in the fruit, grape and the prime food land area are further cut back so that they will have some meaning in preserving these lands?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Well, considering that the hon. member has indicated that there is, perhaps, only a need for 8,000 acres for growth in the particular area, then there is, of course, 15,000 acres that will not be used, and he shouldn't be that concerned. The matter will be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board and we will allow it to peruse what has been done, both by the region and by the ministry—that is anything which has not received the unanimous approval of those supporters of the hon. member.

MEDICAL SERVICES IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Reid: I have a question for the Minister of Health, dealing with medical services in northern Ontario. Could the minister advise if he plans on changing his programme to provide doctors and dentists to isolated communities? Is he going to bat for these communities by getting the doctors and dentists, particularly those who come from overseas, extensions to the one-year contract on their visas to enable them to operate and live in northern Ontario so that those communities may have some continuity of service from these people?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: While my experience of that programme is limited to date, my understanding is that in all cases, whether they be physicians from overseas or people from Ontario or elsewhere in Canada, they are all on contract. It is an annual renewal.

Mr. Reid: They have to go back. They have to leave and come back.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Not if they are on contract. I don't believe so. If there is a renewal of the contract, it is a mutually satisfactory relationship. If the member has a particular case about which he is concerned, please let me know.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: Under the present system they are here under working-status visas and not under landed immigrant status; therefore they have to return to their country if they wish to settle in these communities.

In the same vein, if I may: Can the minister outline the dental car programme for northern Ontario? I understand we will be getting a few more dental cars to provide service to children, particularly where the greatest need is in northern Ontario—in the elementary and pre-elementary grades.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On the first point, vis-à-vis doctors who are coming from overseas, certainly the decision as to whether they will be granted extensions under immigrant status—and they are from time to time—is that of the federal government, particularly if the immigrant is prepared to take part in the programme for the isolated areas.

Now, on the second point, to be honest, I don't remember the details of all that we have decided. Certainly, we are putting several more vans on the road to carry out the dental programme. But if I can take that as notice, perhaps I will send the member a letter that will outline all the details of what we are doing in that area.

Mr. Bain: Supplementary: Am I to understand that the minister is going to send the member for Rainy River a letter on it? If he is just going to report to him, I would appreciate it if he reported to the House, because there are a number of northern members also interested in the same subject.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It's just that the member for Rainy River is the only northern member who has ever expressed an interest on this point.

Mr. Reid: On a short supplementary—I might as well, while I am ahead.

Mr. Foulds: Read your correspondence.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: Join Jack Horner over here.

Mr. Martel: You sound like Bernier.

Mr. Reid: Would the minister also look into the drug benefit plan that now requires drug benefits for senior citizens to be purchased from an Ontario pharmacist? In northern Ontario many people have to go to Winnipeg or the United States and go to a hospital to purchase drugs. Would the minister look into that?

Mr. Speaker: That is not that closely related to the original question. We will hear an answer from the Minister of Correctional Services.

Mr. Bain: Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate it if the minister would reconsider the statement he just made about northern members. I know that I have contacted—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is not a point of personal privilege. We are wasting the time of this question period. The hon. Minister of Correctional Services.

[3:15]

TRAINING SCHOOL TEACHERS

Hon. Mr. Meen: I guess I now have the floor, Mr. Speaker. I have the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Cambridge (Mr Davidson) on Tuesday, April 19 last, relating to Champlain school at Alfred.

The recommendation last year for an increase in the teaching staff at Champlain school was related to a transfer of students from Cecil Facer school in Sudbury. This caused the count to rise to 90 students at Champlain. Now it is down to 60, and of that total only 47 are actually receiving classroom instruction in the school. The present count at Cecil Facer school is now some 40 below capacity and is unlikely to affect further the Champlain school count, which has continued itself to decline.

There will be no reduction in staff at all until September 1, 1977. All programmes instituted for this school year will continue to run and will be completed. Should school enrolment increase significantly for any reason in the future, the collective agreement contains a recall clause, and we will have the number of teachers in the classrooms necessary for the programmes to be taught.

The present enrolment provides a pupil-teacher ratio of five to one, not counting the principal. Tentatively, the pupil-teacher ratio next September would be seven to one, which is more than adequate, even for the school's type of child. Remedial programmes are of high priority in our training schools and we have no intention of lowering that priority. Adequate organization of the timetable and homogeneous grouping of students in classes of fewer than eight pupils will continue to provide effective remedial assistance and individualized attention.

Of the three teachers declared redundant for the next school year, two are shop teachers and one is an elementary remedial teacher. In order to ensure continued programme adequacy, two of the shops are being combined. This redeployment of facilities and staff, when combined with the rearrangement of the present timetable, will leave sufficient teachers for us to continue to provide the full range of academic programmes as offered at present.

I can assure the hon. member for Cambridge that there is no intention whatever to discontinue any of the programmes.

Mr. Davidson: Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that the principal at Champlain school has expressed very much concern regarding the elementary programme that exists? Can the minister assure me that the reduction of the number of teachers in that school will not eliminate the elementary programme that's now in place?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that any of the programmes in place will continue. I am aware that there was some concern expressed by the teachers—and that may have included the principal, I can't say—at the time of this readjustment. I believe this has been sorted out satisfactorily. What I have just said is, I can assure the hon. members that the programmes at present in place will continue.

Ms. Sandeman: Supplementary to the minister's answer: In view of his stated dedication to the provision of remedial education in the training schools, could he explain why recently-announced layoffs—for instance, at Brookside school—have included layoffs of remedial teachers?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I haven't any specific details on that, Mr. Speaker. I simply can say that the extent to which remedial teachers would be required is taken into account when the redundancies are determined.

GOVERNMENT COMPLEX IN TIMMINS

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question for the Minister of Government Services. Is the minister able to tell us what the plans are for the government office complex in the Timmins area? Is it going to go ahead or where does it now stand?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, it is under review.

Mr. Ferrier: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the Treasurer in 1975 said this was a top priority item as far as creating employment is concerned, and that tenders were called during the election and then withdrawn after the election—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ferrier: —I wonder if the minister can tell us how long this matter is going to be under review? Do we have to wait from now till eternity to get an answer?

Mr. Foulds: Or the next election?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the member will have to wait too long.

GASOLINE RETAIL PRICES

Mr. Spence: A question for the Minister for Consumer and Commercial Relations. Would the minister inform us why there is such a wide differential in gasoline prices across the province of Ontario? In one area two weeks ago, around Paris, the price of gasoline at the pumps was 80.9 cents. In other towns and villages in the province of Ontario the price of gasoline was 89.9 cents. Is the minister going to take any action in regard to this wide differential in prices as it concerns many businessmen in our towns and villages across the province?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the reason there are differences in prices is because we still have the competitive system in Ontario. Some people sell their product at a lower price than others. I hope we will always have it that way.

Mr. Foulds: It's called monopoly capitalism.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If it is suggested that we should have a single-price system for gasoline in Ontario, then I simply have to reject the suggestion. There must be competitive forces. That doesn't mean that where exorbitant prices are being charged my ministry is not interested in them. We certainly would appreciate receiving any information to that effect.

Mr. Nixon: Just a little free enterprise, not too much.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions?

Order, please.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Swart: Point of order, pursuant to the order of the Legislative Assembly passed on December 16 in rule 28, I am dissatisfied with the answer of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) to my question today and would like to debate it tonight at 10:30.

REPORTS

Mrs. Campbell from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the com-

mittee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following application for a private Act and finds the notice, as published, sufficient:

Borough of North York.

Mr. Renwick from the standing administration of justice committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Trustees of the Toronto General Burying Grounds.

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Canada Trustco Mortgage Company.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Webwood Investments Limited.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of East York.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting Lombardo Furniture and Appliances Limited.

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting Kevalaine Corporation Limited.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation for the Diocese of Alexandria, in Ontario, Canada.

Bill Pr24 An Act respecting Frank Postl Enterprises Limited.

Your committee further recommends that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation for the Diocese of Alexandria, in Ontario, Canada.

Mr. Gaunt from the standing general government committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Bill Pr120, An Act respecting the Village of Erie Beach.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ONTARIO WASTE DISPOSAL AND RECLAMATION COMMISSION ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 54, The Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish, as mentioned in the title, an Ontario waste disposal and reclamation commission to have the authority in matters concerning reclamation and recycling of liquid, solid and gaseous waste, with particular reference to possible development of energy from these sources.

PERFUME AND COSMETICS BARS LIMITED ACT

Mr. Peterson moved first reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting The Perfume and Cosmetics Bars Limited.

Motion agreed to.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London Centre; any explanation of the principle?

Mr. Peterson: No, no explanations, Mr. Speaker. It is a private bill; I'm very embarrassed. Please don't try to embarrass me, Mr. Speaker.

RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE ACT

Hon. Mrs. Birch, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Parrott, moved first reading of Bill 55, An Act respecting Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The purpose of this bill is to establish a new governing structure for Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. The size of the board of governors is being increased from 13 to 23. An academic council to oversee educational policy at the institute is being established.

This bill is based upon a report received from the board of Ryerson and in addition consultation has taken place with all elements of the Ryerson community.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the orders of the day, as it is the custom now on Thursdays to indicate the order of business for the ensuing week may I take this opportunity to indicate that next week on Monday we'll have the contribution

in the budget debate of the member for Ottawa Centre.

An hon. member: Call that a contribution?

Mr. Moffatt: And Tuesday evening.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We do not sit, of course, on Monday evening. No doubt the member for Ottawa Centre will be completed before we rise on Monday.

An hon. member: We hope!

Mr. Cassidy: We are sitting in the evening I trust?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, not on Monday. Tuesday afternoon we then have the contribution to the budget debate of the member for London Centre.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I want you to spend all weekend getting your contribution ready.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Following that short presentation on Tuesday afternoon—

Mr. Nixon: It is going to be the same as last year? Marvellous speech.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —for the balance of Tuesday afternoon and Tuesday evening we will proceed to carry on with—

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for London North (Mr. Shore) won't have to be here because we are giving the same speech again.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —orders 13, 14 and 16. On Wednesday, of course, there is no House, but there is committee work. Thursday afternoon we'll do private members' business; Thursday evening, budget debate. Friday morning, budget debate.

Mr. Martel: Are we still going to be here by then?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS:

MOTION NO. 2

Mr. Singer moved private member's motion No. 2:

Resolution: That in the opinion of this House: 1. The government should establish a register of all properties owned by the province of Ontario or by any of its boards or agencies, which register shall be set out the following: (a) the date on which the land was acquired; (b) the size of the parcel of land; (c) the total acquisition price; (d) the purpose for which it was acquired and the approximate date that it is anticipated that it will be used for such purpose; (e) the present use of the land; (f) the authority which allowed its acquisition; (g) the amount of commissions paid to any persons or agents concerning the acquisition and to whom they were paid; (h) the amount of legal fees paid in connection with such acquisition and to whom they were paid; (i) that such register be open to inspection by any interested person.

[3:30]

2. The government should establish guidelines for all future acquisitions which will ensure the clarity of procedures and the fairness whenever land is acquired; and that such guidelines be approved by this House; that when any land not owned by the province of Ontario or any of its boards or agencies is acquired that within three months of the date of such acquisition full details concerning the acquisition are added to the register referred to above.

3. When any land owned by the province of Ontario or any of its boards or agencies has been disposed of, full details of such disposition be added to the register referred to above within three months of such disposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wilson Heights may proceed with his dissertation.

Mr. Singer: The purpose of this motion, Mr. Speaker, is to bring as forcefully as I can before this House one of the very serious denials of public information. It's a matter that has caused us trouble in this Legislature for many years—certainly for all of the years that I have been here—and that is our inability to find out what lands the government of Ontario owns, why it bought them, the prices that were paid for them, the manner in which the lands were acquired, whether or not information has been leaked, whether or not there is a standard procedure whereby lands are acquired and on whose authority the land was acquired. From time to time, unfortunately, there has been the suspicion in the minds of many people that the procedures used and the lack of public availability and public information has tended to allow improper practices which have benefited only a few of the citizens of the province and not all of the people of Ontario.

With this in mind, I must point out that it is unfortunate that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) hasn't seen fit to be present here, because he and his predecessors are the ministers of the Crown to whom the majority

of our criticism has been directed over these many years. When the new minister arrived in his portfolio not too long ago, some of us thought that perhaps a new breath of fresh air had come on to the scene and we were going to get some new and enlightened leadership from that minister, because during the course of consideration of his estimates a couple of years ago he did say that a method could be worked out, he thought, that would allow the examination of the minutes of Ontario Housing to be made public.

He promised subsequently to that, in answer to questions put to him, that he was going to ask for representatives of the three parties to get together and he would chair a meeting where the procedures could be determined upon. That sounded very brave, but nothing has happened since. I am told—and again it is unfortunate that the minister isn't here—that when he took that proposition back to those people who populate the directors' table at Ontario Housing Corporation, they talked him out of it. So much for enlightened information; so much for the public right to know what is going on.

You have been around here long enough as well, Mr. Speaker, to know that every time the breath of suspicion is raised about land acquisition or land disposition policies, almost a full and complete iron curtain descends in front of and around those ministers responsible for such acquisitions or those agencies that have been active in making this kind of expenditure of public money. This was particularly evident after the decision of the government in relation to the bill of the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) asking for disclosure of public information, the one that was debated last week, when the government members, every one of them, stood in their place and said, "No, we don't even want to vote on that, because there is a green paper or a white paper or something. We don't want any disclosure of public information. But be patient, some years from now—maybe another 10 or 15 years—you are going to get some kind of a bill."

The reason that my motion is here today is to take up one of the most objectionable, most improper, most obnoxious methods of government handling of its business and to debate on that, together with my colleagues and hopefully with the support of the other two parties, what I think should be a most important step in public policy.

I am going to deal, not too lengthily, with some of the land assemblies that we have questioned in recent days, or the media have questioned. My colleague from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) will be addressing himself, I am certain, to what happened in South Cayuga. But there was never any answer given to the charge made in the Toronto morning newspaper that a Mr. White, who was quite prominent around here in other days and was responsible for acquiring pieces of land, went out and bought twice as much land in the name of the province as the province needed, merely to satisfy his own whim.

The South Cayuga land acquisition was a very fascinating one. It was never explained and I suppose the government thinks that because White is no longer here that it never need be explained again. What happened to the government money? Why was that money spent? Why was it in the public interest? Why is it necessary to spend some $2 million each and every year to maintain that property, which apparently the people of Ontario didn't need to have in their ownership in the first place? These are things that hopefully this system that I have outlined might supply answers to.

There was the South Milton land assembly, Mr. Speaker, and you'll remember that one. We spent some time in this House trying to find out how it was acquired, why different prices were paid to landowners who abutted each other. In some cases, some got a few hundred dollars an acre; others got several thousand dollars an acre.

Why was expropriation not used? Why were middlemen allowed to come in? And in one particular case—and I am not going to rehash all of the sordid history of that land acquisition—but in one case that I made full reference to—and it's there in Hansard and I am not going to repeat my 1974 speeches at great length, but there they are in November of 1974—why was one middleman allowed to come in and make a profit of at least $2 million without laying out a penny of his own money because the government had embarked on this obscure and needless land acquisition in the South Milton area?

When we asked the minister of the day why it was done, the best answer he could come forward with was "it's in the public interest to land bank this land, which we might use in the year 2025 or some time thereafter, provided we want a pipeline from Lake Ontario all the way up there"—what, 10 or 15 miles of pipeline to carry water up there?—"then the land might be used."

But the one particular gentleman—and certain people associated with him—managed, I suppose just because of his peculiar business

sagacity, to find out that it was worth his while to get options to purchase this property just one step ahead of the government land agents who were coming along and they bought all that he had optioned. He made this profit and apparently put up no money of his own. Marvellous if you have this particular kind of sagacity, and marvellous if the government's processes are so slip-shod, so sloppy, and so open to question—and never have to be accounted for, that's the point.

There is the whole Kitchener-Waterloo land assembly, and the story there is a fascinating one. In 1968, some 3,000 acres were purchased by Ontario Housing Corporation and they paid some $5,246,000 for them. My colleague, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk commented on that one in 1968. My colleague, the member for Kitchener, has commented on it. My colleague, the member for Waterloo (Mr. Good), has commented on it. But again, we draw nothing but blanks.

What is happening with those acres, Mr. Speaker? We have tried to find out something about it. Ontario Housing, as we have been told, is waiting for official plans from the Ministry of Housing before moving forward to develop it. Meanwhile, the land is being leased back to the farmers it was purchased from and there is talk now that maybe it's going to be sold back to the farmers it was purchased from. On a leasehold basis, it's not economical. The farmers who lease back land they originally owned are very reluctant to invest money in farm machinery and so on because they don't know how long they're going to be allowed to stay.

As I say, we tried to find out some of the things that are happening in regard to that land. We spoke to a Mr. John Guthrie who, I'm told, is the executive assistant to the Minister of Housing. As a result of conversations with Mr. Guthrie, it becomes apparent that some of the land in the 3,000-acre assembly is prime and actively used agriculture land. To quote from the ministry: "In keeping with the government's guidelines on agricultural land, if some of the land is not needed for housing, then perhaps it's best to leave it for farming." This is 1977—more than nine years after the land was acquired. "Therefore, if and when there is a decision made on all this land, the Ontario Housing Corporation, together with the municipality, if it's determined that some of this parcel is surplus to development needs and will be surplus forever"—whatever that may mean—"then it will be offered to sale first to the original owners."

I hope the original owners are blessed with longevity because by the time anyone makes up his mind as to what's going to happen with this 3,000-acre assembly, if it proceeds at the pace at which it's now proceeding, the original owners will long since have gone on to other places.

A problem was put in its perspective by Bill Thompson of the Kitchener-Waterloo regional office. He's quoted as having said: "In the official plan for Kitchener-Waterloo, about two-thirds of the 3,000-acre assembly is not, according to the present development plan, necessary for housing. The region realizes the value of this land as farming and wishes it to remain in that use. The problem" —as they see it—"is then will any farmer be able to buy back the land at the current market value from the Ontario Housing Corporation? If not, the land will fall to developers and will be lost forever as farm land."

We have the official plan of the Kitchener-Waterloo area and I'd certainly be glad to acquaint any of the members with its contents if they are interested in it. I see the Minister of Housing is here and I'm very pleased about that. But let me go on about the Kitchener-Waterloo plan. "Nine years after the assembly of these acres, the government still has made no commitment on its fate. Reporters from the Kitchener-Waterloo Record asked Mr. Rhodes if this land would possibly be sold back to the original owners who were the farmers. Mr. Rhodes replied: 'Possibly 1,000 acres might be returned to the farmers at agricultural prices rather than at development prices.' "

That's fascinating. The Minister of Housing and his executive assistant don't seem to be in accord with what the planners are talking about for that area. "The vice-chairman of Ontario Housing Corporation, Mr. Riggs"—and he gets into the act every now and then—"informed us that no decisions would be made by Ontario Housing Corporation without a review with the municipality concerned since the regional Kitchener-Waterloo official plan had been approved. The Ministry of Housing has made no official statement on the 3,000 acres. The province simply disrupted the lifestyles of many farmers by pressuring them into selling their land, leased it back to them through leases, containing, in some cases, a six-month notice clause, and now may be selling part of the land back"—but the final answer certainly has not been made known by the minister, by Ontario Housing, or by anybody else who has anything to do with government—"much to the regret of some farmers who gave up farming amidst the uncertain climate of ownership of the land by the provincial government for

the past nine years." And there are all sorts of newspaper clippings in the local papers complaining about this situation.

Surely this kind of problem cries out for some kind of remedy. If the government is going to carry on public business and if it is going to waste public money, surely it should be accountable. Surely the government should be the first organization that should say: "This is what we are doing with the public money. This is why we have done it. This is why we laid out large sums of money. This is why the land is presently standing fallow." And do we get any of that, Mr. Speaker? Not a bit.

[3:45]

Let me tell the House about the Edwardsburgh land assembly. That's that great one down in eastern Ontario. It's the great one that the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) prominently got on public record saying: "We don't want any of that there here. Anybody would be crazy to put industry here."

Hon. Mr. Taylor: He speaks better English than that.

Mr. Singer: It's my English you're complaining about?

Mr. Bullbrook: He was merely paraphrasing.

Mr. Singer: Here's the headline: "Kept in Dark on Land Assembly Planning, Bennett Derided for 'Foolish Buyer' Talk." How many acres did we get down there? That piece of land has come under the aegis and control of something called the Ontario Land Corporation.

I talked to Mr. Omand, who is the general manager. Mr. Omand is a very honest and frank civil servant. He said: "Yes, we have control over all those acres down there, 10,000 acres at Edwardsburgh. We have control over them. I want to tell you, we didn't buy them. The Ontario Land Corporation didn't buy them. However, they were bought and now we have control of it. Unfortunately, nobody seems to be interested in using it for industry."

One wonders when government can act in this unusual way, even against the advice of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. They keep him in the dark. He told them in this House that they were crazy. He told them in speeches that they were crazy. One wonders how the government conducts its business and what kind of sense this possibly makes.

Mr. Eakins: Do you agree with him today, Jim?

Mr. Singer: There's the Saltfleet land assembly. Ontario Housing has 1,670 acres, bought between January 2 and February 6, 1968, for $6.5 million from Jonenco.

John Deans apparently is the principal of Jonenco. The land was assembled by Jonenco from May to December, 1967, at a cost to him of $3.3 million. So Mr. Deans paid $3.3 million in 1967 and, a year later, the happy government, the beneficent government gave Mr. Deans' company $6.5 million. It's interesting.

Mr. Eakins: Interesting.

Mr. Singer: At least, if there was a public purpose for this it could be understood, but there is no public purpose that's announced.

Until recently, OHC was projecting a population for this area of some 70,000. "Actual development has been slow due to the lack of demand, the lack of adequate access. Redhill pre-growth proposed to allow a second means of access." It was proposed but it was never, in fact, built. Ontario Housing Corporation has now built approximately 800 units. Ten years later, $6.5 million later, we provided land for 600 units of housing. That's rather expensive housing, and rather hard to understand.

"Planning for 100 acres was carried out for Ontario Housing by a British firm which recommended stacked townhouses at 40 units to the acre." Notwithstanding the recommendations,"—quite logically—"the government came to the conclusion this was uneconomical and undesirable in this community."

I could go on at great length—I'm catching your signal, Mr. Speaker, that I've just about run out of time—but these are only a few of the tragic horror stories that are obvious and available to us after much research. Surely it would make sense if there was a public record of government land acquisition, if the procedures were regularized and explained, and every time land was being disposed of the members of the Legislature and the people of Ontario could understand why and how it was done? I would hope all the members of the Legislature will support this eminently sensible resolution.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Having carefully looked at and studied the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Wilson Heights, I find

that, while there is much that is laudable in that resolution, to put into reality such a central register would be impractical and extremely expensive.

Mr. Singer: More expensive than clearing the land?

Hon. J. R. Smith: In examining the ramifications of such a proposal, I asked my staff to look into the man-hours necessary to set up such a register and to estimate the cost of such a project, both on a one time set-up basis and on an annual cost basis. Our findings are that the cost of such a programme would be prohibitive, particularly in this time of financial restraint.

Mr. Singer: That's a great defence. Yes sir.

Mr. Nixon: What a joker!

Hon. J. R. Smith: Let me give you some idea, Mr. Speaker, of the enormity of the task and the cost which would be involved if a central register were to be established. Firstly, in reading the resolution presented to us, I see the hon. member asks for the establishment of a register of all properties owned by the province of Ontario or by any of its boards or agencies. Notice that it says all property owned." I assume that means all easements, all rights of way and so on. I wonder if the hon. members have any idea of the number of properties that would involve?

Mr. Singer: It's nobody's business except the public's.

Hon. J. R. Smith: I might add in passing that I asked my staff, in preparing this data, to be conservative in their estimates. At times I believe they might even have been a trifle too conservative. Including easements, rights of way and other properties, we estimate that the province now owns in excess of 450,000 separate pieces of property. Ontario Hydro alone has more than 250,000 easements, for example.

To prepare the necessary data on each property, the data required in the resolution plus other information that would be necessary—such as vendor's name; location of property, including lot, concession and township; whether there have been any improvements on the property; whether there have been any liens on the property in question and so on—would, by conservative estimate, take four man-hours. I am sure the hon. members realize that in many instances, particularly in properties purchased 15, 20 or 50 years ago, the research necessary to provide such data would take far more than that estimate of four man-hours per property.

Nevertheless, to get all the information required without beginning the process of recording it, would take 1.8 million man-hours. I leave it to the hon. members to estimate the number of man-years. At the average clerk four category salary—

Mr. Bullbrook: Wait; 1.8 million man-hours?

Hon. J. R. Smith: That's right—they can see that the cost of preparing such a register alone, we say could be nearly $11 million, or $10.8 million to be exact.

Mr. Singer: That's a man-hour per square foot of land that you own. That's very good.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Add to that all of the necessary start-up costs, such as developing a computer system to handle it—to set up and operate such a register manually would, of course, be logically out of the question—

Mr. Eakins: Who wrote this?

Mr. Singer: It's awful. It really is terrible.

Hon. J. R. Smith: —to input data into that system, to provide for overhead such as accommodation et cetera. In all, we estimate the cost of establishing such a central register would be approximately $12 million. Are we really prepared to spend that sum without tangible benefits, benefits we are not now receiving?

I also asked my staff to prepare estimates of the cost of operating such a system once all the available data were in and the man-hours needed would only be for input of approximately 8,000 property transactions the province engages in annually. There, we estimate an annual budget of around $300,000. But the purpose of having such a registry would only be the retrieval of data. If we were to prepare a report showing data of the province's property ownership, the cost of providing such a print-out would run to $10,000 each and the result, my friends, hon. members, would be a stack of paper that could be 50 feet high. In other words, we could provide an awful lot of bedtime reading for those hon. members—

Mr. Singer: It could be. It might be 100 feet high.

Mr. Kerrio: That's what you are hiding behind now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's have some order, please.

Hon. J. R. Smith: The question we have to ask ourselves is, would the cost, mostly in terms of initial start-up, be worth it? Would we get information that we can't get now?

Mr. Eakins: We can't get it, because we've been asking for it.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Again, the idea contained in the hon. member's resolution is laudable, but practicality suggests that such a registry would actually give us little we cannot get now. Each ministry and board handling property transactions currently maintains its own registry of property, which includes information needed on an almost daily basis by the ministry involved and modified to the ministry's particular needs. These needs would still have to be met if a central register were set up. In other words, there would be a great deal of duplication of information involved if we had a central register.

I believe that it is much more practical to allow each concerned ministry and agency to continue maintaining its own individual record system but modified as necessary to include certain common information, open to retrieval by interested parties. Existing systems also would be modified to ensure that an accurate and adequate record of current and future transactions would be maintained.

Mr. Singer: As Al Lawrence said, "You have no right to know. You have no right to know."

Hon. Mr. J. R. Smith: I will be pursuing this idea in further discussions with my staff and cabinet colleagues. Since I have pointed out the majority of the costs involved in setting up a central register would be for initial research on past property transactions, it might seem reasonable on the surface to suggest that we start up the register as of, say, January 1, 1978, and forego the costly research. How can we have an accurate record of "all properties owned by the province or any of its boards or agencies" if we do not do such research? Would it make much sense to record the sale of a property on that central register when the register has no record of the province owning such a piece of land?

The resolution also sets out a number of questions regarding each property transaction which should be provided by such a register.

Mr. Singer: One wouldn't believe that the minister could make that speech.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Most of that information is already available from each ministry involved.

Mr. Singer: Already available?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Some of the research I was speaking of earlier would take a little time to provide, but it could be provided. For example, in item (c), the total acquisition price might take some time to find out if we were dealing with a property purchased a sizable number of years ago. Similarly, finding out the size of fees and commissions paid, and to whom, would also involve much time and effort for those transactions, if they were, say, 50 years ago.

Mr. Eakins: You are telling the public they have no right to know.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Nevertheless, as I have stated, this information can, in general, be obtained using the current system.

Mr. Singer: Obtained by whom?

Hon. J. R. Smith: It leads me, therefore, to ask again what information and what benefits would be acquired from establishing such a register? What would justify the enormous expense in time and effort involved?

My response has to be that there is no benefit that would lead us to tell the people of this province that we're going to spend some $12 million of their money to give us information we already have.

Mr. Reid: You have got to be kidding—$12 million! You people need new speech writers.

Mr. Singer: If you spend $12 million, you're going to have paper that high.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Wilson Heights was allowed to proceed without interruption. Extend the same courtesy to the member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Singer: It's very hard because it is such drivel, Mr. Speaker. I'll try.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Please try.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We listened to the member's drivel.

Hon. J. R. Smith: In my view, to suggest that the register can be open to any interested person infringes upon the confidentiality of such a transaction and could, if misused, lead to abuses by land speculators. I suggest this aspect might be something better looked at by the commission on freedom of information.

Lastly, point 2 of the resolution asks that guidelines for acquisition be set up. Such guidelines are already set up.

Mr. Singer: Where?

Hon. J. R. Smith: My ministry has them and I know that other ministries and agencies have them. The guidelines are tailored for the particular job each ministry does and the particular land assembly needs that it has. These guidelines are in force and adhered to.

While on the surface there seems to be much to commend the resolution, I'm afraid that in the cold light of the reality of setting up the register with the resulting few, if any, benefits, I would recommend that it should be turned down.

Mr. Lawlor: The arguments we have just heard, Mr. Speaker, are not impressive in this particular case.

Mr. Singer: Right.

Mr. Lawlor: The raising of the bugaboo of all these horrendous costs that are being laid out in front of us, and the statement that that information is readily available in a dispersed form at every registry office and, as the minister himself said, internally to each ministry, and that it needs simply to bring it together and collate it and set up a register for the perusal of the public in this particular regard—these cannot be an overwhelming or supervening consideration in the particular context.

Mr. Singer: Right.

Mr. Lawlor: That doesn't mean I'm going to vote for your bloody resolution.

Mr. Bullbrook: You have been very obstinate lately.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Hang in there, Pat.

Mr. Lawlor: Property is acquired in four ways. First, by direct purchase: a government agency acting as a government agent approaches individuals and buys in the normal way by way of an offer to purchase. The second way is expropriation. The third way is by way of option agreement. The option agreement is broken into two parts: There may be either full disclosure on one side, or an anonymous buyer coming in to purchase under the option. For various reasons, this is the way that speculators largely operate. Then there is the fourth way, whereby an anonymous buyer directly approaches without the option concept operating.

In this legislation there is more than meets the eye, just beneath the surface. Do we approve of the anonymous operator? Do we approve of the government, in certain circumstances, albeit however narrow, approaching individuals under a pseudonym with the use of real estate agents and others to purchase property, largely, of course, in terms of land assembly? Do the members think that's a legitimate practice? No one questions that it is very often subject to abuse, as we've had many instances of—Pickering, among others.

Under the member for Wilson Heights' resolution, that, in my opinion, would be ruled out in the future. There would have to be full, fair and timely disclosure, and that's it.

[4:00]

Mr. Bullbrook: After the fact.

Mr. Singer: After the fact—after the fact. Read it again.

Mr. Lawlor: After the fact.

Mr. Singer: Right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Read what you are saying.

Mr. Lawlor: The only real objection one can have to the legislation is the time limitation written in. The three months. Land assemblies can take two years, possibly three if they are fairly massive. And therefore the three-month acquisition would let the cat out of the bag with respect to the proposals of the government touching a certain geographical area. That could act detrimentally on the government.

In other words, there could be a loss of revenue. The property might very easily have been bought somewhat cheaper. The resolution can't be amended—it has to stand holus bolus as it appears before this House. It says three months—three months it must be. Therefore we have to make up our minds as to the detrimental effect of that over against the withholding of information which is vital to the public.

In line with the freedom of information statute of a week or two ago, or last week, the full disclosure principle commends itself—certainly to me, and I trust to my party—in the largest way. Therefore you have to come down on the side that whatever the private sector may do with respect to withholding information—hiding behind pseudonyms or whatever they do—the government must act fairly, openly, and with respect to its own citizens, and take the risks of that.

What is being said in this resolution, therefore, is that really only one way is available—well, two. The open approach to the in-

dividual vendor, or the expropriation route. There really isn't anything very wrong with that. While the Expropriation Act does not contain guidelines, court decisions down through the years and various recommendations coming out of the Ombudsman and other reports touching Pickering and other places, begin to give the nascent form of the norms whereby honest dealings will be guided and the government—

Certainly, by the time we're through with Pickering, that information can be fully extrapolated and available to anyone. The motion of the member for Wilson Heights forwards that particular cause and therefore it is in line with the current thinking on this matter. Having presented, as I see it, the various arguments on both sides touching this issue, I think on the whole, in all fairness, the government has to weight it in favour of the public, in favour of disclosure, in favour of open-handed and even dealing with the general public, even if some loss occurs to the public Treasury in this regard. It is far better to have a government with integrity and honesty in its dealings, rather than the weaseling around in the backyards of the nation, seeking to extract small favours and traducing its own people.

Mr. Nixon: I believe it's obvious that even if we exclude the Crown lands of northern Ontario, the government of Ontario is by far the largest landowner—land holder and owner —in this province. Probably it is true to say that the government stands to be called the greatest profiteer in the business of buying and selling land. If they proceed with the patchwork policy that the Minister of Housing, didn't announce but more or less referred to obliquely a few weeks ago—as he finds himself the holder, the minister responsible for these large acreages, which now seem to be redundant as far as any kind of useful programme or co-ordinated policy is concerned—he announces that he is going to sell these off, sometimes to the original holder of the property. But if those people are unavailable or don't want the land, then presumably they will be sold, in most instances, to the highest bidder.

It's interesting to look at the names chiselled in the marble of the halls of this building and learn that from the earliest times, even when Canada had only five or six members, there was always a commissioner of Crown lands. The problems were different in those days, of course, since much of the arable farm land was then held by the Crown. But as we see the acquisitions in recent years, it's obvious that once again the government of the province is going into the business of holding land and developing it in a bigger and bigger way.

My colleague, whose motion we're debating, referred to the Ontario Land Corporation, which, I understand, holds just four parcels. The South Cayuga land, I submit to you, will never be put to any significant use by the government of the province. I don't know what they're going to do with it. They may resell it. They may just make it into a park and call it a John White memorial—I don't know. But that particular land in the former county of Haldimand is not going to be of significant governmental use, I would say, for the next half century.

Right close to it, as you're aware, Mr. Speaker, is another property also purchased by the government at about the same time, which the minister is trying to elevate into the status of a new city. I don't know what's going to happen in that regard, but at least there is some validity for the continuation of the holding of that land for some period of time.

But it concerns me very deeply that the policy of the government has been to allow the acquisition of these large properties without reference to any local planning authority; without reference to any official plan—even without reference to the other members of the cabinet over these years. The record of the purchase of these city sites that I've referred to—even the purchase of the Pickering property, which has been so much a matter of controversy in the last 18 months —is an indication that the government does need the constraints of the knowledge that they must report clearly and publicy on all of these acquisitions, the prices paid, and the purpose of the land.

We can, of course, talk about the fourth property that is owned by the Ontario Land Corporation down in Edwardsburgh. This, I would say, is more or less part of the inheritance that John White left us as taxpayers, when, it seems to me, those purchasers were made on his own judgement exclusively. He might have conferred with the Premier, but as Treasurer he then had the power to go forward without even the consent of his cabinet colleagues.

It has already been pointed out that as for being are area for industrial expansion and development, Edwardsburgh was simply a joke, and it still is. And yet the government still continues to hold these properties.

The Ministry of Housing holds properties dotted all across the province, and no doubt they have some kind of registry of those lands, although the Ministry of Housing and the Ontario Housing Corporation have been notoriously secretive as far as information pertaining to the lands is concerned. I know of 1,000 acres that was bought in Brantford township, five years ago now, I guess, for which there has been no known programme of development—no consultation with local planning authorities. It sits there as a beautiful green rolling piece of property, and the ministry has given no indication of what they wanted to do.

The 3,000 acres near Kitchener was bought under very strange circumstances by one of the minister's predecessors going back about 10 years, and at the time it was, certainly questioned seriously in this House, but there was never any legitimate answer given to the representatives of the people as to the reasons for purchase or the details of the purchase.

The Minister for Government Services indicated that Hydro is one of the larger land holders. That's true. It just bought a strip of property through my farm, for example, for a second high-tension power line. But I can't see any problem in listing those lands. The minister indicates that it would take a stack of information 20 feet high, or something like that, in order to list the location of the properties and all of the details asked. Well, I would suggest that it's incredible that the government is objecting, on the basis of the cost involved, to having a registry which would tell them what properties they do own. How can we ever have any co-ordinated approach by the government to the development of the province, if they don't even know what lands they hold? And they hold these lands in every township in every part of the province. The Ministry of Transportation and Communications is another example. They probably buy and sell more parcels, if not a large acreage, than any other agency of government. I believe it would be essential for any citizen simply to go to see what properties are held, what their values were, and what the purpose was in the first instance.

To go on with the list, the Ministry of Natural Resources holds title to a great area of parkland. The Treasurer himself, in one of his franker moments a few months ago, felt that we had committed too much of our moneys, our budget, to the purchase of these lands and indicated that there would have to be some more orderly approach as far as that was concerned.

I feel that the registry that is proposed under the motion before us would at least give some indication to the various ministers who have these responsibilities that they do not act independently, that they do have to justify the purchase and all of the ancillary information associated with the purchase in a public document. In that way I believe that it would be a salutary pressure in the reduction of the kind of bad judgement which the taxpayers have had to pay for in recent years.

When I say bad judgement I say it advisedly, because there is no doubt that the 10,000 acres in Edwardsburgh is simply a waste of money. Very few miles from there the member for Carleton-Grenville (Mr. Irvine), when he was mayor of Prescott, undertook to develop an excellent industrial park associated with Prescott, right on the shores of the St. Lawrence River. And yet his cabinet colleagues come along and buy 10,000 acres for industrial purposes which cannot ever really be put into any significant use.

Surely we can cut down on the results of this bad judgement if the responsible minister knows that his judgement is going to be brought forward for public scrutiny in this way.

I do believe as well that it would reduce the injustice to land owners. Surely if the whole approach to the purchase of the property in Pickering had been on the basis of revealing the facts and figures as required under this resolution, we would not now have the confrontation between the Minister of Housing and the Ombudsman, which made it necessary to appoint a royal commission. The royal commission is there, but they don't seem to be doing anything.

Mr. Gaunt: There's some doubt whether they can.

Mr. Nixon: I see that the Ombudsman is very much concerned indeed at the lack of governmental action in this matter. We may find that that controversy which has brought into question the responsibilities vis-à-vis the Minister of Housing and the Ombudsman is going to flare up again.

This would have been unnecessary if there had been some indication of clear policy direction in the government when they decided to get into the Pickering business which has proven to be such a mess, such an expensive albatross hanging around the necks

of the government and therefore a cost on the taxpayer.

A waste of money? The hon. member who indicated that the government can't support this resolution has indicated they don't want to waste money by simply having a registry which would indicate to the government and others what these lands holdings are.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would do away with the kinds of waste of money that must embarrass the ministry when they think about what has happened in the past. I surely hope that there is a commitment among the individuals in the ministry not to allow that kind of super arrogance to lead them into the sorts of purchase without adequate planning that has gone on in the past.

The government says information about specific pieces of land is always available if you ask for it. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are aware that opposition spokesmen have asked for the details of the purchase of properties associated with Browndale. For many months, in fact years, the information has been promised, but it has never been forthcoming. The purchases are made with public funds and the information has not been adequately made available to those in the House who are concerned with this matter.

I would hope that such a registry would form one of the basic pieces of information which would lead the government to promulgate a plan for the province of Ontario. This too was associated with John White and I have been very critical of his lack of judgement in the acquisition of properties heretofore. But I do believe that the concept of a plan for Ontario, which is and has been Liberal policy for many years, is something that must be associated with this concept of the registry of land.

[4:15]

It was very interesting to me on the night of the budget, Tuesday night, when the Treasurer introduced former Treasurers in the gallery, when he introduced in the same breath, the Hon. James Allan and the Hon. John White. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, when there was some controversy over the acquisition of the South Cayuga property, reporters had phoned Jim Allan who indicated it was that bad judgement that had resulted in his defeat in the constituency of Haldiman-Norfolk. It might have been part of it but, of course, I am prepared to say that his defeat was as a result not only of the policies of the Liberal Party, but the—

Mr. Shore: But a good candidate.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: —excellence of the candidate who was representing our party at that time. When this was reported to the former Treasurer, John White, he said: "Well, of course you can't expect anything else because isn't Jim Allan 81 years old?" or some gratuitous comment—

Mr. Bullbrook: About as low a blow as he could make.

Mr. Nixon: —such as that. Actually the people in those areas concerned had a chance to pass judgement on the decisions made by the former Treasurers who up until now have had the main responsibility for the acquisition of land. They found that judgement not only wanting, but seriously expensive and injurious to the best interests of the province of Ontario.

I do not agree in any way with the complaint put forward by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain that this resolution would be inordinately expensive. Somebody wrote that speech for him. This is about the only hook they could hang their objections on and it is a very inadequate reason to oppose the motion. I would hope, however, that the motion will be supported by both opposition parties and, as it passes here, the government, being a responsible government, will accept the direction of the Legislature and establish the registry as is called for in the resolution.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: First of all, I want to say I had hoped we might have the remarks this afternoon dealing primarily with the contents of the motion that has been introduced by the hon. member for Wilson Heights. Unfortunately, and I think unnecessarily, it has become some reason to charge off on a vicious attack on individuals who are no longer in the Legislature and to bring into play again many of the things that have been said by hon. members for the past number of years that I am familiar with. Certainly I have listened to many of the comments of the member for Wilson Heights with a great deal of interest in my estimates. I thought, being the author of this particular motion, he would in fact deal with the specifics of it.

I want to say immediately I find the motion not that difficult to recognize as having some merit. I have said in the past there are a number of things relating to the listing of properties and purchases for which we should be finding a better way to make that in-

formation available. However, I do think, with respect, it is worthy to note that much of the information the hon. member for Wilson Heights presented here in his remarks as to specific pieces of land, prices, who the owners were and from whom they were purchased was provided to the hon. member by Ontario Housing Corporation at his request.

I have tabled in this Legislature a great deal of information dealing with land parcels, their purchases, the dates of purchases, the price paid and the persons from whom they were purchased. So I can't buy the comments made by one of the hon. members that everything was notoriously secretive. I can say that we have in fact attempted to make that information available.

I see some value in the philosophy behind the motion that could result in a uniform collection of the information concerning land purchase and sales and an easy access to such information. Right now it is difficult for many people to obtain that. I think that's a goal that perhaps a large land buyer like the government of Ontario should be interested in. But I do believe that as the motion stands on the order paper, there are a number of major difficulties and, for that reason, I would like later in my remarks to present a suggestion that perhaps the hon. member and others might agree to discuss with me.

I'm not going to go into some of the points that were raised by my colleague, the Minister of Government Services. I do say, though, that we have to take into consideration just the amount of work that would be entailed in the actual reading of the hon. member's motion. As I read the motion—and I certainly bow to his interpretation of his own motion—it would appear that what he is asking government to do—all land purchasing ministries, agencies or boards thereof—to list in this registry centre all land transactions since the beginning of time as far as the province is concerned.

I think that the hon. member for Wilson Heights, being a lawyer and knowledgeable in these areas, would recognize that that would be a very, very difficult chore to complete. Albeit the member for Lakeshore has indicated all of this information is available in registry offices, but even at that, I think he would agree that a tremendous amount of work would have to be done to bring all of those transactions into play that have taken place over these many, many years.

I also would like the hon. member to consider that we can, I think, get this information over a shorter term and still accomplish what I think his motion really wants to accomplish—that is the establishment of this sort of registry. I don't think we should say we will start it tomorow or a week from now or six months from now. I think we should go back a reasonable length of time and produce that information.

I think I would certainly be in a position to examine a proposition that, rather than using a central registry, a standard purchase and sales recording format could be established and applied to the various ministries, their boards and agencies, and that a central access office should be established for use by interested parties. But in any system we set up, the guidelines, I think, would have to be established along the line of what the hon. member for Lakeshore referred to.

I am concerned that in the course of acquiring land for a large project, the government will acquire it a parcel at a time. Despite the criticism that I thought I noted in the hon. member for Lakeshore's comments, I think it is legitimate for government to not find itself in a bind and to be subject—because it's the government—to the pressures of land values suddenly taking tremendous jumps. We should be in a position to go out and purchase land through an agent, so that the actual purchaser remains unknown.

For example, if we were going to be acquiring land for a park site or a highway right of way that we may want to acquire over a period of two or three years, and we acquire it as the parcels become available, if we could do that, then I think we can continue to keep land at a reasonable price. I don't have to tell you gentlemen and ladies of this House that that may not be the case if you have to register each parcel purchased three months after it has been purchased. In view of that in a few moments I'd like to talk a little bit more.

As the government is a volume buyer and seller of land, it is possible in some instances that we may be dealing with real estate people, land acquisition agents, who may, in an effort to do a large volume of business, suggest that they would be prepared to work for a lower fee. I think we should be able to take advantage of that. However, I do have some concerns that bother me in that at the other end of the coin if we don't want to list the lower fees we could be accused—quite properly, I suppose—that we're

not listing the higher fees that might be paid. So, on first blush, I was not too keen about the listing of fees. If there's a standard fee, that's what should be charged. There should be no problem with putting that into the records—including, I might add, the legal fees which usually are extremely, horrendously high—beyond all reason.

Mr. Singer: I mentioned them. Don't shake your head at me. They are in my resolution.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On point (i) in the resolution, I would suggest that rather than having a registry open to any interested person we should decide here to give some thought to the degree of information that would be provided to various types of inquiries. I'm not too sure whether we would, in fact, want to allow any individual full access and my reasoning for that is this.

We have people in our society who are knowledgeable of land transactions. This is their lifestyle. This is how they make their living. They work in this environment day after day. They will be taking advantage of this and I think it would afford them an opportunity to get information, albeit available to anyone, but not that the average citizen really would take the time to find out. This would give such people, I think, an advantage of buying property where they may be aware of something happening and in this way getting an unfair advantage of the present property owners. I would like to see us deal with that and not necessarily have it open to any interested person; rather, we would decide that we could limit that to specific people, specific groups, or they would have to show cause that they really need that information; also to weed out the frivolous things which would be time-consuming and costly to the taxpayers.

Land for the Ministry of Housing is purchased, as you well know, by the Ministry of Government Services. If my colleague would agree, I would certainly be prepared to support a directive to the Management Board requesting that the matter be reviewed and appropriate recommendations—perhaps, along the lines I have suggested—be made to Management Board and to cabinet.

I realize that what I'm going to ask is not in order and that I may well be turned down, but I would ask the hon. members if they would give me their unanimous consent that I might propose an amendment to the hon. member's resolution and have an opportunity to discuss it with him.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Do the hon. members agree to give unanimous consent to the minister to place an amendment to the resolution?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes moved that the introductory words of the first sentence of the resolution be amended to read as follows: "The government should establish a system of registration for all properties purchased by the province of Ontario or by any of its boards or agencies on or after January 1, 1970, which system of registration shall set out the following:"

Hon. Mr. Rhodes further moved that sentence two of the resolution be amended by adding to it the following words: "... provided that when more than one parcel of land is being acquired for a project, the registration is not required until within three months after the date of the last acquisition."

Mr. Acting Speaker: May I point out to the hon. member that his time has expired?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And I'm expired as well. Thank you.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is that a commitment?

Mr. Acting Speaker: To save time the Chair will refrain from rereading the amendment; we can deal with the amendment and the resolution at the appropriate time.

Does the hon. member for Riverdale wish to speak to the original resolution and the amendment?

Mr. Renwick: With your agreement, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak both to the resolution and to the resolution as amended, if I may.

I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate for three or four reasons. One is because I very rarely have occasion to agree with my colleague, the member for Wilson Heights and, therefore, it's a kind of memorable occasion for me. I don't know whether he would consider it in that light or not.

Mr. Nixon: It makes him doubt his position.

Mr. Renwick: Secondly, because I do appreciate the complexity of the start-up provisions that are required in establishing any form of central registry, we have no hesitation in saying—or I have no hesitation in saying, for my part—that we certainly accept the proposed amendments indicated in the motion made by the Minister of Housing.

I also agree with his comment as to the availability of the information and the bona fide nature of its use. Again, I think that is a matter which, if this scheme were adopted in broad outline, could be accomplished. There is, for example in corporate law, a provision by which a person can get a list of the shareholders of a corporation by filing a necessary statutory declaration stating that it is for a bona fide and legitimate purpose and not merely curiosity or for some illegitimate purpose or for reasons which he claims entitle him to that information because he is affected, or interested by it.

In the working out of a scheme for establishing this kind of central registry, along the guidelines indicated by the member for Wilson Heights in his resolution, a number of those matters can be dealt with.

[4:30]

I certainly understand, because I extend to the Minister of Housing the utmost good faith, the difficulty it is to resurrect from the government files information about particular transactions. I have, standing in my name on the order paper, an inquiry of the ministry with respect to the consideration paid for the acquisition by Ontario Housing of a piece of property in 1972. The minister filed, a day or two ago, an interim answer saying the answer would be forthcoming in due course but it would take some time to get the information for me. So I don't underestimate the complexity of providing for a register.

Certainly, from my point of view, whether 1970 is the appropriate date or not, the complexities of establishing such a registry would determine what a reasonable date would be. January 1, 1970, appears to me to be a very reasonable kind of a date.

I think in addition, however, the ancient history of the government, if such a scheme were adopted, would indicate to me that it would be wise to have a central registry that showed the land owned by the government of Ontario without any of the details of the particular transactions by which it was acquired. Thus, in one central registry it would be possible, apart from Crown lands, to indicate quite clearly that these are all the lands owned by the government of the province of Ontario other than the exclusion of the lands, say, in northern Ontario which are governed by a different statute.

With those comments out of the way, I did want to take the opportunity of resurrecting a report of the Law Reform Commission dealing with that esoteric and arcane piece of legislation known as The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, simply for the purpose of indicating there are certain analogies that can be drawn between the traditional prohibition against, for example charitable institutions of one kind of another owning land, either for their own use and occupation or for the purpose of investment, and the prohibition contained in that Act.

In this day and age it is not straining too much to say that government at all levels has become a significant holder of land in mortmain. It doesn't pay any taxes; it pays substitute amounts for it. There is no reason why, if there is a prohibition against charitable institutions holding land for investment purposes as distinct from for their actual use and occupation—and indeed, in charitable institution cases even for those purposes—that some form of criterion such as that should not apply equally well to the government.

For example, I would think that a central registry, to be of some use, should show that the land is being acquired for the actual use and occupation of the government. I think the register should disclose the purpose for which it's acquired—whether it's acquired for the purpose of implementing a policy of the government. I think consideration perhaps should be given at some point to having a statute of the government simply requiring that if the policy has not been implemented within a reasonable period of time—as is the case for corporations, a seven-year period—the government would be required to dispose of the property, so that the government is not involved in holding lands simply for the purpose of holding land when the purpose for which it was acquired originally has ceased to be a feasible objective for government to pursue. There are, of course, without me mentioning it, a number of current examples of that kind of problem.

I think it is extremely important that we understand that if done properly by this government, such a central register might very well provide the pro forma method by which the regional municipalities and the other municipalities throughout Ontario would also be required to set up a central registry as to the lands which they own. Strangely enough, The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act seems to exempt municipal corporations in one way or another, by various methods of exemption, even though municipal corporations are covered under that particular statute.

I have only one further comment. If this is to go forward, then I think we have to have, as I have mentioned on a number of occasions, an adequate definition of boards and agencies of the government, because no one at

the present time can in fact determine what is a board or agency of the government.

For example, The Crown Agency Act, which is a very short, compendious statute of three sections, does provide specifically that certainly some kinds of universities are boards and agencies of the government. I think in our case, we would like to require public boards and agencies to maintain their own registers of land which they have acquired, whether they are universities or whether they are other public bodies.

I noticed, for example, in the report of the Law Reform Commission dealing with The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, that it says we should get rid of the ancient statute. But if government policy wants to have a monitoring and control of the ownership of land in the province of Ontario, either by aliens on the one hand or by other institutions of government, then it should set up a specific method by which that can be achieved.

It would be my hope that out of this resolution of the member for Wilson Heights there very well not only might be a register established by the unilateral act of the government to do it, but it might be possible to begin to think of defining in a statute the terms and conditions under which such a register would be established and requiring, in due course, that such registers be established for public corporations of one kind or another, be they universities, museums or other types of institutions. Certainly, it should be extended, in my view, to the municipal governments across the province of Ontario.

All of this means to me that a useful starting point would be for the government to work out a system and then have it extended much more broadly. For example, every now and then we have come through the assembly a provision exempting public bodies from the prohibition against their acquiring land for investment purposes. Why it went through, I don't know, but apparently the University of Western Ontario has such a statute, and I believe there are other educational institutions which can acquire land for investment purposes and not just for their actual use and occupation. This is the standard provision that is generally applied under various types of mortmain legislation.

For those reasons, I welcome the resolution and I certainly would support it as amended.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia. May I draw to his attention that the time for this debate will expire at approximately 4:40.

Hon. Mr. Norton: He is the only one who can do it.

Mr. Bullbrook: I've always been known and appreciated in this House for the brevity of my remarks, and I'm going to be muchly appreciated today.

I wanted, if I may, to agree with the Minister of Housing in his censure to us that we dealt not so much with the bill but with the background material. But I ask him to understand that after a decade on my part of attempting to try to find out information, I'm sure my colleague from Wilson Heights can be understood in wanting to point out some of the problems.

I don't mean to attack someone who is not here to defend himself, but I had to sit here during the budget of 1971 and watch the then Treasurer, girded in vainglory before the television lights, talking to us about his new city. When I find out he's wasted $32 million of public funds, it's hard for us not to feel some degree of partisan venom in that context. So bear with us.

But the minister is quite right, we should deal mainly with the resolution. The first part is the register for the purpose of public information. The second and I think most important part of the resolution is the establishment of clear guidelines dictating the acquisition of lands for public purposes.

I want to record my total agreement and support, and the support of our party, for the amendment to the resolution, subject to one caveat on my part, if I may. I don't think 1970 goes back far enough. I think we should try to go back another decade if at all possible. Some of the land acquisitions that have concerned me and my colleagues in this party took place prior to 1970, and I think we should be entitled to that information. But that's a minor matter. As my colleague has pointed out, this is done by resolution and not by bill.

I direct myself to the Minister of Government Services. We attempted to be flexible here. I don't want to be offensive to him, but he tells us he can't personally accept this because of the expenditure of 1.8 million man-hours and $12 million. I'm going to leave this assembly shortly and I'm going to practise law so I tell him to hire me to sue his speech writer. The land titles office in Toronto handles well over 100,000 land acquisition transfers at a cost of less than $500,000, and we're not asking for all that type of information. As I say, what we want is an ability on the part of the public to know

why the government acquired land and how it acquired land.

I want to compliment my colleague from Wilson Heights, then I must sit down. I want to compliment him, and I want to compliment the official opposition and the government's flexibility in this respect. I think it's a move in the right direction. Minority government might be coming to an end but it shows that it works and it shows these new rules do work. I think the integrity of purpose and the sincerity of the Minister of Housing in putting forward the amendment and accepting the principle of the resolution will stand us all in good stead in the future and will inhibit us from decimating each other annually during his estimates.

I think it's really important. In the days we had to deal with Emerson Clow—again a man not here who can defend himself—I have been subjected to, I felt, the most offensive type of response from the board of directors of the Housing Corporation, with that attitude of, "Lookit, we know, and we know what's best." I want to see us get away from that. I want to see the government get away from it in the future. It doesn't have to exist. The opposition is entitled to know. I think this is the type of step that is in the right direction.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might find an appropriate place to conclude his remarks.

Mr. Bullbrook: I was just going to compliment the Minister of Housing once more on one other matter and I think it's appropriate I don't do that.

Mr. Acting Speaker: This concludes the debate on Mr. Singer's resolution. The disposition of it will be dealt with later this afternoon.

ELECTION FINANCES REFORM AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Johnson moved second reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend The Election Finances Reform Act.

Mr. Johnson: I have sponsored this bill simply because I'm deeply concerned that every single riding in this province and every single voter have available information about provincial elections during the election period. We all know how important elections are to our parliamentary form of government. Elections give every voter the opportunity to review the government's performance, take a look at the opposition's alternatives, meet his local candidates and decide just whom he wants running Queen's Park for the next four or five years.

In a province the size of ours, meeting the voters is no mean task. It is getting more and more difficult. If one can't speak with everyone personally, the only alternative is to speak to them through the press—send them one's message by the electronic media or the printed word. The printed word is what this bill is specifically concerned about.

The intent of The Election Finances Reform Act, in limiting political advertising to the 21 days preceding the day before the election, was to reduce overall spending. Since media advertising has now become the largest single expenditure in most election campaigns, this was a good decision and one I can applaud. However, in deciding upon the 21-day time period, that does not consider the plight of the weekly newspapers or, more importantly, the plight of the many people in this province who are served only by weekly papers. In fact, there are about 30 ridings in the province where that is the case. These are ridings not served by daily papers. The majority of weekly papers publish on Wednesday.

Through my discussions with various concerned groups, I have found it is virtually impossible to switch to another publishing date. As the papers are printed at central offset plants, rescheduling a large number of them all at one plant would be a horrendous task. It would almost be easier to switch the traditional voting day from Thursday to Friday. What this means is simply that, although weeklies would be able to publish their election issue, it would be devoid of any political advertising or party platforms for a full nine days before the election. One can see how ridiculous that would be and has been.

[4:45]

To me it doesn't seem fair that weekly newspapers should be placed at such a disadvantage to the dailies and the electronic media during election week, the crucial campaign period. The latter are able to carry advertising and serve their audience well simply by virtue of their frequency and their operations. At the same time, the weeklies are denied this right.

What this bill proposes is that the 21-day maximum time period for political advertising be extended to 22 days for any bona fide weekly newspaper. This 22-day period would end immediately before polling day. The

benefits of such a move are quite clear. The main ones, of course, relate to the information available to citizens in making reasoned choices when they vote. The other benefits are equally obvious: Weekly newspapers will gain thousands of advertising dollars if this bill is passed.

No incentive to small business is too small to be considered by this House. The weeklies employ 6,000 Ontario residents and represent a capital investment of $85 million. Running a solvent newspaper is also no easy task, especially a community newspaper. These papers provide an invaluable service to the community they serve, linking the residents with the local governments, keeping them informed about local events and promoting a community spirit in their own inimitable way. There is nothing like them; I know, I have about a dozen in my own riding. Many of my colleagues on both the government and opposition sides of the House share the same experience. Perhaps that is why I was so emphatic when I first heard of the Ontario Weekly Newspapers Association's attempt to get The Election Finances Reform Act changed.

I know what problems the weeklies face during elections. Having served their communities well between elections, weeklies should be allowed to serve them well at election time. At present, not only are they unable to inform the public adequately but weeklies that really need the money lose a great deal of potential advertising revenue.

The weeklies' association has waged a strong campaign through its president, Bob Schreyer, and its executive director, William Taylor. As Mr. Schreyer said recently, "It is important that weekly publishers encourage their local MPPs to support this bill. This change will go a long way towards keeping people informed."

As a matter of fact, my colleague, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. McCague) and I met with Mr. Taylor and his delegation. These men had done their homework, and it didn't take them long to convince us that their cause was well worth fighting for.

Mr. Nixon: George had done his homework?

Mr. Johnson: As I said before, I've had personal experience during my own campaign and well understand the plight of the weekly papers.

Let me quote for a moment from Justice Hugo Black, writing in 1944. He said: "The widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources is essential to the welfare of the public." This is my belief, which I think is shared by members on all sides of the House. So far as it is possible, whether it be through party politics or this Act, we must ensure that diversity of choice is available in Ontario. The change I am recommending is non-partisan and must be so if it is to have any effect.

Mr. Samis: When's the election?

Mr. Moffatt: I like that "diversity of choice" part.

Mr. Johnson: The Election Finances Reform Act itself is an excellent piece of legislation. I am justifiable proud of that Act, an Act to which members of all three parties in this House contributed. We've been through one election with this Act and have seen just how effective it can be. We've also had an opportunity, through viewing it in practice, to see just where it can be improved. That is what I feel the change I propose will do—improve it.

In the next election, in 1979 or thereabouts—

Mr. Breithaupt: I like the "thereabouts" part.

Mr. Moffatt: Author! Author!

Hon. Mr. Norton: Don't be provocative .

Mr. Johnson: —we will want to run our campaign under the most equitable and efficient Act.

Mr. Good: You won't be here in 1979.

Mr. Johnson: We will also want to ensure that everyone is encouraged to know about and participate in the electoral process. Stop and think of the people in those 30 or so ridings who are served only by weekly papers —that 24 per cent of the Ontario population who don't subscribe to dailies. Will they be encouraged to vote if they don't hear from the candidates for nine days before voting day? What sort of campaign fever will they catch? A pretty cold one, if you ask me.

Stop for a moment and think of those community newspapers where the staff put their hearts and souls into their work. Is it right to deny them the same opportunities afforded to the larger dailies? I believe the weeklies will continue to give us the fair coverage that they always have in the past, whether this bill is passed or not. Objective journalism has generally been their style. But the individuals who've worked so hard for this change will be justifiably discouraged—

Mr. Ferrier: You're going to get headlines for this speech.

Mr. Johnson: —if this bill is not passed. Grass-roots input has its place in this legislative process. This bill is just one example of such grass-roots input.

It is the Legislature's job to look very carefully at bills like this. For my part, after having considered the matter at length, I think voting in favour of this bill is the only course to take. If this bill is passed, it will allow the weekly papers to participate effectively in the campaign during that crucial election week. It will allow my fellow members and me, and every other candidate for provincial office, to speak directly to all constituents in the province. It will also allow those people who depend upon their community paper for news an opportunity to review the candidates and issues before they cast their ballots.

Isn't this what our parliamentary form of government is all about? Isn't this the very basis of our democratic society: an open society and a free press, with every voter being given the chance, conscientiously and knowledgeably, to cast his ballot?

In closing, let me quote from a distinguished Canadian, unfortunately of the wrong political colour.

Mr. Moffatt: Jack Horner.

Mr. Johnson: In his committee's report on the mass media, Senator Keith Davey notes—

Mr. Ferrier: We thought it was Jack Horner.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Some authority.

Mr. Bain: Surely you could have got one of Tommy Douglas's quotes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The interjections are not adding to the debate.

Mr. Johnson: Senator Davey notes that the more separate voices we have telling us what's going on, telling us how we're doing, telling us how we should be doing, the more effectively we can govern ourselves. There's no question but this bill encourages such a sentiment. I would like to express my strong support of this bill and this sentiment and request that my colleagues in this Legislature, on every side of the House, vote to support it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham East.

Mr. Moffatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, My colleague says he's the only one who applauded, so I'll thank him as well.

I'm pleased this afternoon to join in supporting the bill put forward by the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel. I think that in his opening remarks he has made a number of particularly cogent points. He has also opened the principle of the bill to the kind of discussion I hoped we would have, that is, that instead of talking about the narrow business of what day or which day one can publish that sort of thing, we should be talking about the right of the public to have access to information from sources such as the weekly newspapers.

The problem that has occurred has been that the publishing day was established and The Election Finances Reform Act has precluded the use of the weekly newspapers in that last week unless they were fortunate enough to have gone to the press on Monday. It makes for a very difficult situation.

In my own riding which is extensively covered by weekly newspapers upon which most of the residents depend for the major portion of their news, the problem in the last election was a particularly difficult one. The question of revenue aside, I think the question of information is the one which has been raised and the one with which this House should deal.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Do you run one in your constituency office too?

Mr. Moffatt: I urge members, even the hon. minister, to support the legislation. I think everybody in this House at some point during an election campaign decides the pros and cons as to whether he should publish a new weekly newspaper. It goes under many headings, but the most often used one, I guess, is something called The Leader, for obvious political reasons. In some few cases it was called The Liberal, but only in rather disastrous circumstances.

There seems to be a very important point here that I would like to emphasize. The right of information is one we could expand substantially. I urge, from conversations with the weeklies in my own riding, that one of the things we might well do, which doesn't even require legislation, is place all the weekly newspapers in this province automatically on the mailing list for Hansard. In talking to those people, I discover that they can get Hansard only if they send in a special request and plead with some person such as yourself, Mr. Speaker, to have Hansard sent to them. I would recommend, sir, with

all respect that that is one move you might well make in the spirit presented by the previous speaker that it does open up this whole question to more information and makes available to those small papers a source they don't normally use.

I realize some weekly newspapers do subscribe to Hansard and have prevailed upon you to have it sent them, and that is fine. But a great many others are not aware that it is available. The dailies all seem to be aware that it is available and use quotes from Hansard extensively. It seems to me in this province when the weekly newspaper is read cover to cover rather than just the headlines, because it stays around for an entire week, it might well be that we could urge the use of more extensive quotes from Hansard and some coverage of some of the things in this Legislature. Toronto is the legislative centre, but it is certainly not the demographic centre of the province of Ontario. The things that take place in this House are quite often missed by people who live at some distance and depend on a weekly newspaper.

This whole business of information is rather mystifying. I note that the member spoke of himself and one of his colleagues from the government party attending a meeting with the Ontario Weekly Newspapers Association. I would be interested in knowing when that meeting was because I have here the latest newsletter from the Ontario Weekly Newspapers Association. On page 12 in the column headed, "A few words from Bill Taylor," the following appears:

"The election expenses advertising Act was thoroughly discussed. Mr. Davis"—I gather that is the Premier—"recognized the problem and admitted our industry was getting the short end of the stick." Along with a lot of other industries, I might add parenthetically.

Mr. Reid: He doesn't discriminate.

Mr. Moffatt: "The difficulty in amending the Act stems from not wanting to throw the complete Act open for other possible changes." Isn't that incredible? "It was strongly felt a private member's bill would have the best chance of success."

I sincerely hope this private member's bill is indeed a private member's bill put forward by the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel and not put forward by the government under the guise of being a private member's bill. I sincerely hope that is the case.

Mr. Shore: You are the only one who thinks that.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Of course it is.

Mr. Moffatt: I expect that that is the case.

Mr. Reid: It should be government policy, is what he is trying to say?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Durham East is the only one who has the floor. He has a limited time so give him all his time.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He is being provocative.

[5:00]

Mr. Moffatt: I'd be interested in knowing just when the meeting that the member referred to took place because this particular meeting at which the Premier is supposed to have made these comments took place on February 24 of this year. I just wonder what we are being asked to support.

In the same column there is a longer reference as well made to this whole business of freedom of information. Oddly enough, the Ontario Weekly Newspapers Association agrees that the freedom to information—of access to information by the public and by weekly newspapers—is one principle it regards as being important and it would like to see some action.

I commend this little editorial page to the members opposite. They will certainly enjoy it because it makes some rather flattering remarks about certain of the cabinet ministers, as well, in addition to that one little part.

The point I want to make in this is that there obviously are a good number of changes which could be made in The Election Expenses Act. I suspect we would have been better off had we had a piece of legislation introduced in this session which could have cleared up some of the difficulties around that particular Act.

The member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel has, with his private member's bill, pointed out one of the more obvious ones. It was obvious in the last election. I really can't understand what the reasoning was, other than that somebody wanted to make sure that the other media people didn't get some of the funds that they felt rightfully theirs directed out into the rural parts of the community. I just don't know how that whole thing happened, and I would be interested.

I also don't understand why the commission, in its recommendations, did not recommend this change as well. It seems to me to be an eminently sensible one and I can't understand why it wouldn't have recom-

mended it. It certainly was widely recommended across the province after the last election.

The problem of mailing is one that I hope is not raised. Some member may decide that if we allow the printing to take place the mailing may leave the document or the paper to be delivered on election day. If it had to be published on the regular printing day and it had to be put in type and people would have access to what was in that paper before election day, I don't see where that is going to cause a problem.

There are a number of things which arrive in households on election day, some requested and some unasked, that some of us might object to from time to time. I think the whole business of explaining to the public the platforms of all the parties and the candidates running, is a very important one—one that needs to be fostered and brought forward as quickly as we can. I urge all members to support the bill. I, for one, think it makes eminently good sense.

Mr. Riddell: I rise in support of Bill 10, Mr. Speaker, and I want to compliment the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel for recognizing the inequities of the current legislation and for introducing the amendment that will solve a serious communications problem facing the weekly press of Ontario and candidates in any future Ontario provincial election.

I am sure many legislative members tend to treat the concerns of the community newspapers rather lightly. But I for one can appreciate the high profile that these weekly papers have in a riding such as mine as there are no less than nine weeklies disseminating reliable news in all areas of the Huron-Middlesex riding.

A recent study of Ontario weekly newspaper coverage, conducted by the highly qualified company of Clyde McDonald showed that about one household in four or 24 per cent received a weekly newspaper regularly but no daily or a daily only occasionally. This means that about 260,000 households in Ontario are regular subscribers to one or more weekly newspapers almost exclusively. The study also shows that an estimated 664,000 of the households surveyed in Ontario receive a weekly newspaper regularly.

Might I just point out a rather interesting comparison of weekly and daily newspaper penetration throughout Ontario. Weekly newspaper coverage varies according to region but it ranges from a low of 35 per cent households to a high of 88 per cent. The mean for Ontario is 64.4 per cent coverage or an estimated 691,300 households which regularly receive one or more weekly newspapers. Regular daily newspaper coverage ranges from a low of 42 per cent to a high of 80 per cent, for an average of 62 per cent in Ontario. An estimated 664,900 in Ontario receive one or more daily newspapers regularly.

Who would have thought that the penetration of weekly papers for the various sales areas under study was greater than for the daily newspapers? There has to be a reason for this, and I would say the acceptance of weekly papers by the communities throughout Ontario is an indication of the depth and reliability of the news contained in the weeklies. The weeklies are more concerned with individuals living in the community, and, in my estimation, the news is more objective than it is in the daily papers. Certainly, as far as I'm concerned, they do a better job of covering campaigns on a non-partisan basis than do the dailies.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Right on.

Mr. Riddell: Subscribing to both weeklies and dailies, I find there is a greater degree of mechanical competence displayed in the weekly papers—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Hear, hear. Attaboy, Jack. Sock it to them.

Mr. Riddell: —than there is in the daily papers. According to the study, an estimated 43 per cent of households in Ontario would have the opportunity to be exposed to advertising in daily newspapers if they were scheduled.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Did you hear that?

Mr. Riddell: And at the same time, if the Ontario weekly newspapers were scheduled, another 37 per cent of homes would be reached with the same potential, for a total of 80 per cent of homes throughout Ontario.

Mr. Shore: Keep it up, Jack.

Mr. Riddell: The fact of the matter is that 37 per cent of households would not have exposure to information about the campaign during the week of the election if the weekly papers were not permitted to advertise up to polling day.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tell us about the Toronto Sun and the terrible columnists.

Mr. Riddell: I sure would like to; I could spend two or three hours on that.

Mr. Samis: Which columnist in particular?

Mr. Riddell: Considering all these aspects, there should definitely be no discrimination shown against the weeklies in such matters as election advertisements. The weekly press remains a vital link between the candidate and the voter, especially in the rural ridings and, increasingly, in many of the suburban ridings. Of the 125 ridings in Ontario, there are 30 in which no daily newspaper is published and—although this is not to argue that daily papers are not read in these ridings—it cannot be a foregone conclusion that these dailies reach all potential voters. Indeed, recently-completed readership studies prove otherwise.

In many of the ridings where dailies are published, these surveys prove that the riding weeklies are an important link between candidates and voters. The goal of every weekly is to produce a high-quality newspaper that will contribute to the social and economic well-being of our communities. The only way the weeklies can remain economically viable is to be able to compete favourably with the daily papers in reporting that which is current. I have found the weeklies give much more coverage of election campaigns than do the dailies, particularly in the area that I represent. But the present wording of The Election Finances Reform Act militates against the candidates and voters who want to present and read the various parties' financial election statements as close to polling day as possible.

During a campaign, there are few weeklies that face the problems that dailies do, with the large number of candidates to be covered. Because their candidates are fewer and their interest primarily local, weekly newspapers are usually generous with their news space and provide an excellent vehicle for candidates to debate local issues as well as express their opinions on broad provincial matters. It has been suggested that weeklies could overcome the current problem due to the existing legislation by publishing on Tuesdays. Unfortunately, since the vast majority of weeklies in Ontario are printed at central web offset plants, rescheduling of these plants would be virtually impossible and the weekly publisher's work week would be backed up into Sunday.

The only answer is a change of legislation. We have an amendment here in Bill 10 that should be easily supportable by all members of the House. Acknowledging that these private members' bills permit members to vote as they see fit, I think I can safely say my colleagues in the Liberal Party support the amendment that would allow political advertising in community newspapers up to polling day. I hope all members of the House will see merit in this change to the existing legislation.

Mr. McCague: I rise, Mr. Speaker, to second the private member's bill put forward by my friend and colleague, the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel. I suppose I should point out very early that the remarks of the member for Durham East were very incorrect—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Again.

Mr. McCague: —as he presumed that the bill was as a result of a meeting that the Ontario Weekly Newspapers Association had with the Premier. Memory should probably serve him in this particular case, for he would recall that last year, in the spring session, the hon. member introduced the same bill, except it was Bill 42 at that particular time. I think that should clear up that difficulty.

I'm sure the impetus for it did not come from the Premier's office, but probably from chats he'd had with the local newspapers in his area. I'm sure he's on excellent terms with all those newspapers.

Mr. Moffatt: I said I expected that.

Mr. McCague: Although this isn't the subject, I noticed from looking at some of them that he gets more than twice the coverage of the other two parties put together.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are a lot of weeklies in Brampton.

Mr. Nixon: Of course, if you count the government advertising as well, he gets even more than that—he gets about half the paper.

Mr. Yakabuski: It works out pretty well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe has the floor.

Mr. McCague: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for keeping the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk under control.

It's true that I and the hon. member who proposed the bill did meet with Mr. Taylor of the association when we were drafting this bill. I entered the picture as a seconder for the member, but I did recognize the difficulty in the last election campaign. As we all know in this House, I think there were some people who moved their publishing date up one day to accommodate the printing of election advertising. I must also say they did it for all parties, but there were

also some who couldn't do it because of the problem of getting the paper printed. Many of the papers in my area especially, are printed in the same shop and there are 13 weeklies that serve the area and only one local daily that serves a very small portion of the area.

Somebody mentioned to me that this change would only accommodate the farming area, but I understand that only nine per cent of the regular subscribers of weekly papers are actually farming households; that leaves many whose occupation is other than farming. Mr. Taylor's figures showed that actually more people read only weeklies than people who read only dailies.

All it takes is an amendment to the Act, an amendment which would put everyone in this province on equal footing, whether they depend on a daily or a weekly to keep them informed. The election is serious business and, when voters go to the polls, they deserve to be as well informed about their decision as possible. There is no reason why some people should have campaign advertising literally cut off nine days before election day. The voters have the right to know about the latest party stands on the issues and about their local candidates, and the parties and candidates should have the right to tell them their opinions.

It is a worthwhile bill, it is a worthwhile amendment, and I sincerely hope that everyone here this afternoon will vote in favour.

[5:15]

Mr. Bain: I, too, rise in support of Bill 10, Mr. Speaker. I feel it's a fairly common-sense bill. I suppose most of us like to think that everything we do in this House is extremely momentous. But I think some of the less striking bills have just as much an affect on a segment of our population, and this bill is one of them.

As has been mentioned earlier, this bill will allow the weeklies that publish on Wednesday to carry advertisements placed by candidates during the next provincial election campaign. I was interested in the comments made by the speaker, the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel, the person who introduced the bill, in that he felt this bill would be in place for the 1979 or thereabouts election. I suppose we have all been interested in the thoughts of the Premier on this particular subject. I am happy to note that, if I want any information along that line, I know where to go to get it from now on.

The bill itself addresses a problem that all of us are aware of that represent rural ridings. I am sure the Minister of Housing would like to represent a rural riding as well. Although he doesn't, he no doubt is sympathetic to the needs of the rural communities. I only wish his government was as sympathetic.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: A government member introduced the bill.

Mr. Bain: Yes, but he's a government member from a rural community. The wave seems to be starting in the north. The rural communities in the north have been ignored for the longest period of time and that wave is sweeping south.

Mr. Shore: You guys over there don't know what day it is.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It hasn't improved any with you.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker, if you would control the member for Sault Ste. Marie, I would be happy to get back to the discussion of the principle of the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I suggest you ignore the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect to you, I suggest I was not interfering with the hon. member's presentation until he addressed himself directly to me.

Mr. Hall: That's unusual.

Mr. Bain: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The interjections of the hon. member in question are sometimes hard to ignore even though we might like to. Nevertheless, I am sure we would miss those interjections for no doubt at times they enliven the proceedings. The bill under discussion today addresses a section of the community in this province that sometimes does not receive the attention it deserves in this House. Urban needs are probably much more evident to the members of the House in a day-to-day sense in that the Legislature is located in Toronto. Our electronic and daily media seem to centre on the urban areas, especially Toronto, and so those problems of the urban communities are much more accentuated.

This particular bill addresses itself to the need of the weeklies in our rural communities. I think that the support that it would give to our rural weekly newspapers is very much deserved. Any members who live in rural communities have no doubt a paper in their own riding they have grown up with. In my own particular instance, the Temiskaming

Speaker has been a byword in our area since its founding at the turn of the century. The paper in question epitomizes many of the virtues that have been mentioned by members today of the rural weekly media. I am sure many members would agree that the weekly media tend to be somewhat more balanced in their perception but, needless to say, not always supportive of any particular party. I think they tend to have a wider range of coverage on various subjects and generally make a contribution that is very worthy of support.

As a member from a political party that never has had very much money to spend and no doubt will not have very much money to spend in the future, I don't envision myself being able to take out full-page ads in any weekly newspaper even though I might like to do so. We just can't afford that. But I would think, if any party would like to do so, and by all reports the Conservatives have a lot of money to spend, then if for no other reason, I am in favour of this bill so that the Temiskaming Speaker and the other weeklies of this province might get more of those Tories bucks at election time. If they would like to take out ads in the local newspaper, I urge them to do so. There would be a small commission if you wished to place those ads through myself.

The bill, I think, as I said at the beginning, is a very straightforward bill and certainly worthy of support from all members of the House. The idea of a link between the candidates and the voter I think is a real one. In many cases people do not receive daily newspapers in a number of rural ridings; and I think that's by choice, because in many cases even where there are dailies these dailies are much more focused in the larger communities, whereas the weeklies tend to cover a larger number of communities. In the case of the Temiskaming Speaker, it covers a number of rural communities and, therefore, each community feels it gets reasonably balanced coverage.

The bill, as I've said, is worthy of support; and hopefully it will allow weeklies to get more of the money that is spent at election time in advertising. This, I think, would benefit people who work at these papers and live in rural communities.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I want to support this bill through a brief comment of my own. I commend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel in his creation of this bill, and I think it's one that possibly should have seen the light of day earlier than this. I have nothing but praise for him in his consideration of it.

Weekly papers are very important, I suppose, not only to all of us in the Legislature as politicians, but they're also an important part of life in smaller towns. I know in my community I have a number of weekly papers which not only manage to keep the constituents informed of the activities here in the Legislature and town council and what's going on in Ottawa, but often too they serve them through reporting of sports and news events and the promoting of community affairs. I think it's very important that we do anything we can to further these small weekly newspapers.

To that end I think it would be appropriate, possibly, if the government considered supporting them by way of their advertising programmes as extensively as they do through the daily newspapers. That, I think would be a wonderful way of helping those newspapers continue because so many of them operate on a marginal basis.

This particular piece of legislation is a good idea insofar as it will put the weekly newspapers on equal footing with the dailies. That's something that I look forward to in this next campaign because I must tell you—

Interjection.

Mr. Cunningham: I'm sorry? Who woke you up?

Mr. Shore: I thought I woke you up.

Mr. Cunningham: I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, I rely on these newspapers as a vehicle to communicate my points of view to my community, and to date they have been very helpful to me. I must admit I have somewhat of a conflict of interest here in that I don't think I'll have the extent of money that my Conservative opposition may have. That has been the traditional case in my area, but, nevertheless, as best as possible, we will try to convey our message to them.

I would also at this time like to offer a few comments on The Election Expenses Act, and the possibility, Mr. Speaker, of entertaining, as long as this Legislature exists, some other changes to that particular Act. There are a number of areas I think we would do well to consider. I know in my particular area, just driving through the city of Hamilton, I see these great big, red, white and blue billboards saying "The Leader", and then right underneath it it has the name of a Conservative candidate, a car dealer in the area; and right underneath that in the small-

est words possible, George Kerr, and then the word "Chevrolet." I want to tell you that I'm not advertising for Chevrolet, and I don't think through those billboards the individual paying for them is either. That's an area where I must say to you, with the greatest respect, I see some serious abuse.

Mr. Shore: Maybe you'll get one with an Oldsmobile on it.

An hon. member: You missed the point again, Marvin.

Mr. Cunningham: The point raised by the hon. member for Durham East (Mr. Moffatt) concerning freedom of information was a very valid one, and one that should not go without comment because I think it's very important. Only last week, in this new exercise of private members' bills, we had the opportunity to support such a bill, and I must say I was distressed that the members of the government party would not at least allow it to get to a vote. This, I think, must be equally disturbing to people who operate small weekly newspapers, because they rely on that kind of information to continue to put their newspapers out.

I would conclude by saying that the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel has at least served his small weekly newspapers well by putting up this piece of legislation, which I support.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

Mr. Yakabuski: This is a very important amendment to The Election Finances Act; after already having a half-dozen or more speakers on the subject, it's going to be difficult not to be repetitious. But, as did the others, I do want to commend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel for sponsoring this amendment and introducing it into the House. I think it's a very important amendment to The Election Finances Act, for the many reasons already outlined by the various speakers. We realize that the dailies have the Monday and the Tuesday of election week—since by statute we must vote on Thursday—to solicit and print ads on behalf of various candidates and parties. Today, that opportunity is not available to the average weekly in the province.

Some years ago, the weekly newspapers of this province were not as viable, they were not as "with it" as they are today. They, too, have had to adjust with changing business methods and changing times. We all know that most of them have their papers printed by the offset process; these plants are located in central areas and print six, eight, 10 or more papers for a given region. Therefore, in an election week, it would be difficult for them to print on a Monday or Tuesday. And in all fairness, of course, they too should have a piece of the so-called campaign-funds pie. They, too, reach a good many readers not touched by the dailies or the other media in the province. I'm told that some 24 per cent of people in the province rely on weekly newspapers for their information. Weekly newspapers are read not only in rural Ontario, they are also read by many in the urban centres. I don't think there is hardly a person who has left the rural parts of the province and moved to other areas who does not subscribe to a weekly from his or her home area.

Mr. Breithaupt: They are read very carefully at Queen's Park.

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes, that I must say, especially by the members. I think the members know what a vital link the weekly newspaper is between the government here at Queen's Park and the constituency in whatever part of the province it might be. The weekly newspaper industry, it has been said, is a viable one today, with an investment of some $85 million and 6,000 or more employees. If it were for no other reason alone, we should be doing all possible to make and keep it an ongoing, viable industry.

I mentioned it was difficult not to be repetitious, but I did want to go on record as supporting this amendment and supporting it wholeheartedly. It would be discrimination to eliminate that portion of our press from participating in the last week of a campaign or to deny this facility to the candidates who wish to use this form of media at that time. So, again, I want to commend the member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel for introducing the legislation and to go on record as wholeheartedly supporting it.

[5:30]

Mr. Ruston: I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm wholeheartedly in favour of this amendment to The Election Finances Reform Act. Having been in a considerably rural area for a number of years, I find that weekly papers serve a great need in the community. There are many areas in the province of Ontario where the weekly papers are the only kind of paper that people have access to. There are a surprising number of

areas—I think the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. Spence), who I see has come in, will have a few remarks to make about the number of ridings that do not have daily papers and are served by the weeklies. They certainly do serve a great need in the community, especially in the large rural areas.

I just want to reiterate that the change proposed in this bill should be allowed because, considering the time they go to press, by bringing their paper out one day early they would have access to this business. Certainly we use the weekly papers in our campaigns and so forth; in some areas it seems as though the weekly is the only paper you can afford to use, unless you have a co-operative advertising with a number of other members. Some of the dailies are quite large and the price is rather prohibitive, especially for some of us who run on a pretty small campaign budget. In the last election I think mine was one of the smallest in Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: You don't need any money to get re-elected.

Mr. Ruston: Maybe we can thank the weeklies for serving that need. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am in favour of Bill 10.

Mr. Spence: I must say I'm pleased to support the amendment in Bill 10 which would permit the weekly papers to advertise right up to election day. In my own riding I have nine weekly papers. I have been through a few elections, and I know that it has meant a great deal to me in many of my elections. I must say it has given the people in my community an opportunity to look at all the candidates during the last week of an election. I say that's a most effective time, because that'se when the voters decide who they're going to support and whether they're satisfied with the looks of the candidates.

Mr. Nixon: If they do it on looks, no wonder you win every time.

Mr. Spence: I've had trouble with that. It would be better if I didn't have any advertising, because my picture didn't show up too well beside my opponent's.

Mr. Ruston: You still win, though, don't you?

Mr. Nixon: You look honest, Jack.

Mr. Spence: As I say, the weekly papers have proved to be a great benefit to the people of the rural areas. I understand that 30 of our ridings in the province of Ontario have no daily papers; and if we deprive the weekly papers in those areas from carrying advertising before election day, it would be a blow to those who are candidates in an election.

I don't know whether we are going to have an election or not. There seem to be rumors going around these corridors—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Tell us, Jack. Let us in on the secret.

Hon. B. Stephenson: When is it?

Mr. Kerrio: In 1979.

Mr. Spence: We hear from the government members that it won't be until next year—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, they are pretty timid.

Mr. Spence: —so I'll just have to go around again and ask the same question to see if what they are telling me is actually the truth. But in a few days we'll actually know.

Mr. Nixon: There is a first for everything.

Mr. Spence: I support this bill. I think it is really worthwhile, because I am glad to give the weekly papers an opportunity to advertise right up to election night.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You get all those Grit editorials, too.

Mr. Mancini: I too am very pleased to be able to rise and give support to Bill 10. I feel it's a very important bill which does deserve support from all the members of the Legislature. I would just like to mention that we have five weekly papers in the riding of Essex South: the Amherstburg Echo, the Harrow News, the Kingsville Reporter, the Leamington Post and the Wheatley Journal. I believe these weekly papers certainly do a lot for the people in my riding as far as being able to bring them good, fair and precise news.

One thing I would like to mention, and I'm sure all of us know this, is that usually a daily paper is not kept any longer than a day or at the most probably two days, but a weekly paper stays in the home all week. A person can later appreciate some of the things he's missed on first going over the paper.

I feel that this bill is an assistance to small business, which I firmly support. The weekly papers do not have the opportunities the daily papers have in being able to make money off the provincial election campaigns. It was very unfair the way it was before, so I'm

very pleased to rise here in the Legislature and give support to Bill 10.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Breithaupt: Dispense.

Mr. Drea: I want to pay a particular tribute this afternoon to my colleague, the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Peel. This is not his first venture in this particular area. If my recollection is correct, in the third session he introduced a private bill under the old rules. I believe it was Bill 42. Under the old rules, of course, it was for dialogue only because it couldn't be passed.

His bill deals with a particular area that everyone agrees should be corrected. There are notations from a commission that the matter should have been resolved some time ago. Probably the only reason this private bill is needed today is that in the great haste and the great urgency for the original Election Finances Reform Act, it was probably overlooked.

Mr. Nixon: Pretty slow, those Tories.

Mr. Drea: It is not fair to penalize a very significant portion of the print media of this province simply because of their publication date and the fact that they are not in control, as are the major dailies, of their distribution facilities, and to preclude them, not from the finances or from the profits to be gained from election advertising, but from being able to go into the homes they normally service with election coverage. Hopefully, the bill will not have to go to a standing committee, but will go to a committee of the whole so it can be done expeditiously and so that the particular benefits go to the weekly papers before they have to wait too long—

An hon. member: Third reading today.

Mr. Drea: I'd go for third reading today. I think it does achieve a sense of fairness. I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, even though I come from a very cosmopolitan and a very heavily populated suburban area, my two weekly newspapers, the Scarborough News and the Scarborough Mirror, certainly are the communication vehicles in my riding, notwithstanding the fact that the three Toronto dailies are also there.

I think it has been very unfortunate in the past that the particular unfairness, which was an oversight of the Legislature, hasn't been corrected.

But once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague for his diligence, for the fact that he has used the new rules of the House, not for personal advantage or not for the distinct benefit of his constituency but in a manner in which the public of this province will understand the enormous changes that have taken place in this Legislature and the fact that we are now in a position to remedy simple wrongs in a very expeditious manner.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. members wish to address themselves to this item? If not, the necessary questions will be placed at 5:50 p.m. In the meantime I shall declare a brief recess until that time. I warn the hon. members there will not be a bell; I will be in here at 5:50 and those who wish to express an opinion should be here at the same time.

Mr. Nixon: By the way, there are no objections are there?

Mr. Speaker: There may not be any objections at this time, but I don't know whether you could take this as a precedent or not. It was pretty strongly agreed that we should not—there don't appear to be objections. Do I detect the feeling of the House?

Mr. Moffatt: Let the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) talk.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have the unanimous consent of those members here to proceed with the questions?

Mr. Deans: If I may, I certainly wouldn't want to be one to withhold unanimous consent on a matter such as this, but the difficulty with it, as always, would be that at some other less appropriate time the same procedure could well be followed. I think if I were the government, forgive me, I wouldn't want to have unanimous consent given since the House leaders and others dealt with the matter at some length and decided in the best interests of everyone that the vote should be taken at 5:50.

I realize it is an inconvenience. We did discuss the need for an adjournment or a brief recess, and decided that was the appropriate time. I wouldn't want to be party to breaking an understanding that I have with the government House leader.

Mr. Breithaupt: I would agree, Mr. Speaker, that it would be practical, I think, to have that recess. It had been agreed that we would, in order to accommodate members who might be in committee or to accommodate others who were out of the House otherwise, deal with the matters at that time. I think that would be the best way to handle it.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker agrees that this was the understanding and agreement and it should be followed rather than start a procedure which may get us into difficulty later. So I will declare a brief recess until 5:50 p.m.

The House recessed for five minutes.

[5:50]

On resumption.

Mr. Speaker: We will deal with these two items in the usual way then. First of all, Mr. Singer had moved a resolution standing in his name and Mr. Rhodes had moved an amendment thereto.

So, the first question is, shall there be a vote on this motion? Any members opposed to a vote must now rise.

Twenty members having not risen, the vote will be stacked.

Then, Mr. Johnson had moved second reading of Bill—

Mr. Nixon: Bill 10.

Mr. Speaker: Bill 10, was it?

Shall there be a vote on this motion? Any members opposed to a vote must now rise.

Twenty members having not risen, the vote will be stacked.

Mr. Singer: Well done.

Mr. Speaker: We'll have the votes then.

Voting first on Mr. Rhodes' amendment to Mr. Singer's motion. Shall Mr. Rhodes' amendment carry?

Motion agreed to.

Resolution as amended concurred in.

[Applause]

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Johnson had moved second reading of Bill 10. Shall this carry?

Motion agreed to.

Ordered for third reading.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, we would have no objection at all to giving unanimous consent for third reading now.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We just did.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Deans: No, we didn't. You should listen and learn the rules, Dennis.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading on motion:

Bill 10, An Act to amend The Election Finances Reform Act.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, this is a very momentous day—April 21, 1977, we'll remember this.

Interjections.

An hon. member: Minority government works.

An hon. member: This week the weeklies; next week the dailies.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Don't book your advertising.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is without precedent.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975, second session.

Mr. Nixon: It is almost 6 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Durham East (Mr. Moffatt) have the floor? Yes? No.

Mr. Singer: It is 6 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be a feeling that perhaps we might recognize the clock. Well, okay, it being almost 6 o'clock, I do now leave the chair and will resume at 8.

The House recessed at 5:52 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 21, 1977

Transmitting estimates of certain sums required, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 705

Re death of Major G. R. Soame, CD, former Sergeant-at-arms, Mr. Welch 705

Jubilee medallions, statement by Mr. J. R. Smith 705

Court of Appeal, statement by Mr. McMurtry 705

Land speculation tax exemption, statement by Mr. McMurtry 706

Point of order re judicial inquiry, Mr. S. Smith 707

Classified driver licence exemption, statement by Mr. Snow 708

Unemployment, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Peterson 708

Job creation, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy 712

Peel teachers' dispute, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Sweeney 713

Environmental tax, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Deans, Mr. Cunningham 714

Agricultural jobs, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Riddell 714

Wiretapping charge, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Roy, Mr. Singer, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Haggerty 714

Children's services, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. McClelland 716

Sales tax exemptions, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Edighoffer 716

Group home regulations, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Breithaupt, Mrs. Campbell 717

Women in labour force, questions of Mr. McKeough: Ms. Gigantes, Mr. Cassidy 717

Grants to conservation authorities, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. O'Neil, Mr. Foulds 718

DRG Globe Envelopes Limited, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Grande 719

Women crown employees, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. S. Smith 720

Niagara region official plan, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Swart 720

Medical services in northern Ontario, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Reid, Mr. Bain 720

Training school teachers, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. Davidson, Ms. Sandeman 721

Government complex in Timmins, questions of Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Ferrier 722

Gasoline retail prices, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Spence 722

Notice of dissatisfaction with answer to oral question, Mr. Swart 722

Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mrs. Campbell 722

Report, standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Renwick 723

Report, standing general government committee, Mr. Gaunt 723

Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 723

Perfume and Cosmetic Bars Limited Act, Mr. Peterson, first reading 723

Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Act, Mr. Parrott, first reading 723

Legislative schedule, Mr. Welch 723

Private members' business re Motion No. 2, resolution re land acquisition and registration, Mr. Singer, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Bullbrook 724

Private members' business re Election Finances Reform Amendment Act, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Riddell, Mr. McCague, Mr. Bain, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Spence, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Drea 738

Resolution (Motion No. 2), as amended, concurred in 749

Election Finances Reform Amendment Act, Mr. Johnson, second reading 749

Third reading 749

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, on second reading 749

Recess 749

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Breithaupt, J. R.; (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K.; Minister of Correctional Services (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Government Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)

Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)



No. 19

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, April 21, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:02 p.m.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: When we were last on this item of business, I believe the hon. member for Durham East had the floor. He may continue his remarks.

Mr. Moffatt: If you recall, Mr. Speaker, my remarks the other day were of a very short nature when I adjourned the debate, so I will be brief this evening. In putting a kind of end to the discussion of second reading of this bill, I simply want to put together a couple of things that I think need to be pointed out; I think there are three all told.

The first point I would like to draw to the minister's attention is that while he has been reluctant in putting forth the Act and the amending processes, one of the reasons he gives for tying the thing up so neatly is that there is now some understanding of the whole process and we wouldn't want to tinker with the eight per cent rule because people finally understand what is going on and a little bit of resistance has been taken away.

I would like to say to the minister that one of the reasons we've had such great resistance to the way this whole process has worked is the minister himself, with his remarks on the unworkableness and the futility of intervening in this sector; it's really counter to any of his theories and his philosophy. That's been one of the problems that the legislation has faced. It has been made almost unworkable from time to time because of statements by the minister saying: "See, I told you it won't work," "I'm sure this is going to be difficult" and so on. And "I don't want it. I want another ministry" or "I want out. I'll resign." There have been a number of things which have not lent credibility to the entire process.

I am pleased to see that at least he now feels he is lending something other than credibility to the process, because he has put forward these amendments and obviously he is now a true believer. I hope he continues and that his positive aspect of making the programme work will be the one emphasized during the coming months. I'm quite sure, if the rumours we hear from the press gallery are true, that he will be emphasizing all of those positive aspects in certain places. In other places he will be emphasizing those aspects less and others more.

One of the other things I wanted to touch on was the statement by the member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer) in his leadoff remarks for the Liberal Party the other day, in which he said, quite straightforwardly, that he would be introducing an amendment in committee that would tie the legislation to the AIB – because that's the stated philosophy of this government, that the AIB is supreme and should run things. He felt that it was, of course, quite safe to tie in that amendment, but in his remarks referring to the AIB he said—and I would like to quote two lines: "I believe 10 per cent for October 1975 to October 1976; eight per cent for October 1976 to October 1977." And then he says: "I will be proposing an amendment that would truly relate this bill to the AIB guidelines and would reduce the rate of increase to six per cent in October 1977 or at such times as the AIB guidelines are reduced."

I would like to remind the member that the federal counterpart of this particular group brought in that legislation in a famous Thanksgiving Day message. If the member would care to read what that legislation says, it says that it started out at eight per cent. We are now at six per cent and in October 1977 we will be at the four per cent level plus two per cent for productivity. I would like to point out, too—and I am sure this will elicit the support of the member for Perth for the amendment that we will be putting forward, as we have talked about it for some time and have argued the point—that this particular programme should be tied to six per cent; that makes far more sense when you compare it to the kinds of settlements that have been handed out across the prov-

ince. It's important, I think, to point out in connection with that six per cent amendment that we are bringing in, that we are pleased to invite the member for Perth to join us. I can't explain how he got mixed up in the federal statistics but I am sure he fully intended to support our amendment. I am sure that's what he meant.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Chickening out. You are going to support him.

Mr. Moffatt: I am sure, too, that if the member takes time and if the minister is interested in reading the Hansard which I have before me, he will find that—

Mr. Nixon: Are you making another flip-flop?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They are going to support you.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly they are.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister does not have the floor at this point.

Mr. Moffatt: I am simply pointing this out to the member for Perth so that it will be clear that he was talking about six per cent, not six plus two, which is the old formula of eight per cent that the minister would like us to go with. I want to make it very clear that we are talking about six per cent this year. We are not talking about anything else. If we wait until October, it is four plus two. If we do it now on this basis, it is six plus two—and that gets right back into the minister's ballpark.

Mr. Edighoffer: You are not going to vote the same way as the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis)?

Mr. Moffatt: The member for Cornwall is very clear on this. The whole party is very clear on it. We are inviting the member for Perth to support us.

Mr. Nixon: I thought he was very clear.

Mr. Moffatt: I can't apologize for their mistake in mathematics or for their lack of understanding as to how the programme works.

Mr. Reid: We can't apologize for the electorate of your riding either.

Mr. Moffatt: I will let them make their own apologies. I am sure they will have plenty of time to do that.

Mr. Edighoffer: What was the number of the federal bill?

Mr. Moffatt: I would like to say in conclusion that the entire programme can be made to work if the minister will stop making statements like the ones he made in estimates last year and others since then; and if only he and his government will lend themselves to working in the interests of consumers rather than constantly trying to balance some kind of equation which says, "Well, at this point we are talking to the landlord, and we will talk to them as though we are in favour of that; and now we are going to talk to the tenants because we would like them to know that we support them as well." The government can't have it both ways.

There is no difficulty with this legislation. The cost increases can be passed through. The landlords now understand that. I invite the minister and I invite the government to stand up and be clear about this—that they are putting forward consumer legislation. I invite them also to make sure that when we get to the point where they want to cut it off, we forget about that and we tie the whole thing to the availability of rental accommodation. To do otherwise is unfair and it is unwarranted. We don't need it.

Mr. Givens: I'm trying to digest what the member for Durham East said. I thought when I was going to start we had some allies to the suggestion of the member for Perth that we were going to have an amendment we were going to unite on and we were going to get some unanimity in this Legislature. But I guess from what he said we're not going to have allies and we're going to be disunited again on this particular amendment.

Mr. Moffatt: Are you going to vote with the government on it?

Mr. Mancini: How is your leadership campaign?

Mr. Givens: I'm going to refrain from indulging in flagellation of the minister and heaping calumny on his broad shoulders—

Mr. Moffatt: Heap away.

Mr. Givens: —because preceding speakers have abused him. He had threatened to resign if the government brought in legislation extending rent controls and he said he couldn't live with them. I like the prospect of a sinner who repents and I think it's good that he should bow to the inevitable and go along with it. I want to tell this minister, although I may not agree with some of his ideas, I admire him for his intelligence. I think he's a very intelligent man. He real-

izes he had to do what he had to do, and this is why he's doing it.

Mr. Eakins: However.

Mr. Givens: I find it very difficult to understand why the minister and some of his colleagues are so lackadaisical and so cavalier in their attitude with respect to this legislation, that even though they've brought this in, they've had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the arena for the purpose of extending this legislation. Their attitude is one of reluctance. The legislation, their discussion and everything that they do about this are shot through with the kind of reluctance—

Mr. Shore: You may have to burn this speech afterwards.

Mr. Givens: —that underlines everything in this particular bill. I don't understand that, because generally the members on the government side are pretty good politicians.

Mr. Eakins: Having said that.

Mr. Givens: But I think they have to understand that 50 per cent of the electorate today is made up of tenants and that this is a very serious problem, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto. It costs the government. Probably the reason the government came back in a minority capacity in this Legislature at the last election was its attitude towards rent control. Toronto was always known as Tory Toronto. In the last election is cost the government 17 seats. It lost 17 seats because a critical factor in the election of 17 ridings in Metropolitan Toronto was rent control. I give the government this advice freely.

I don't care when the election is held, whether it's held this spring or next fall, but there's certainly going to be an election before December 1978. If the government wishes to recoup any of these 17 seats in Metropolitan Toronto, it is going to have to change its attitude with respect to rent control. Probably the same thing applies in other urban centres, like Ottawa, Windsor, Kitchener, London and other big metropolitan areas and other big cities in Ontario.

This has cost the government. Surely as good politicians they must realize that and should shuck off this reluctance that makes them so embittered about this situation. As far as I'm concerned, I'm a free enterpriser too. Some members who have got to know me personally, like my friend the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth)—

Mr. Shore: You like everything for free.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: You are an enterpriser.

Mr. Givens: —whom I've only known for about 43 years, know that I'm a free enterpriser. We don't want to interfere with the market forces. I don't want to interfere with the market forces any more than my friend, the Solicitor General, or the minister in charge of this legislation.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, in my riding of Armourdale I've got a lot of tenants. When I sit by the phone and listen to some of the complaints of anguish that I get from some of the tenants—and they're real and they're genuine and they are downright heartbreaking—it isn't a matter of interfering with the market forces, it's a matter of trying to assist people who are really being ground into the ground. The government has got to come to their assistance and heed their plea.

Mr. Hodgson: What do you think we're doing?

[8:15]

Mr. Givens: I would like to see the business of the market forces work. I don't want to see this bureaucracy built up any more than the government does, but the fact of the matter is that the legislation is necessary.

The minister has put an arbitrary date on this of December, 1978. I think you truly believe, as you believed the last time when you put a time limit on it, that this is temporary legislation, jerry-built for the purpose of disassembling when December of 1978 comes around. With great respect, all the evidence I see is against the possibility of this legislation being able to be done away with by December of 1978. There is no evidence at all to go on.

As a man of affairs—I know that the minister is an educated and trained economist—he knows he needs lead time to start building rental housing of any kind. He needs lead time for the purpose of putting a business deal together, of getting a mortgage commitment, of putting the financial deal together and so on. It takes six months to a year to do that. Even though the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) will get up and promise $600 per unit per 10 years and all that stuff; that's great, but that doesn't mean that the builders get off the mark and start rushing to the marketplace and start building, because there's another thing that's involved.

I can talk about Metro Toronto with some authority and some knowledge. Most of the land in Metropolitan Toronto is zoned against multiple-family building. This simply means

that the people who want to build, whether they're offered $600 a unit or $6,000 a unit, have to go to the respective municipalities, which are inimical to their desires to build, and they have to make applications for rezoning. They have to make an application to the committee of building and development, which then has to go to the planning board, which then has to go to the department of works and the parks department and the board of education and the traffic department for clearance; and then it goes to the executive committee or the board of control; and then it's probably sent back to the committee of buildings and development; and then it's sent to the council; and then it has a run around there. Finally, after it passes there, if they're lucky it goes up to the Ontario Municipal Board. Then even after there's a decision reached at the Municipal Board it has become very fashionable, regardless of who wins at the Municipal Board, to appeal the decision to the cabinet.

Does the minister know that nowadays for a man or a company to make an application for rezoning to any council in Metropolitan Toronto, it takes from 18 months to three years—if he is lucky? That's if he is lucky. So what reason has he to believe that he has the chance of a snowball in Hades that by the time December 1978 rolls around he can take off these rent controls? He has to start thinking in terms that these rent controls that he is putting in tonight are going to last beyond the lifetime he is contemplating right here.

Let me tell him something else that's happening today.

Mr. Worton: You tell them, Phil.

Mr. Givens: There's a hearing going on right now before three esteemed gentlemen of the Ontario Municipal Board involving the city of Toronto downtown core bylaw. I don't know what the official name is—I call it that and the minister knows what I'm referring to. The other day my leader asked the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) what they could do about intervening with respect to the length of the hearings that are going on down there.

Now this core bylaw, in case the minister doesn't know, involves a very important principle. It involves the introduction of rental housing in the downtown area. This can be a big boon if it happens, if the OMB approves of it. I won't get into the merits of the discussion as to whether there should be rental housing in the downtown area. This is not the forum for that kind of discussion, and besides it's probably sub judice. But assuming the city of Toronto is right in promulgating this kind of philosophy and this kind of theory, this hearing started in January 11, the prognosis is that this hearing probably will last for another six months, it probably won't be through until the end of the year. There are about 100 lawyers ranged against the city of Toronto with applications for exemptions and exceptions, and for argument and for contemplation, and for debate about the philosophy and so on. After the hearings are completed and voluminous notes are made, I say to the minister that the members of the Municipal Board, whom I admire and respect, will be completely incapable of rendering a decision immediately; they will have to reserve the decision. I don't care how smart they are, it will take them from three to six months to render a decision. So that takes us into the middle of 1978.

Even after they render a decision, having regard for the fact that it involves the city of Toronto and 100 people making applications who have very important pecuniary interests in the situation, there are bound to be appeals to the cabinet, which brings the decision to the end of 1978. How in heaven's name does the minister expect that on that particular deal, on that particular application, on that particular bylaw, there can possibly be a resolution of that bylaw before December 1978? We need not expect any kind of relief, any kind of leeway, any kind of elbow room for rental housing from that. I don't know what the minister is going to do about it.

The answer of the Attorney General to my leader was that he didn't think it was proper to interfere or intervene. On the basis of law and on the basis of jurisdiction, the OMB certainly has the jurisdiction; there's no question that they have the jurisdiction. But I tell the minister that it was never contemplated—and I was a member of the select committee that looked into the OMB a couple of years ago—it was never contemplated that the OMB should be geared to deal with that kind of situation. If we added another 26 members today to the Ontario Municipal Board's present complement of 26 members, I don't know whether we could accelerate the speed with which hearings are handled there. It's simply impossible to accelerate the speed with which things are done at that particular level of government.

What evidence has the minister got that this legislation can be contemplated to be anything but permanent? He must look beyond December 1978—indeed, he should be

looking towards December 1982—as the point for the ending of rent control in this province, because he doesn't have a chance of a snowball on a hot stove of increasing the market. After all, one thing we're all agreed on in this House is that the only way we can end rent controls in this province is if we have a sufficient market of housing in this province.

The minister today answered my friend from Kent-Elgin (Mr. Spence), who asked what the minister was going to do about the price of gasoline, which my friend's investigation has shown is 80 cents a gallon in one place and 89.9 cents a gallon elsewhere.

Mr. Foulds: It's $1.06 in the north.

Mr. Given: The minister got up and said: "This is a wonderful province, and we have a competitive system with respect to gasoline." Although he didn't say so, the minister implied that if you don't like paying 89.9 cents a gallon in one gasoline station, you drive away and go to another station and pay 80 cents; and you can do that with pretty easy facility. But when you're an old lady—

Mr. Foulds: He is an old lady.

Mr. Givens: —or when you're a senior citizen, living on a fixed income in an apartment where you have been living for many years, and your landlord comes and and socks you with an increase of $20 or $40 a month, you can't pick yourself up and, at the age of 75 or 80, start walking down the hall, down the block or 10 blocks away or 10 miles away, and start looking for another apartment.

Mr. Nixon: It will happen to you, Sidney.

Mr. Givens: The competitive marketability in rental accommodation isn't that way.

Mr. Mancini: How does that grab you, Marv?

Mr. Givens: We have got to be humane about this thing. We've got to use some heart in this; we can't just look at it callously.

Mr. Mancini: How do you feel, Marv?

Mr. Shore: We're debating rent review. What bill is he on?

Mr. Givens: The point that I'm trying to make is that the minister is off on a wrong tangent when he is talking about the temporary aspect of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Givens: As much as I dislike it, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I dislike it as much as you do. Until you have evidence, at least 18 months in advance or two years in advance, that the rental accommodation is increasing, it is wrong, it is cruel, it is callous, it is not smart politically for you, standing on the edge of an election, to take the position that come hell or high water you're going to abandon rent controls. I think you'd be very well advised to take the termination date, right now while while you're headed for an election, face it realistically and admit that it isn't temporary and that it's got to be more permanent than in the next year and a half that you have in your scope, in your view.

With respect to specifics—that was specific, the date. On the percentage increase: I don't like talking about eight per cent or six per cent. I think those figures are arbitrary. I don't think you can talk about eight per cent or six per cent any more than you can talk about four per cent or 10 per cent, it has no meaning.

The only thing that has meaning for me is the index of inflation, which is set now by the AIB. If the AIB is abandoned or done away with or goes into limbo for some reason, there will be some other kind of price index, the cost of living index of Statistics Canada or some other price index, which will be related to the index of inflation of the country; and you should tie yourself to that, whether it's six per cent or eight per cent or anything else.

I don't think we should get into an auction sale in this Legislature as to whether it should be eight per cent, and if you go for eight per cent you're the bad guys and if we go for six per cent we cover ourselves with glory. Let's not get into that kind of cheap politicking.

I think that's wrong. I think what is right is that we should tie ourselves to the index of inflation—if it goes up the increases should go up; if it goes down, the increases should go down.

Mr. Mancini: Do you understand this, Ed? Just zero.

Mr. Cunningham: You could do your thesis on it.

Mr. Givens: One other thing: With respect to decisions I think we should have some form of registration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Givens: I don't know whether that form of registration should be that everybody, every landlord who has rental accommodation, should register the rentals of his rental accommodation, whether he has one

unit, two units or 2,000 units; but I think there should be a system that everybody who runs can read. Where a tenant goes into a unit, whether it's two units or 100 units or 500 units, he should be able to tell, either by application or by seeing it somewhere, what the rental is. What is the big secret?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There isn't any.

Mr. Givens: Why hide it? Well then show it, make provision for it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's there.

Mr. Givens: You don't have any provision for it in here. You've got to prove it to me because I don't see it in here.

Mr. Shore: You've got to read it first before you can see it.

Mr. Mancini: Go back to sleep, Marv.

Mr. Givens: We will be putting forward an amendment on that.

Another thing, where you have a building with 100 units or more run by one of the big corporate giants, why should there have to be 100 applications? Why can't there be one application? When you have one application, the things that are considered by the Rent Review Board are the same; whether there's a put-through of costs for the increase of taxes or electricity or heat or whatever, they're the same for a unit as they are for 100 units. There should be one test case for the whole apartment house which should apply pari passu—and you know what that means—to all the units and that should be the end of it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Wonderful.

Mr. Givens: I think you should give professional help to the small tenant, the senior citizen, the widow, the elderly gentleman who comes and who fights with the big corporate giant. How can you compare the ability of some of the applicants who have come to me for help with the corporate giants who have their solicitors and their accountants and their managers?

Mr. Nixon: Fancy accountants from London.

Mr. Givens: How can you compare the ability of both sides to present their case properly before the Rent Review Board unless you protect them? I think you should give them such protection.

My final point is that the regulations you will be promulgating under this Act should be published and they should be circularized very quickly. They shouldn't be secret. Everybody should know what they are and they should be readily available.

Mr. Samis: That would be something new.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, those are my submissions; thank you.

[8:30]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If I didn't know better, I could easily get the impression from listening to hon. members across the way that rent review over the past 18 months or so has achieved precious little and perhaps worse.

Mr. Kerrio: That's what the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations said.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It is surely time to get the whole thing into better perspective so that we understand properly the significance of the amendments before us and what is really required at this point to ensure maximum protection under the law. Without imposing impossible burdens on the landlords.

Mr. Mancini: You probably put him up to it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Nobody, I take it, will quarrel with the fact that at the time of rent review coming into being tenants were asked to finance an inflationary upswing in the cost of labour, land and building materials. For several years before rent review, the resale value of properties had been going up because of the inflation in those costs, and investors were beginning to look elsewhere. It was only natural then that the property owner, seeing his income from rents dropping, relative to the value of his property, tried to get back the old balance between rents and property values by putting up rents. As we well know, rents went too high and too fast for many tenants to cope with. Rent review was necessary then and we all agree it is still necessary—

Mr. Martel: Why do you oppose it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —while inflation continues at present levels, to prevent tenants having to pick up the tab for the high prices they are not to blame for. I doubt if any government, majority or minority, could have done better in the time available to set up the process of protecting tenants—

Mr. Martel: Under pressure.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —while being fair to landlords, than we have actually done.

Mr. Kerrio: That's minority government.

Mr. Reid: Only from pressure from the opposition.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The fact that about three-quarters of the residential units in the province never came to rent review at all is a good indication that the eight per cent guideline was found reasonable and that most people decided to live by it. However, the quarter that did come accounted for 7,317 hearings, at which rents for 130,455 units were reviewed up to the year-end 1976. This work was done by a staff of just a little over 300 for the whole province, including about 80 rent review officers. Only two of this total staff are civil servants. The remainder are on contracts that can be terminated on two weeks' notice. Of course, some mistakes were made; no one is perfect.

Mr. Cunningham: All Tories in my area, all of them, every one.

Mr. Drea: That's a lie and you know it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: After all, this is the first time in the history of this province that we have had rent review legislation, barring World War II when there were controls of a different nature.

Mr. Cunningham: Every one Tory—big T.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If the amendments are necessary to make things work better or to keep the legislation up to date, that doesn't mean that a darned good job wasn't being done before.

Mr. Davidson: You had to be squeezed into it.

Mr. Martel: You did it reluctantly.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It is true that rent review has changed a lot of people's lives. But it has often changed them for the better.

Mr. Cunningham: All Tories in my area.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Because of rent review, thousands of tenants can now look forward to a full year of steady rent payment—

Mr. Martel: What about 1978?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —that they can budget for in advance, and so can their landlords.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. members refrain from their conversations and let the hon. minister continue.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: In many cases, landlords have told their tenants they will stay within government guidelines, so tenants can budget even further ahead. The days of sudden rent increases and abrupt evictions are over.

Mr. Martel: What about 1978?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: There have been a lot of sparks flying at rent review hearings, I know, but the hearings have been a unique opportunity for landlords and tenants to get together and quite often to learn for the first time about their various problems and their responsibilities. Rent review has given both sides a forum they never had before, a platform to express their feelings and air their grievances in an orderly way. The old landlord mystique has gone, and I don't think any honest person would say that that is a bad thing, including the landlords themselves.

Mr. Davidson: Even the Waterloo regional management association would say that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Tenants are now meeting face to face with landlords at rent review hearings and having a chance to discover why increases are made and what the landlord's burdens of costs and expenditures are all about. A lot of tenants and landlords have told me they've found rent review officers to be fair and impartial, and they are convinced they have been doing their very best to weigh all the facts and figures, listen to everybody and order rent levels that faithfully reflect increases in allowed costs.

Incidentally, as I understand, very few of these officers are out of the real estate field. The great majority are accountants or were finance managers or the like.

Mr. Cunningham: Tories.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Some hon. members forget that rent review was not, and cannot ever, be designed to make everybody happy. Tenants who get increases higher than they expected, or sometimes any increases at all, don't like it.

Mr. Samis: This is not the Rotary Club, you know.

Mr. Mancini: That's a cheap shot; that's a very nice Rotary Club.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Landlords who can't increase the return on their investment under rent review don't like it. But the cost pass-through principle, the same principle that the federal anti-inflation curbs are based on, is surely the fairest of possible choices for the short run.

A number of smaller landlords have told me they are grateful to rent review for help-

ing them to get their books in order. The need to collect together figures on costs and revenues periodically has helped them to get a clear picture of where they stand, a better basis for planning ahead.

Tenants involved in rent review have been sharing their concern with their neighbours and getting together to form tenant associations. These have not necessarily involved hostile confrontations with landlords. Very often tenant representatives have been getting together with landlords to work out problems, and both parties have appreciated the advantages of this.

I represent a riding—Scarborough East—in which there are literally thousands of tenants. Through my office in the riding I have been able to advise many of these tenants on how to go about applying before—and to appear before—the rent review officers. I have had many letters thanking us for what we have been able to do on their behalf. I would like to read into the record a letter that I just received yesterday:

"Dear Mrs. Birch:

"My husband and I wish to sincerely thank you for the time and interest you expended on behalf of us and other tenants at the above address in connection with our rent problems. I do not know if you were ever advised, but our landlord was granted an increase of 9.6 per cent only over the previous rent in 1976.

"I realize, and I do hope that other tenants do also, that this was largely brought about by the efforts of my husband and Mr. Loveridge, but we all realize that your interest and help did a great deal not only towards our goal of a fair rent increase, but also to restore some feelings in the interests of you and others like you as representatives of the people and the government to act on our behalf."

This is just a sample of many letters that I have received from people who recognize that the landlords, as well, have to have—

Mr. Martel: Did you get any of them complaining?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, of course.

Mr. Martel: Read a few of those too.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It stands to reason neither landlords nor tenants want problems in taking up or terminating tenancies. If rental units are affordable, tenants will stay in them. In other words, although landlords and tenants may approach rents initially from different standpoints, their goals really are very similar, as rent review has shown. If these goals can be achieved without rent review, so much the better. But I doubt if anyone would seriously suggest that they could, in the immediate future.

Meantime, the figures show that while landlords in Ontario ask for average rent increases of 19.66 per cent through rent review, the average figure they were granted to the end of last year was 12.56 per cent. Those figures speak for themselves.

Some members, it seems, are not as familiar with the rent review Act or with the amendments as they should be.

Mr. Samis: That is an understatement.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If they were, they would not have made the comments and criticisms they did this week in the House. Rights or facilities which hon. members have claimed do not exist for tenants have been in the statute since the rent review Act was passed. They have simply not been used by everyone who could have done so.

Take the question, for example, of registering rents. It's possible many tenants might object to having their rents available for inspection in some public place. However, I'm assured by rent review officials, that it is a fact that any tenant checking the file on his unit at his local rent review office will find in it information about rents for his residence going back to 1974, as well as a list of the current rents on all other apartments in the building. This is information that the landlord is required to submit; and the amendments introduce stiffer penalties for anyone who withholds or falsifies information.

Also, any tenant can phone his local rent review office to find out if there is an ordered rent on his unit, and what it is.

On the question of assistance given to tenants from the first days of rent review, there have been staff in every rent review office whose sole duty has been to explain the Act and all of its ramifications to anyone who asks. The help is there and it always has been. The public have only to avail themselves of it.

And there are no longer to be thousands of pieces of papers passing hands, as one hon. member believes. Section 7(2) of the amendment Act takes care of that.

Sometimes a little knowledge can be more dangerous than some members opposite may believe.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. During the very eloquent address by the minister there was an interjection. The interjection was that the rent review officers—and, presumably, it's in the Hamilton area, although maybe in the Wentworth area as it was the member for Wentworth North who made the interjection—

Mr. Breithaupt: What is the point of order?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Please state the point of order.

Mr. Drea: It was an interjection—that the rent review officers there are Tories.

Mr. Nixon: Why don't you make a speech if you want to make a speech?

Mr. Drea: I think that remark should be stricken from the records. It's derogatory to professional people. I am prepared to believe it's a very naive remark.

Mr. Nixon: It is a terrible insult to say they are Tories.

Mr. Cunningham: They are Tories.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member does not have a point of order.

Mr. Drea: No, they aren't Tories.

Mr. Cunningham: They are.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The hon. member for Oakwood will continue.

Mr. Shore: Just because they didn't vote for you doesn't mean they are Tories.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The Chair has ruled that the hon. member did not have a point of order.

Mr. Cunningham: That's not a sin.

Mr. Foulds: To the point of order: I thought the Tories were all derogatory, that's all.

An hon. member: They have all the good jobs.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has ruled that the hon. member does not have a point of order. The hon. member will start his remarks.

Mr. Foulds: I thought he was indicating that "Tory" was an obscenity.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it's at least unparliamentary.

Mr. Martel: He also called the hon. member a liar. You should check Hansard.

Mr. Grande: The way the minister was talking about this rent review legislation, it appears—maybe I've misconstrued her remarks completely—but it appears she's beginning to take credit for the rent review programme in this province.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Oh, back to taking credit again.

Mr. Grande: If I may remind you, Mr. Speaker, and through you the members opposite, of the election of September 1975, I'm sure they recall the Premier (Mr. Davis) in the months of June and August, hopping from one idea to the next. We're going to have rent review; we're going to have this type of rent review; until finally he could not deny it any longer: rent control was necessary. He realized it, but unfortunately it was too late.

[8:45]

Mr. Davidson: They were forced into it.

Mr. Grande: And then when they came back here as a minority government, they really had no option, they had no option whatsoever. As a matter of fact, if I recall correctly, the first piece of legislation that came before this House was the rent review programme. And all scheduled for one thing, and that was to suggest to the tenants in the province of Ontario that the Conservative government moves and does something about tenants.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No.

Mr. Martel: Nonsense. You opposed it steadily.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No.

Mr. Martel: Oh yes you did. Where do you get the gall?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: From watching you.

Mr. Martel: We were around here too, you know.

Mr. Bain: You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can never fool a northerner.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: You're a sanctimonious character.

Mr. di Santo: You want tenants' votes, that's why.

Mr. Martel: You opposed it all through the election of last spring.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: Don't give me that nonsense.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I find the Provincial Secretary for Social Development's speech really amazing, because I thought that no one from that side of the House was going to get up to speak in terms of protecting the tenants in this province. She must at least admit the fact that she was forced into bringing in rent controls.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, never.

Mr. Grande: The government was forced into it, and that's all there is to it.

Interjections.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Grande: If she is going to attempt to take credit for this legislation—

Mr. di Santo: The tenants will vote against you.

Mr. Grande: —the tenants out there will certainly know what has happened in terms of rent controls and who brought it in.

Mr. Cunningham: Nowhere to go? Try Social Credit.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Shore: Take care of your schools, Remo, they need a janitor down there.

Mr. Kerrio: Hand in your blue suit and get back over here.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, if I may begin with the remarks that I really intended to make—

Mr. Shore: Speak to Trudeau. I think he is looking for some help down there.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I wonder if the hon. members would kindly refrain from their remarks and allow the member for Oakwood to continue.

Mr. Grande: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, except those people on the other side of the House obviously cannot take what reality is all about, and what has happened in 1975 is reality.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When are you going to start saying something?

Mr. Bain: That is by a minority government.

Mr. Grande: They have to be reminded all the time that they have lost complete touch with reality in this province, whether it be in this budget that was presented the other night or whether it be the return of the rent review mechanism in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we remember the minister all too well. Perhaps he was flirting with the press throughout the last three or four months, suggesting: "Look, we haven't decided. The cabinet hasn't made the decision in terms of rent control and whether we're going to extend it or whether we're going to change it."

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I didn't say that.

Mr. Grande: Sure you did.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You should have been here in December.

Mr. Martel: You were going to resign. I was here, don't kid the troops.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You didn't even know we brought in amendments to The Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue without interruption.

Mr. Grande: Then the press did not report the minister fairly; and it is the first time, perhaps, in the history of this province that the press has not reported fairly what a minister of the Crown had to say. It will be the first time.

Mr. Shore: First time, eh?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I cannot read that small print.

Mr. Bain: You are familiar with small print.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, tenants across this province, and in particular Metropolitan Toronto, when this particular legislation is introduced in the House are breathing a sigh of relief. They've been waiting for this legislation since last December, before the House adjourned. We thought, at least before the House was adjourned in the year 1976, the minister would have—

Mr. Bain: And they only got it because there are a lot of New Democrats here.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There will be a lot less in a short while.

Mr. Bain: That is your numerous colleagues from the north.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Allow the hon. member to continue to speak on the principle of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He's not saying anything.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, it's quite all right. I welcome those interjections. I'm beginning to learn that the interjections are the fun part of this Legislature.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member may welcome the interjections but the Chair doesn't. Will you continue.

Mr. Grande: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the tenants welcome this legislation. This side of the House welcomes this legislation. As a matter of fact, as I was saying in December and in November, we were asking the minister questions during the question period and saying to him, "When are you going to introduce legislation which shows a commitment by this government to the tenants of this province?"

The minister was saying: "Well, in due time. When we come back from the break, we will introduce legislation. Perhaps we will introduce legislation, but we haven't made a commitment. We haven't made a decision in cabinet as to what to do."

As a matter of fact, as the minister was flirting with the press across Ontario, he said at one particular time—and other members have been mentioning it and let him please correct the press if the press was wrong—he was saying: "If this rent control legislation is not going to be continued, certainly my ministry is not going to carry it out." In other words, he implied that the Minister of Housing should have that responsibility back—and by the way, it should be as far as I am concerned the responsibility of the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Bain: He doesn't want it either.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You don't understand anything.

An hon. member: You tell him, sir.

Mr. Davidson: You are the only one who understands it.

An hon. member: You knew what you were doing, John.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's why you got rid of it.

Mr. Kerrio: The best pass you ever threw, John.

Mr. Grande: Surely, Mr. Speaker, everybody in this province realizes that this rent review or rent control legislation is stop-gap type of legislation. Everyone realizes this.

The tenants want some protection from the gouging the landlords have been doing in the past three to three and a half years, beginning in 1973, 1974, and 1975. The tenants require some bit of protection.

As I said, it's a stop-gap measure because really in essence there is not going to be any need for rent control or rent review in this province as long as the government moves with speed to get the developers to build the type of affordable housing and the apartments at affordable prices that the tenants in this province need. Until the government does that, I am afraid that one of the things the member for Armourdale (Mr. Givens) said is quite true and that is that rent control is going to be a permanent thing in the province of Ontario.

Another remark that the member for Armourdale had to make is that he is a free enterpriser.

[Applause]

Mr. Bain: All rise.

Mr. Drea: Well he's certainly not a pinko.

Mr. Grande: That's the remark that he made and, Mr. Speaker, if he is such an avowed free enterpriser, perhaps he should be getting up from that side of the floor and moving to the other side and keeping company with the member for London North (Mr. Shore).

Mr. Cunningham: They should come here.

Mr. Kerrio: You have 24 hours to make up your mind.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, make me a Horner offer.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You've got to admit we won on that trade. We got Shore and you got Horner.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Grande: He is obviously quite willing.

Mr. Reid: Marvin didn't do half as well. Marvin is a loser.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order please. Perhaps you would give the courtesy to the hon. member for Oakwood.

Mr. Breithaupt: We have got future considerations.

Mr. Grande: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Reid: We have got three designated players.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Oakwood will continue.

Mr. Grande: Thank you. The last few days have certainly proved—or at least let me say this, that actions certainly speak louder than words in terms of where the difference between the Tories and the Liberals in this country and in this province is.

Mr. Martel: Nowhere.

Mr. Grande: There is virtually no difference. When one of the staunch Conservative members of this country, Mr. Speaker, will cross the House and join the Liberal government and vice versa, obviously it happens.

Mr. Breithaupt: Only because nobody wants the New Democrats.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would return to the principle of this bill.

Mr. Grande: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Thank you. Order, please.

Mr. Grande: I was talking about the member for Armourdale.

Mr. Eakins: Are you talking about Hazen Argue?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will direct his remarks toward the principle of the bill and ignore the interjections.

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: I'll tell you we have lost on the deal, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you, and with other members of this House who might be interested, my experiences in terms of rent review and how well the rent review Act worked in the past 18 months in the province.

I've gone about three to four times before rent review officers in taking some of the tenants in my particular riding before the rent review officer to plead their cases. Later on I've taken these tenants to the rent review board.

One of the things that has struck me in going before the rent review officer is that the very first thing the rent review officer did was, when he saw there were about 100 tenants in that particular room at the library where we were, he began to lose his cool very fast. As a matter of fact, it came to the point that the rent review officer said to one of the tenants, "Please be quiet or else I'll have to throw everybody out." Exactly those words. I thought perhaps those rent review officers would have been trained a little bit better in order to give to the tenants, at least at that particular meeting, the kind of decency—

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. There are too many conversations going on in the chamber, The hon. member for Oakwood has the floor. Let's give him a little attention.

Mr. Grande: —the kind of decency that tenants across this province and in Metropolitan Toronto should expect as common courtesy. The rent review officer decided that the tenants should be paying a 13 per cent increase. One of the things that really worried me at that particular time, after the rent review officer decided on this 13 per cent increase, was that the tenants should be going before the rent review board to appeal that decision, but the tenants decided not to do that. They were quite satisfied, they were quite happy with the 13 per cent increase because in previous years they had been used to 15 per cent, 20 per cent, 25 per cent increases.

I very well understand the fact that the tenants were satisfied with it, and I accepted their decision. What happened in that building is that the tenants started to form a tenant association, and here is where the things that really upset me at that particular apartment took place.

Two months after the tenants decided to form the tenant association the landlord began a very systematic approach to all six people who were on the organization of the tenant association. With one particular tenant the landlord said: "I understand your wife is having a baby and you're going to be looking for a two-bedroom apartment. I'll tell

you what, I'll give you the two-bedroom apartment if you drop out of the tenant association."

A second member was told: "You are two weeks in arrears with your rent and I legally could be throwing you out, but I will let you stay in the apartment for one more week if you drop out of the tenant association."

I can go on with the other members of this tenant association, because they were all singly approached by the landlord to drop out of the tenant association so that the tenant association could not function any longer. That's the kind of thing that the rent review legislation encouraged. Those tenants talked to me, but there was no way that they would be going before the landlord and saying to the landlord: "We in this province have rights. We in this province can take you to court for the kinds of things you're saying and the kinds of things you're doing." The tenants, I suppose, did not have the courage or the strength or the time to spend and to waste going through the court procedures.

[9:00]

Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to give you a flavour of what has been happening in the riding of Oakwood in terms of rent review. I am attempting also to give you another incident in which this group of tenants who formed another tenant association went before the rent review officer. The rent review officer said that the landlord is allowed an 8.2 per cent increase. As soon as the tenants returned to their apartments, the landlord was at their doorstep. The landlord said, "I will want an increase of 9.5 per cent." That was a completely illegal increase. The tenants didn't go for that. They were in a group by this time and had formed a tenants' association. They went before the rent review board.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we could have a little more order in the chamber.

Mr. Grande: I understand that a lot of the people perhaps on the other side of the House might not be interested in this particular rent review or rent control legislation.

Mr. Bain: How many government members are in the House?

Mr. Grande: It appears they're not interested in finding out the problems that the tenants in this province have been having. It appears they just want to take this legislation through so that when they can go to the tenants of this province and say: "We have extended rent control" and so that they can safely go to the province. I don't think that that government has the intestinal fortitude of its own particular principles by saying: "We really philosophically do not believe in rent control. So, therefore, what we're going to be doing is saying to the tenants: 'We want no part of rent control'."

I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, at least be honest, but I'm sure you would call me to order. At least let the government be true to its principles and firm on its principles. Then I would understand its position. But don't let the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations go across the province and say he will resign if rent review has to be extended and then have the Provincial Secretary for Social Development come into this House and pretend the government is doing some good for the tenant by extending this rent review legislation. The government has been forced into it and knows it. The members on this side of the House have forced the government into it.

Mr. Good: I have a few comments I would like to make regarding the amendments to The Residential Premises Rent Review Act. Since I had a part in the original passage of this bill, I have followed it with considerable interest, although it has not been as controversial and as prominent a piece of legislation in my area as perhaps in many other areas, especially here in Metropolitan Toronto. Recent checks have shown me that in my particular area there has been no upsurge in applications since the original large number of applications for rent review has subsided. It is pretty well standardized and there are not as many applications now as one might have expected at this time.

There are inequities in the legislation on both sides. I think inequities can run in the section which allows pass-through of costs. I think those inequities can work against the landlords, especially small landlords, who are not allowed return on investment; by the same token, with the pass-through of costs, especially in the section which deals with not allowing losses to a landlord, especially after the sale of a building, the adjustments could be considerable.

If a building is sold, and mortgages are increased that of course affects the cost to the landlord and those are passed through. The suggestion has been made that losses sustained through the sale of a building should not be allowed to be applied directly to the rent in the succeeding year; that this loss should be amortized over a succession of

years to follow so that there would be no undue increase in rent because of the pass-through of additional mortgage costs on the sale of a building when a large mortgage is put on by the new owner.

Several things in the bill appear to be rather controversial. I think one must look at them with a good perspective from both sides—from the tenant's point of view and from the landlord's. I think the thing can be simplified to the point where both will be well protected.

The matter of the percentage of increase that should be allowed without the landlord applying for a review, I think has been dealt with very well by the member for Armourdale. He suggested we should not be playing a numbers game. We are in a programme of controls, federally, under the Anti-Inflation Board, and I think the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board make, without exception, the best level of control that should apply to other areas of the economy.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, it is most difficult to understand how the NDP can be so vehemently opposed to the AIB guidelines—

Mr. Bain: Because there are no rent controls in the AIB.

Mr. Good: —and yet be so dedicated to the idea of rent controls. It just doesn't make sense. But, of course, very little they do say makes sense when you look at it from an economic point of view and a position of sound economic principles that should be imposed for the best of everything.

Mr. Moffatt: You wouldn't understand.

Mr. Bain: Liberalism has nothing to do with sound economic principles—just opportunism.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Waterloo North will continue.

Mr. Good: I'd like to offer comments to the minister, Mr. Speaker, on several of the ideas that have been put forth in amendments in this bill and some of the ideas that are prevalent among tenants and landlords.

First of all, I'd like to comment on the matter of considering all units in a building for the ensuing year when the first application for review comes up. On the surface, that may very well sound like a good idea so that the number of hearings could be reduced and tenants would know what their increase would be. I suggest that hardship could come to tenants if the increase is set a whole year in advance. Conditions change, and I would think experience in the last year has shown that we may hope the inflation rate will decline and that smaller increases in rent will be given—or needed—by landlords six months, nine months or 11 months from now. To me, it would not make good sense to set the rent for a unit for a complete year in advance.

I think there is a provision now in the Act where the rent review officer, at his discretion, can ask landlords to make applications which would come up within the near future. I think this idea could be improved somewhat, in that landlords could be required to make application for other units that come up in the immediate future. But I hope the minister will take regard to the fact that I for one feel that setting rent increases a year in advance on those units, in my view, is not fair to the tenants. It's too far in advance. With the declining rate of inflation which we are now enjoying, it would become a hardship to the tenants to set the rate a year in advance.

Another matter I'd like to talk about—and perhaps when the minister replies he can explain it—is the registration of rents for a building. Under the amendment proposed in this bill under section 6, there will be a new section added to the bill, 11(a), and this section will require that where an application—excuse me.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the terms of this bill are quite technical and I would like to get my point across to the minister. Mr. Speaker, if I could have at least your attention, I would like you to relay to the minister that I would like to have his attention.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Waterloo North has the floor.

Mr. Givens: Sit that farmer down in his seat.

Mr. Moffatt: You are an agrologist, aren't you, Bill?

Mr. Cunningham: You and Jack Horner.

Mr. Good: Thank you. My point is this. Section 6 of the bill calls for the addition of a new section in the Act, and this new section says that the rent review officer may ask for a rent roll or a rental agreement for a particular unit when there is an application by the landlord for review of any unit in that building. That's fine, except that this

is permissive. Personally, I think that the rent review officer should be required to have that information on file to begin with. The rent review officer in my area tells me that yes, they invariably will ask for a schedule of rents, so there would be no problem whatsoever in changing that "may" to "shall" and require that they have a schedule of rents for every building where there is a review hearing.

However, in my view that does not help the other situation that occurs when tenants are new and they're moving into a building and have no accurate information of what previous rents were. There have been all kinds of suggestions, including posting up within the building what the rents are in that building. That idea I personally reject. I don't think it's good. I think they would get torn down in no time, and I don't think they should be held up for public display.

There has been the idea that there should be a rent roll and a schedule of every rental of every apartment unit in the province on file with the rent review officer. That may or may not have merit. To me that sounds very cumbersome, that the owners of every duplex, triplex and fourplex that's never been to rent review would have to file a rent schedule.

I think, though, there must be some protection for the new tenant and I would think a system could very well be worked out—I have spoken to people on this and it would not be cumbersome—where a tenant could be able to file with the rent review officer a form 5A, which is a form asking for justification of the rent, and that the rent review officer would on the filing of a form 5A by a tenant, whether that tenant has been given an increase at that particular time or not, but especially this would be applicable to new tenants moving in, when the tenant goes down and fills out the 5A form it should be mandatory that the rent review officer requests from the apartment owner a rent rollback to 1974, the same as he is requesting when the landlord files an A5 for a rent review.

I don't think that would be a cumbersome situation. It would mean that the rent review officer would have on file the rent schedules for apartments where the landlord has asked for a review and where the tenant has asked for a justification. I would think the tenant should be able to file the 5A form not only when the landlord wants to increase the rent, but at any time during his tenancy or especially when he moves into a new apartment. It would be quite difficult for a tenant moving in to find out on his own just what the previous rent was. Since rent review legislation does not apply to the tenant but to the apartment, I think the new tenant has the right to know what that previous rent was.

[9:15]

I don't think that would be cumbersome. It would mean that the rent review officer would have to file that rent schedule under those two conditions. They tell me they are doing it now for the landlord's application where there is a justification of rent which does not trigger a rent review hearing; it simply allows the rent review officer to ask the landlord to justify his rent.

Unfortunately, I have to go along with the idea that there is a necessity to continue this legislation here in the Metropolitan Toronto area, and perhaps in some other areas of the province. I would be glad to see a programme that would gradually phase this thing out. When rent review came in we had a 10 per cent vacancy in the Kitchener-Waterloo area in the summer months and about four per cent in the winter months. Since no apartment buildings have been built in our area since rent review came in, our vacancy rate is now considerably less. It will not improve until we get a splurge of new apartment buildings.

There has been one redeeming factor. There have been a lot of condominiums built in our area, and while their sale has been quite slow there are people moving out of apartments into condominium units. I think this is helping our rental figure to some extent. That concludes my comments on this legislation.

Mr. Moffatt: Come on, "Jack"; let's have your speech, "Jack".

Mr. Shore: I welcome this opportunity to speak.

An hon. member: There's a by-election in Crowfoot.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for London North welcomes the opportunity to speak. I hope you will welcome the opportunity to listen to him.

Mr. Shore: I welcome this opportunity and, with the permission of the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), I would like to share a few remarks with you.

Mr. Nixon: The member for Riverdale isn't even here. He might be smarter than the rest of us.

Mr. Shore: I've had permission from him to speak.

Mr. Good: Are you still as opposed to it as you were before?

Mr. Shore: I would like to join with the minister in actively supporting the Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act.

Mr. Ferris: You didn't used to like rent control, Marv.

Mr. Shore: I take pride in joining with the government in the extension of this Act.

Interjections.

Mr. Shore: These interruptions make good Hansard. I notice a lot of Liberals aren't wanting to talk because they are a little scared about what they said last year; this year may vary a little bit.

An hon. member: Not so with you, Marvin.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hope the member for London North will confine his remarks to the principle of the bill and ignore the interjections.

Mr. Mancini: Marvin scores again.

Mr. Moffatt: It is still one to nothing.

Mr. Shore: I will talk on the principle of the bill but, for the record, I would like to state that on many of the specifics brought up by other members—and I note particularly some of the comments made by the member for Waterloo North—I share their feelings; I won't, however, repeat some of the specifics.

I think it should be stated that the members of the New Democratic Party have shown very clearly that they are truly in opposition. It wouldn't make any difference whether this bill was extended or not, they would be opposed to it.

Mr. Moffatt: We said we supported the bill.

Mr. Shore: They are clearly indicating that they are opposed to everything; they have shown that today.

Hon. W. Newman: They are opposed to everything.

Mr. Moffatt: We will continue to support the bill.

Mr. Shore: They like to be the initiators or the originators, to take the credit all the time. They are not the end all or the be all on the rights of tenants. They may think so, but the tenants don't necessarily believe that.

Mr. Bain: No, you are, Marvin.

Mr. Ferrier: You are the end all and be all on the rights of the landlord.

Mr. Shore: I would also like to state, for the record, that in the year or so that this legislation has been in place tenants and landlords in the riding of London North have experienced certain unhappiness.

Mr. Bain: If you quit switching around you wouldn't get all the flak.

Mr. Shore: I have been pleased that in many of these experiences—unfortunately not as many as I would like either through the rent review Act or through discussions, both the tenant and the landlord have come away happy. Just this week, through a bad experience with the rent review Act, a landlord and a tenant who had been getting along for a number of years became involved in a very apparent and unfortunate conflict. I am pleased to report that I am going to be meeting with both these parties and hopefully they will communicate with each other, if nothing else.

Mr. Ferris: Bash their heads together.

Mr. Shore: There is quite a bit that I could say of my feelings and experience on the administration of this legislation heretofore—hopefully the new amendments will help clear that up—but the most consistent experience I have had is with the inconsistency in its administration.

Having got that out of the way, I would like to speak for a moment on the whole concept of rent review. I would like to reply for a moment to the criticism of this Act which has been made by the opposition. Apparently the hon. members of the opposition would prefer to see the government institute permanent rent controls.

Mr. Moffatt: How would you know?

Mr. Shore: They have suggested that there be no termination date in The Residential Premises Rent Review Act—and that the rent review programme continue indefinitely. I submit that is no way to eliminate the shortages. I was extremely surprised to hear the opposition make the recommendation, and I would have thought that the hon. members of the opposition were acquainted with the experiences of permanent rent control in other jurisdictions—jurisdictions which I think they should be somewhat familiar with.

Mr. Grande: You don't want this government—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my understanding the member for Oakwood has already participated in this debate.

Mr. Shore: However, they are actually as out of touch with the real world as I had always believed they are. Still, I would have assumed that they were somewhat familiar with the writings of the great economists they sometimes read about, but the hon. members of the opposition appear to be living in a fog. They are not aware that historical experience and economic theory demonstrate—

Mr. Kerrio: You have risen above that now, eh, Marvin?

Mr. Shore: Yes, I've gone above it.

Mr. Moffatt: You are right up to your eyes.

Mr. Shore: As a matter of fact, I was never quite there. I think you are above it too but you don't want to stand up and say it, that's the problem.

Mr. Mancini: Is that a Jack Horner remark?

Mr. Shore: We can't afford Trudeau's price.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the member for Essex South try to contain himself, please?

Mr. Mancini: It is awfully hard, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And the members for Niagara Falls and Durham East.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, it is time we realized that permanent rent controls—and I stress permanent rent controls—and housing shortages are substantially synonymous and that permanent controls invariably create shortages.

Mr. di Santo: Don't be so silly.

Mr. Shore: Really the ultimate losers in all this are the people I want to protect—and I am not so sure about you—

Mr. Bains: The landlords.

Mr. Shore: —the tenants of this province. Put that in your Hansard as you send it out too.

Mr. Speaker, a rent review programme is merely, I submit, a short term measure only to be applied when a disequilibrium has developed in the housing market. I would like to remind the hon. members why this government originally decided to implement The Residential Premises Rent Review Act.

Mr. Bain: You were forced into it.

Mr. Shore: Supported, incidentally, by all parties. I think it is correct to say that the problems which eventually led to the institution of the Ontario rent review programme probably began back in 1971 or maybe a little earlier.

Mr. Campbell: No, 1975 is about right.

Mr. Shore: Oh, we've got a new voice. Before that date, and indeed, for some time afterwards, tenants in this province enjoyed a buyer's market. I would like to debate that because, in fact, they did. There was a large surplus of rental units available and consequently rental accommodation was comparatively inexpensive. In many parts of the province, then and to this date, there are still major losses incurred by ordinary landlords suffering unduly. I had the pleasure, a week or 10 days ago, of being in Windsor and speaking to a group of people of approximately 200—and I'd like particularly the loyal opposition to have been there—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: What principle of the bill is the member enunciating?

Mr. Shore: The principle is this: They have accused landlords of being bandits, pirates and thieves. They should have shared that evening with me, with 200 people, some of them owning four units, six units, 10 units, and tell them they were bandits, with all their savings put into these things. These were entrepreneurial people who put their savings into it.

Mr. di Santo: Oh, come on. Sit down.

Mr. Shore: And I'd like to see them go down to Windsor, and call that group of people bandits.

Mr. Ferrier: How do you know what rents they were charging?

Mr. Shore: In 1971, Mr. Speaker, economic studies were beginning to show that investment in rental properties was no longer sound. Bonds were much better to buy. Rent increases were needed to make new investments profitable and to enable older projects to catch up with costs.

Moderate increases of four or five per cent a year were needed to restore the balance between rent and costs. I doubt that many people would have objected. After all, these increases would have been less than general inflation. But the necessary rent increases were delayed in many instances, partly because of the market conditions. From 1970 to 1974, rents rose approximately eight per cent compared to 41 per cent increases in costs for many homes. The reasons why rents didn't rise to that level was because completions had created, in many instances, an oversupply. Then again two things happened to make the investment situation even more desperate.

First, the federal government went ahead with its package of tax reform. Among other things, during that time, the reforms meant that depreciation on rental projects could not be deducted from other income. The benefits that some tenants had been getting because of the tax break provided to rental investors came to an end—and in fact it did. I know for a fact and many others know, that many owners were satisfied to take nominal returns, if any returns at all. But they weren't doing it and the marketplace was also a determining factor. The federal government's own advisers warned that this provision would reduce investment in rental properties and they were right.

From 1970 onward, starts on apartment buildings began to decline as a percentage of total starts from better than half of the total starts to less than one-third last year. Vacancy rates began to decline as well, of course. At the same time, renewed inflation at ever higher interest rates pushed capital and operating costs to new highs.

Look at some of the facts. In just the past couple of years, property taxes are more than 18 per cent higher than they were two years ago. Mortgage interest rates have risen substantially. Tenant repairs—nearly 23 per cent. Fuel and utilities—more than 30 per cent. In the same period, average rents rose just a little more than 11 per cent for existing apartments.

But it was still evident, Mr. Speaker, that this moderate rate of increase could not be sustained. As the costs continued to escalate, it became obvious and apparent that a day of reckoning was coming and that the accumulated deficiencies of the past would create rent increases of higher proportions. Individual cases of hardship were reported with increasing frequency and a sense of panic—and I stress panic—started to spread among the tenants. The cries rose up for rent controls and ironically, this cry itself helped to stampede the market and make controls necessary. No one knew what rent increases were coming or what they should be.

In an effort to get ahead of the game, and stay within the game in some instances, some landlords seemed to be pushing for increased rents. Some appeared to be grabbing what they could before the controls came in. So controls became necessary to cool out the situation and to phase in legitimate rent increases to cover legitimate costs—

Mr. di Santo: Who wrote your speech, Marvin?

Mr. Shore: —rather than overnight increases and overnight raises without justification or explanation.

Mr. di Santo: What is that? A ministerial statement?

Mr. Ferrier: Who wrote your speech, Marvin?

Mr. Shore: I do it. I do a lot of my stuff myself now.

Mr. Mancini: We can tell, Marvin.

Mr. Shore: Oh, and I try to get some help from whatever side of the House I can get it—although I agree you agree with most of the comments. I appreciate that.

Mr. di Santo: You will make it next time.

Mr. Shore: Rent controls are not an argument against the private sector, but rather a necessary although short-term period of adjustment.

[9:30]

Landlords are not to blame for inflation. They must eventually pass it on. In the main, it is not their fault that it came all at once; that was largely dictated by circumstances, I submit. Nor is the tenant to blame. Obviously, tenants must be sheltered from a sudden reckoning with inflation that at one blow takes away the capacity to pay for an apartment which only the week before was well within their reach. It would have been inhuman to sit back and watch circumstances deprive people of their homes.

Some of the factors that led to the government's decision to introduce the rent control scheme still remain, particularly the federal government's anti-inflation programme, continuing high rates of inflation and a shortfall in rental accommodation.

Mr. di Santo: What about high unemployment?

Mr. Shore: This has necessitated an extension of The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, which has been prolonged until the official termination date of the anti-inflation programme. The hon. members of the opposition feel that rent review should remain in force until all shortages in rental accommodation are removed. I would like to remind such members that the provincial government has programmes now in force which are working, and hopefully will work better. Ontario has Canada's most comprehensive and well-developed rent supplement scheme. This has been rapidly expanded to meet the needs of those who cannot afford basic accommodation. The government rents apartments from private landlords and leases them to families and individuals based upon what they can afford.

On this point, I think this concept is worthy of strong improvement and expansion because therein lies hope for the future of rental accommodations, and therefore help for the tenant. It has been proven time and time again that the private sector can not only build them at less expensive costs, but can operate them at substantially less. Provincial co-operation with federal and municipal governments will continue in order to increase the amount of rental housing for senior citizen and low-income families. Through the newly merged Assisted Home Ownership Plan and the Home Ownership Made Easy programme, we will continue to assist moderate-income families to buy their own homes, thereby freeing currently occupied rental units.

Mr. di Santo: When?

Mr. Shore: I must tell you, if you're truly interested in the tenants—

Mr. Moffatt: We are.

Mr. Shore: Yes, you are all right; however the government is also initiating a programme to stimulate the construction of moderately priced rental units. This programme will work in conjunction with the assisted home rental plan of the federal government.

Mr. Haggerty: You don't believe that?

Mr. Shore: Oh I believe it, sure.

Mr. Deans: That one has been an overwhelming success?

Mr. Shore: I believe it, yes.

Mr. Deans: You would believe almost anything.

Mr. Shore: No, I wouldn't believe some of the things you would say, but next to that quite a bit.

Mr. Deans: I said almost anything.

Mr. Shore: As I said earlier, this has been successful in most areas of Ontario and the federal government expects to commit more than 5,000 units in 1977. This will make a substantial contribution, I submit, to removing rental shortages over the coming year.

However, in some areas, such as Toronto apparently, the federal programme will need assistance in replenishing the rental housing market. To ensure that ARP functions as effectively as possible, the Ministry of Housing will provide an Ontario rental construction grant, as we now know, of up to $600 per unit per year in those areas where the federal programme requires additional support. This new programme should provide starts for more than 3,000 additional units in areas where they are most needed.

On this point, I believe that we're going to have a little expansion, a little more understanding of the details of this, so that the builder and the developer can understand the long-term effects of it. While the government of Ontario recognizes the need for solving the problems of shortages, we cannot accept the argument of the opposition that no termination date should be written into the legislation.

Mr. Deans: Why?

Mr. Shore: The opposition has its argument back to front as they usually do in many other things.

Mr. Swart: You went from front to back.

Mr. Shore: Rent controls act as a negative force in the government's aim to create new housing. It causes shortages, it doesn't eliminate them. This is why additional construction programmes and taxation changes have become necessary.

Mr. Deans: Thirty-four years and now you are moving—maybe.

Mr. Shore: Quite apart from that, there are a number of reasons why it would be unwise to extend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act indefinitely. For one thing, the legislation merely permits the pass-through of cost increases and offsets the possibility of a financial loss to the landlord. In order that rental construction will continue in the future, we must recognize that rental properties have to provide an attractive re-

turn on capital comparative to that of an alternative investment. Otherwise we can sit in this Legislature and give the great speeches that are given on that side—

Mr. Ferrier: Not many great speeches coming from your side.

Mr. Shore: —but the builders will be unable to find investors willing to purchase rental structures and will have little incentive to construct additional units.

Mr. Deans: The rent controls don't have anything to do with that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will recognize the member for Wentworth next.

Mr. Shore: By establishing rent controls indefinitely — and I stress indefinitely — we could in effect be giving the private construction industry notice. We could be giving them notice and we don't want to do that; we don't want to do it because of the health of the tenants in this province. We could potentially be giving them notice to divert resources toward construction of non-rental units, thereby creating an indefinite shortage of rental accommodation that could only become worse year by year. When will the members opposite wake up? I don't know.

It is essential that the rent review programme harness rather than discourage the private sector. There is no solution in replacing private industry with government involvement in the construction of rental units, both from a capital nature and from an operational nature. Even their own critic, formerly, who is either being demoted or promoted—I can't quite figure yet—has stated clearly that the operational costs of governments are upwards of 20 per cent higher. Private builders say they can build and manage rental units for 15 to 20 per cent less. I believe it, and the experience of public corporations in the past bears this out.

Mr. Deans: How come Jack Horner did so much better than you?

Mr. Shore: We must remember too that it is necessary to maintain a healthy public debate over the provisions and the desirability of the rent review programme. This has always been a government that is open to new ideas and possibilities, one that has never been shackled by ideologies or doctrines. But if we were to make rent review permanent, as many opposite would like us to do, we would be stifling that debate and diminishing the likelihood that alternative and better proposals for housing policy would emerge. I would like to believe we do not want that to happen.

I would like to respond briefly to one more criticism that has been made of rent review programming—that it is causing a great problem. I don't want to go into this in great detail, but it seems to me that while I support strongly the continuance of this programme for the time being, we must do everything possible to make sure that its administration is improved and at least try to reflect some form of consistency across the province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. di Santo: Some pounding, please.

[Applause]

Mr. Deans: Is that enough?

Mr. di Santo: Okay. Mr. Speaker, after the contribution of the member for London North—

Mr. Shore: Just say you support what I said and you'll be all right.

Mr. di Santo: —half facetious, or pitiful I should say, I would like to rise and support the continuation of the rent review legislation. I think this is a necessity in the province of Ontario at this time, and not because I am dogmatic, but because I don't know how long we are going to be in this situation. I really don't understand the Tory members, the minister and the other members from the government benches, who are speaking on this bill. We are in this situation because the private sector was unable to respond to the needs of the people of the province of Ontario; it was unable to supply enough accommodation to the tenants so that, two years ago, they were objectively in a situation where they were gouged by landlords. That was the objective situation we were in two years ago because the private sector was unable to respond to the needs of those people and that is why we were forced to introduce this legislation. There is nothing dogmatic on this side.

We don't think there has to be rent review or rent control legislation like this forever. On the contrary, we think that everyone in our society is entitled to have housing because we think that houses are a social right and not a privilege. It's because the Tory government, in 34 years, has been unable to promote the kind of economic development in the housing sector where people could afford a house, that many people today

are forced to go into rental accommodation. Since there is not enough rental accommodation for all those people who cannot afford a house, we were forced into a situation where we had to introduce this rent control legislation. It was not because it's our choice; it was because of the failure of Tory policies over 34 years.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Is that why all the provinces have it?

Mr. di Santo: We are talking about this province and the results of 34 years of Tory government. I don't care what happens in Rhodesia or North Korea—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Why does Manitoba have it?

Mr. Shore: What about Saskatchewan?

Mr. di Santo: We are here in Ontario and we are suffering. There are thousands of people, not only in my riding—I don't want to be parochial—but 50 per cent of the population in Metropolitan Toronto, who cannot afford a house any more. Not because of us, because we have never been the government of this province; the Tories have been the bloody government of the province of Ontario for the last 34 years.

Today we are faced with this situation and the Tories are trying to justify it. I'm really shocked when the member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) stands up in her place—

Mr. Drea: Don't you point at me.

Mr. di Santo: Not the member for Scarborough Centre, of course.

Mr. Ferrier: Only you are allowed to point, Frank.

Mr. di Santo: I'm shocked when the member for Scarborough East stands as a defender of the rights of the tenants when we know what happened before introducing this legislation. We also know what happened last summer when the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations was against extending this legislation; and the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth), on the contrary, was maintaining that this legislation should be extended. It probably was because of the different constituencies they represent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I've got more renters than he's got.

[9:45]

Mr. di Santo: I would also like to say that there is a reason why we think the rent increase at this point should be comparable to the increase in the wages allowed by the Anti-Inflation Board. The reason is that this government immediately endorsed the anti-inflation programme for reasons that have been discussed during the Throne Speech debate and we think that we cannot afford any more that this government can introduce legislation calling for excessive increases in items which are not regulated by the Anti-Inflation Board—like hydro, which last year was increased by 30 per cent—can increase rents by eight per cent and then the workers of this province because of the anti-inflation legislation can only get a six per cent increase.

I think there has to be a rationale in the economy of the province. If this government is not able to produce enough rental accommodation; if this government is unable to produce enough houses for the people of this province, at least the workers of this province should have the right of paying only as much as they get because of the anti-inflation legislation.

I think we will not solve this problem in 1978. We will not solve this problem in 1979, because there is no way that we will have enough rental accommodation in this province. Just one or two weeks ago, the Minister of Housing, in announcing his grand plan, said, if I am not wrong, the incentive for the new rental accommodation will be $600 for a unit.

Mr. Haggerty: Right on.

Mr. di Santo: It was calculated that we will have 3,000 units in the whole province, while one year ago it was said from the government benches that we need at least 10,000 rental units every year. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, you will realize that there is no way that the pressure on rents will decrease, because the market is just unable to supply enough accommodation to meet the demands of the tenants.

For this reason, I support the legislation because I think that it is necessary. I think, though, that the increase allowed should be within six per cent, because that is not only what the Anti-Inflation Board allows, but will slow down the inflationary spiral that is still here, according to what the Treasurer of the province (Mr. McKeough) said the other night in the presentation of his budget.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: First of all, I would like to comment just briefly on some of the remarks I just heard from the hon. member

for Downsview. He made one of the most accurate statements that I think he has probably made since he came into this Legislature and I quote him: "We will not solve this problem in 1978 or 1979." Absolutely correct. That member and his caucus will never have the opportunity to solve this problem—

Mr. di Santo: No, never; you will not solve it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —in 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981 or 2000 plus.

Mr. Moffatt: Five years before you solve it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: So I can assure the member that that is the first accurate statement he's made since he came into this Legislature.

Secondly, the hon. member for Downsview stands up and says that I announced a programme the other day in which I've indicated 3,000 units. The hon. member has obviously taken a leaf from his leader's book. That is you fool around with the numbers, you play around.

As I said one time not too long ago, what those people do over there is approach this whole situation as if they were at a buffet luunch. They go along taking all the things off that they think suit them, then pile up on the plate more than they really need and then they want to pick somebody else's pocket to pay for it when they get to the end of the line.

If they had taken the time to read the material that was presented to them, they would have found that under the assisted rental programme now being carried out by the federal government in this province, 5,000 units are expected to be built this year—under the assisted rental programme.

Mr. di Santo: You take credit for what the federal government is doing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I kept those figures as low as possible because I feel there's no point in trying to inflate the figures. I said by new programme should provide for 3,000 more units and I said most of those will be in Metro. That for the member's benefit, in case his math isn't as good as it should be, is 8,000 units. Add to that the number of units that will be built for rental by the private sector, add to that the number of rental units to be provided by Ontario Housing—

Mr. di Santo: Do not take credit for the federal programme.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Sit down, I'm talking. Sit down, you're out of order Add to that the number of units that Ontario Housing will put onto it, and the member has his 10,000 to 12,000 units.

So start counting more than just fingers. Start paying attention to what's going on and quit fooling around picking numbers out of a paper. Pay attention to what you think you're doing.

Now we'll come back to the principle of the bill. I don't think there's any question on either side of the House that the rent review legislation has accomplished what we hoped it would accomplish, and that the rent review legislation is here before this House so that we can continue the programme.

We think we have accomplished holding rent increases at a reasonable level over this past year. If we haven't done that, then, of course, I must say that the hon. members in this Legislature now, plus those who are not gracing us with their presence, joined with us in supporting the legislation as it now exists. That's what happened; the legislation is there. The New Democratic Party would like very much to have everybody believe it is responsible for rent review legislation.

Mr. Kerrio: That's not true, we are.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That is not correct. This Legislature is responsible. The bill was brought here, it was debated, it was abused a little by some ridiculous amendments, but basically it was this Legislature that brought in the legislation. Don't try and take any credit for anything. They haven't got the ability to bring in anything that will stick in this Legislature—and they know it.

Mr. Deans: I think we have stuck in your craw a few times.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We are attempting to bring this new legislation in for the purpose of continuing the programme as has been agreed by all three parties. Speeches have been made here and it was agreed by all three parties that it should be temporary. The leader of the New Democratic Party has said it should be temporary legislation. That's what we've got—legislation that will be continuing for another year and, hopefully, within that year we can see an easing of the shortage of rental accommodation in this province.

I don't come from the metropolitan area, but I recognize that it's here in this part of the province where the real problem is. That's what we're hoping to be able to resolve by programmes that will provide more rental

accommodation. Hopefully, that can be accomplished. I am not going to take the tack that has been presented to me by members of the New Democratic Party, in discussions I've had with them publicly and privately, that all of the housing in this province should be built by the government.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's ridiculous. That's the position they have taken all the way along. They would like nothing better than to see the private sector say, "We're not going to build any more housing." They'd love to see that, because then they would come back—and they've done it here to me already—beat me over the head and say, "The private sector won't do it, the government has to do it." That's their whole philosophy.

Mr. Grossman: The same old stuff.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Someone said we have rent review and not rent control. That's right. But if they had their way they would have rent control. They would have control of everything. They would control every aspect of the economy, because that's the whole philosophy they live by.

Mr. di Santo: Come on, that's nonsense. Sit down.

Mr. Grossman: Check out your leader over there.

Mr. Ruston: You want to control all the farmers over there.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We're not going to do that. We have a real belief that the builders of this province, the people who are capable of building the rental accommodation in the private sector, will in fact build, but they have to have an atmosphere in which they feel they can build and can recognize and can realize that they are going to be able to make a reasonable return on their investment.

Mr. Shore: Do you understand that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The NDP members should go and talk to some of these builders —if they have the nerve, considering the position some of them have taken—go and talk to them and ask them what return they are getting on investments. Go and talk to some of the landlords who are now trying to make a living out of buildings they buy.

Mr. Bain: I think Cadillac-Fairview is doing all right.

Mr. Germa: How about Ronto Development?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Ah, Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for someone to grab that hook, and the member for Sudbury grabbed it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's not a principle in this bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Absolutely no principle in anything he said, you're right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He hasn't got the floor; you have.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'll go on, sir. I'll bow to your order. But you're absolutely correct, there's nothing principled in what he had to say.

Mr. Kerrio: That's not fair—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We would like to continue with this legislation as it has been presented, because we believe that over the next year, with the efforts of the private sector, with the continuing of the programmes that are going to be needed by Ontario Housing, with the units that will be built through the combination of the programmes between this province and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, we will be able to provide more and more rental units, primarily here in the Metro area but as well throughout the whole province, to get vacancy rates in the various communities so that rent review will not be necessary.

We don't believe we should put rent review in as a permanent piece of legislation. I don't believe that. I would like to think my friends in the Liberal Party don't believe that either. I think most of the forward-thinking, not-too-far-left members of the New Democratic Party think the same way as well.

Mr. Shore: All two of them, whoever they are.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I believe we can go along and carry out our programmes and provide the necessary accommodation.

Mr. di Santo: You created the mess.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I want to commend the member for Armourdale. I'm sorry he's not here. The member for Oakwood pointed a finger at him and said he's a free enterpriser. I commend him for admitting he's a free enterpriser because it's the free enterprisers who've made this province work for many years.

Mr. di Santo: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It sure hasn't been that socialistic approach that you guys have been taking.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You are the best housed people in the world.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's what has been making it work. Right now, we have our AHOP programme in place and providing housing for people with low and medium incomes. The grant programme that we've started to provide rental accommodation can deliver, provided those investors and those builders can have some confidence they'll be able to get that reasonable return. They're going to watch with interest what we do with this legislation. But if some members opposite are determined to keep them out of the market and not build those units, then let them just carry on with the way some of them have been talking about six per cent increases. That's ridiculous.

Mr. di Santo: You are determined. Don't say we are determined.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We've taken off the land transfer tax. That's going to help provide more units in this community and in this province. I say to members that the basic bill that's before them for approval tonight is a good piece of legislation and that it should receive the endorsement of this House. Let's get on, get it into place and move on to other matters of importance to be discussed here in this Legislature.

Mr. Deans: I hadn't really intended to participate in this debate.

Mr. Shore: I can't believe that.

Mr. Deans: I had thought earlier that the debate was going to terminate early in the evening and we were going to go on to other legislation. But since the debate now has dragged on for some considerable time, I thought it might be worthwhile to put some comments on the record with regard to views I've held for some time about the rent control legislation we're now debating again.

I want to bring to your mind, Mr. Speaker, the fact that over a number of years—10 to my reckoning and perhaps you can remember even other times prior to your and my coming into the House—we had placed before the government problems that were evident and emerging in the rental accommodation field. I can recall distinctly on a number of occasions over the 10 years from 1967 to 1977 we pointed out to the government that there were evidences that rents were rising out of the normal range that might be acceptable to the majority of people and that we needed rent review legislation to allow for a reasonable review of rents in order to ensure that we didn't have to end up with rent controls.

It has been evident since 1967, in all fairness to the minister, that there has been a general slowdown, or perhaps to put it another way, the number of rental units being constructed in the province of Ontario hasn't been keeping pace with the need. It hasn't been keeping pace with the need for a number of reasons. One of the reasons is that people who up until 1967 had been able to look forward to and save for and acquire a home of their own were no longer able to because of the inadequate policies of this government. People who might have been going into the purchasing of accommodation in the years 1967 through 1977 were being left in the rental marketplace.

I've got to say to the Minister of Housing, who just finished speaking, that much of what he has said is absolute nonsense.

Interjection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the member for Essex South stop hollering across the chamber. That's not permitted.

[10:00]

Mr. Deans: Show a little decorum. To use the words of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), I've come to the conclusion that the ministers involved in this debate—the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and the Minister of Housing—just don't understand what's happening in the province of Ontario. I get the claim from the Minister of Housing that we in the NDP believe all housing should be built in the public sector.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I can read it back to you.

Mr. Deans: I want to tell the House what we believe.

Mr. Shore: You mean this week.

Mr. Deans: Incidentally, why did you do so badly? Jack Horner did so much better than you.

Mr. Shore: I know; he's a smarter guy. What am I going to do?

Mr. Deans: I don't know. Don't you feel a little embarrassed?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How about the principle of the bill?

Mr. Shore: He is a better negotiator.

Mr. Deans: In any event, we believe that accommodation can't be left simply to the

whims of people investing money. It can't be left to that. Accommodation for people is a basic right—not only accommodation, but accommodation at a price they can afford.

What has happened in the province of Ontario, because of the non-policies of this government in the housing field, and because it hasn't been able to cope with the rising costs, and because there was little if anything done in the area of ensuring mortgage interest rates at prices that could be afforded—because these things weren't happening across the whole country, but in particular in this jurisdiction—we found that more and more people were being pushed out of the purchase market into the rental market.

That meant the province of Ontario should have been—and this won't come as news to the members—in the business of providing rental accommodation many years ago in a far greater way than it was. There should have been a concerted effort made to ensure for those people who couldn't afford to pay what might be considered the economic rent to guarantee the investor an adequate return on his or her investment, that there had to be alternative accommodation in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of those people. That wasn't done in the province of Ontario.

There are, at this point, tens of thousands of elderly living in accommodations for which they are paying far more out of their meager incomes than their incomes can afford. And the province doesn't move with any meaningful purpose to try to ensure that there are either accommodations for them at a price they can afford or, on the other hand, a subsidy for the rents that will enable them to live in the accommodations they are in. That is the first problem.

The second problem is that there are any number of people, who can be easily identified, who fall into the category of being low-middle and low income earners. They go out to work every day like you and me. They work hard for their livings. They don't earn enough, though, to get into the marketplace and pay again the economic rent that was required by investors in order to ensure what they thought was an adequate return on their investment. Yet the province of Ontario was unable—or unwilling, I suspect, rather than unable—to move swiftly into the provision of accommodation for those people.

So when we found that as this province failed to provide that accommodation; failed to take the necessary steps from 1967 through 1975 to ensure that land prices didn't continue to escalate unreasonably; failed to build or to enter into the building field; failed to provide the kinds of mortgage financing at interest rates that were necessary in order to maintain a reasonable level of payment for most people—when we found those things weren't happening, we were faced with situations where the average family was having to pay out far more of its disposable income for accommodation than it could reasonably afford.

In Metropolitan Toronto it was clearly evident three years ago that there was, to use a rather nasty term, rent gouging taking place. It wasn't a matter of an economic return. It wasn't a matter of guaranteeing a reasonable profit level. There were people in the market who were prepared to take everything they could get without any consideration for the capacity of the individuals living there to meet their obligations, not only for accommodation but for all the other things that make life bearable and worth living.

I think that is what we were faced with in the province of Ontario, and in particular in metropolitan areas, Toronto being the worst example. Here we were with people who were goughing—plain ordinary gouging; who were taking far more from the individual renters than was reasonable. We were forced to rent controls.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Why do you say rent controls?

Mr. Deans: I say rent controls because that is what they are. Let's not kid ourselves. They are rent controls. The government is controlling rents.

We were forced to rent controls. We needn't have been forced to rent controls if the government had had an adequate housing policy; but it didn't. So the government was dragged kicking and screaming into rent controls in the province of Ontario. It didn't want them. If the Tories had had a majority government they would never have been there. The government brought them in because it knew the results of the last election were at least to some extent influenced by the people who said they were being taken unfair advantage of by certain landlords in the province.

I say certain landlords because I recognize, as evervone else recognizes, that not every landlord in the province gouges. There are any number of landlords who own small apartments, even some who own large apartments, who have a social conscience. There are landlords who are prepared to recognize the problems that confront the tenants of their buildings, and they do deal fairly. Those are the landlords, incidentally, whose tenants

never complain to the members, whose tenants never go before the rent review boards, whose tenants are satisfied they are being dealt with in a reasonable and fair way.

Rent controls didn't hurt those landlords one single bit—not one bit. Not a single one of those landlords felt any undue pressure as the result of having had rent controls brought in. There are a lot of landlords in the province of Ontario, many of them small—I don't mean small in stature but small in the numbers of buildings they own or in the types of buildings they own—who didn't need rent control in order to live up to their obligations, and to recognize what was a fair return on their investment.

But just as there are a large number who fall into that category, there were, if one were to measure in terms of the numbers of rental units available in the province, an equally large number who had no conscience at all. They cared not one whit for the desperate straits their tenants were being placed in, and were prepared to take out of the marketplace every single cent they could get, whether it was justified or otherwise. And they are still around.

They are the landlords who today are before the rent review appeals system trying to get more. They are the landlords who appear and who place before the Rent Review Board great lists of all the things they do for their tenants—and then when you start to check it, you find that while they've put down sums of money for painting, they never paint. They put down sums of money for maintenance of the building; they maintain the building hardly at all. They charge in excess. What they put before the rent review officer and subsequently, in almost every case, before the Rent Review Board, are extravagant guesses about their expected costs.

I find it most offensive when I look at it, when I appear before a rent review officer, as I have done on numerous occasions, and I find the landlord is placing before the rent review officer statements that are false—phoney statements that don't bear any relationship to the way they deal with their tenants or to the way they maintain their buildings.

I wonder at times if part of the fault for that doesn't rest directly with this minister, because every time he stood up and said he didn't like rent review or rent controls, that he was not going to extend it, that he thought it was unfair to the landlords, that he was going to quit if it was continued—every time he did that he shored up all the cheap ones, all the ones who were prepared to take advantage of people. He gave them the opportunity to feel secure in the knowledge that the government supported what they were doing, even though it may not have.

I think that is where the problem lay, it was an attitude of landlords that they didn't want to be controlled. Of course, they didn't want to be controlled. Many of them were taking such advantage that they didn't want to lose the massive profits they were taking out of the buildings they had.

Mr. Reid: They weren't all taking massive profits.

Mr. Deans: If the member had been here a moment ago he would have understood that I explained that. It's too bad he doesn't sit and listen to these things.

Mr. Reid: Anybody who can sit and listen to you has got a better stomach than I have, I must say.

Mr. Deans: Yes, but perhaps not bigger.

Mr. Reid: Not bigger, but stronger.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: I bow to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: The difficulties of tenants, though, are far greater than the difficulties of landlords in these situations. To begin with, we hear the former Liberal member for London North, and also the Minister of Housing, talking about how this holds down investment in rental accommodation. They seem to forget that new development doesn't fall under the Act.

Mr. Shore: You'll never understand, you know that?

Mr. Deans: New development doesn't fall under the Act.

Mr. Shore: You could look in the mirror forever and still not understand.

Mr. Deans: Those people who are investing—

Mr. Shore: Hopeless.

Mr. Deans: —know full well that they are going to be able to charge whatever it is that they require in order to recover their investment. Either that or the government is going to go back to the system that says that the person who has owned a building for 30 years and has paid it off a long time ago and who owes absolutely nothing on it is entitled

to get in return for that the same as the person who has invested most recently and who has a large mortgage at large interest rates.

The member can't tell me that that would be fair and he surely doesn't expect that.

Mr. Shore: Do you know what indexing means in pensions? Do you know this?

Mr. Deans: Oh, yes, I know what indexing means.

Mr. Shore: I don't think you do.

Mr. Deans: The government is just about to try to eliminate indexing in pensions. I know exactly what it means.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You're not saying that if you paid $20,000 for a house 20 years ago, that you'd only get $20,000 today?

Mr. Deans: I'm going to tell the government something. If it had taken care of land costs as it should have, if it had been in the housing market as it ought to have been, if it hadn't taken the position taken by Stanley Randall and others who are in the gallery, if it hadn't taken the position—

Mr. Grossman: Oh, that's not fair.

Mr. Deans: —that it didn't want to enter into competition with the private developer—

Mr. Grossman: You'd better get into this, Stanley.

Mr. Deans: —if it had taken the position that it was prepared to use the land of the province as a lever against ever-increasing prices in order to hold prices down on a level that people could afford, then the minister wouldn't be asking me that question. Because the prices wouldn't have gone up—

Mr. Kennedy: You would have the government own every house in the province.

Mr. Deans: —by leaps and bounds as they did over the 10-year period that I'm talking about.

Mr. Drea: And the member for Beaches wouldn't have made thousands on a fast sale.

Mr. Deans: There was a period in time not so many years ago when the appreciation of land values and the appreciation of real estate was nominal.

Mr. Drea: Wait until the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) reveals how much he made.

Mr. Deans: It rose, but it didn't rise in the way that it rose over the last few years. The reason it rose over the last few years is because this government helped to shore up the land speculators in the province by charging to the public for the land that it had purchased years before at much reduced costs. It charged at the very same level as the speculators were charging in the marketplace. It worked hand in hand with them in order to shore up their greed. That was in spite of the fact that these matters were brought to its attention time after time, year after year.

And so the reason we're faced with such exorbitantly high costs today is directly related to the fact that the government was not prepared to take the necessary action over that 10-year period—

Mr. Shore: What bill is he speaking on, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Acting Speaker: The same one you spoke on.

Mr. Deans: —in order to maintain the costs at a level that people could afford. In the same time, it forced families into the situation where they had to become two-income families. Now the budget's beginning to try to move away from that position. How in heaven's name people are ever going to live on one income again in the province is beyond my understanding.

Mr. Shore: Time.

Mr. Grossman: Meanwhile, back on the bill.

Mr. Deans: In any event, to go on, tenants in the province have great difficulty in dealing with this problem. Even though tenants can get the time off work to go up and find out what the landlord has filed, the majority I have to deal with first of all don't fully understand all of the documentation that's provided; and secondly much of what's provided is provided in the kind of language that it requires legal advice in order to understand or at the very least accounting advice.

So the majority of tenants are going on instinct. Their instincts tell them that the increase that's being asked is somehow out of line with what they understand the rising costs to be. The landlord then appears before the review board, and you find that he is then able to make changes in his submissions. And of course when the tenant—

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, perhaps there might be some order in the second row.

Mr. di Santo: Frank, you're right.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member may continue.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, I was just having a drink. When the tenant then appears before the review board, the tenant is faced with figures that are somewhat different from the figures that were filed with the review board in the first place. If, as and when the landlord is questioned, either by the review officer or by someone from among the tenants or by someone representing the tenants, you find that in fact the information that is being sought is very difficult to obtain.

[10:15]

For example, when I'm appearing before the review board, how can I tell whether the landlord does maintain his building adequately? How can I tell whether his maintenance costs are real? How can I tell whether the landlord does have to recaulk all of the windows in his apartment building this year because it hasn't been done for five years? How am I going to know that? How can I tell whether the price that he attaches to that is a reasonable price?

How would I know whether the landlord has to do substantial maintenance to the heating plant? How could I tell whether the landlord provides janitorial service and what the cost of it is? There is no way. He can file and say that's what it costs or that's what the projected cost will be, or these are the capital projects he intends to undertake. But there's very little opportunity for anyone appearing to either verify or dispute what's being placed before the review officer.

I don't deny that the review officer himself, or herself, can then go away to some secluded spot and, if he or she so wishes, require the landlord to produce evidence. He or she could, I suppose, go and look at the building and could, I imagine, ask to be shown the bills of five years ago if they were still available. But they don't do it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, they do.

Mr. Deans: Oh no, they don't. The reason I say they don't is that if they did it, then how could there be a reasonable explanation for the difference between the rent levels set by the review officer on the one hand and the substantially increased rent levels that have been set in so many instances by the review board on the other hand? If the review officers do all the things the minister says they do, then it wouldn't be possible for the landlord taking the same basic information to the appeal board to obtain such an extravagant change.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: A hearing de novo.

Mr. Deans: Right. I understand that. But when it's a new hearing, how can two people hearing basically the same information come to such substantially different opinions?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's not the same.

Mr. Deans: But it must be the same. If the landlord, on the one hand, produces a great list of all of the costs attendant on maintaining that building and paying it off, then surely he can't be able to produce additional figures.

Let's say the landlord comes in and says: "My mortgage is X dollars at a certain interest rate over an amortization period of so many years. My maintenance last year was X dollars; I anticipate undertaking certain capital repairs in the forthcoming year, and I have estimates to show that this will be the cost. My heating last year was such and such, and I now have evidence to show that my heating costs will rise by a certain sum." And on and on they go, right down to the bottom line. He adds it up, divides it out and comes up with a figure. How then can that selfsame landlord take an entirely different set of figures to an appeal board? Somewhere along the way there is something phoney about this whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No.

Mr. Deans: I'll tell the minister how it's phoney—and I told him the last time I spoke on it.

I had an instance — and I've seen others since where I went to see the ministry's appeal people; the landlord in this instance had imposed a rent increase that was appealed. The decision was given and the landlord then appealed to the board. The board came to a considerably different conclusion than the review officer. In fact, the board granted every single cent that had been asked for in the first instance by the landlord. The man who hadn't been able to attend the second hearing because he was on vacation—I've told the minister this before—came to me and said: "I don't understand that. I went to the first hearing. The review officer had placed before him all of the information with regard to the mortgage and all of the other attendant costs, and the review officer came to the decision that"—for the sake of argument—"$190 was the ap-

propriate amount." You will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, the figure may not be absolutely correct, but for the sake of this argument, let us say $190. "The landlord on appealing to the review board was granted $240." I wrote to the review board and said: "I wonder if you would be good enough to provide me with the basis upon which your decision was reached?" That's all.

Mr. Reid: They couldn't give you an answer.

Mr. Deans: I got an answer. Do you know what the answer was? The man received another notice with a substantial reduction. Damn it all, if that's the way the system works, it's inadequate and it's phoney. How can it be that after a letter from me—and I didn't even get the information I asked for—the man received a second notice from the review board telling him that his increase was less than they had originally determined. That speaks volumes.

Mr. Reid: That is not one that made sense.

Mr. Deans: That speaks volumes about the process and tells a long and bitter story about the way this thing has been working.

Mr. Reid: Ask him where he got the people to administer the programme.

Mr. Deans: I don't know as much of Toronto as I do of Hamilton, but I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, in almost every instance that I am aware of—I say almost, although I could say every instance I am aware of but I just can't be absolutely sure that's true, but certainly in almost every instance I am aware of—in spite of whatever it was the original review officer decided, on appeal to the board, the amount granted was substantially more than the original decision.

Mr. Reid: Because the tenants didn't have time to go back.

Mr. Deans: I am not talking about marginally more. I could understand there might be some difference.

Mr. Grossman: And therefore.

Mr. Deans: But it was substantially more. Okay, and therefore it makes a mockery of the first hearing. The landlord simply was feeling out what he could get without presenting adequate information, or the information that was provided was adequate but the review officer didn't do his or her work properly or the review board is biased in favour of landlords.

Mr. Grossman: Do you want examples the other way?

Mr. Deans: I am talking about the cases I am aware of in the city of Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There were thousands which went the other way.

Mr. Deans: If the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick would like to rise at some other time and explain his experiences, I would be quite happy to listen to them.

Mr. Grossman: I helped tenants and they were more successful.

Mr. Deans: I helped tenants and mine have been marginally successful. But I am not going to get into an argument with you over whether you do a better job. It may be that in your capacity as a lawyer, you can charge more. I don't know.

Mr. Grossman: I didn't charge anything and I did best.

Mr. Deans: How do you know?

Mr. Grossman: You have admitted your marginal success.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member for Wentworth will ignore the interjections and speak to me.

Mr. Deans: What would you like me to talk to you about?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The principle of Bill 28.

Mr. Deans: In any event, Mr. Speaker, since you and I are going to talk about it, I just want you to know that, incidentally, while this may not be a problem up in your area—I suppose it could be, but it is not likely to be—in my area what I have found is that there is something terribly wrong with the system. There is something wrong with that. Truthfully, I don't understand—

Mr. Reid: Neither do the rent review officers, that's the problem.

Mr. Deans: —how there could be such a disparity in the decisions made by the various officers at the various levels, given that they are supposed to present all of the evidence and the evidence is intended and supposed to be factual. That's what my argument with it has been all along. The minister says he wants to maintain it at eight per cent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Take a look at the Act.

Mr. Deans: No. I said the minister has said that he wants to maintain it at eight per cent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I said I have no information that indicates it should be less.

Mr. Reid: Has the minister got information that indicates it should be eight per cent?

Mr. Deans: If the minister says to me he has no information to indicate it should be less than eight per cent, I have got to assume that he is going to maintain it at at least eight per cent. Is that reasonable?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes; I have given it to you.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. I thought it was myself. Anyway, I then assume that the minister is going to maintain it at at least eight per cent—maybe nine or 10 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It can't be, under the Act.

Mr. Deans: Oh, I see. So it will be at least eight per cent, okay?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Not more than eight.

Mr. Deans: Not more than eight.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Right, there's a difference.

Mr. Deans: Maybe you could help me—will it be less?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Could be.

Mr. Deans: Are you prepared to recommend six? Do I hear six—once?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This isn't a question and answer period.

Mr. Deans: I'm just curious. I just want to know.

Mr. Germa: How low can you go?

Mr. Deans: The truth of it is that you and I, Mr. Speaker, both know that the Anti-Inflation Board regulations that govern all of us, in spite of the better judgement of some of us, have set the six per cent level. I assume there's no productivity factor in rents—I'm assuming there's no productivity factor. So, therefore, the six per cent level would appear to be the appropriate level to establish as the minimum, because that's what it is, you know; that's the minimum, in most instances. But, in any event, six per cent seems to me to be more appropriate, since we're all under the anti-inflation guidelines of the federal government, in any event.

If you don't like six per cent and you think you deserve more, you can always appeal it. Since the landlords have access to all the information in every case, and since the landlords are using the tenants' money to hire lawyers to go into the review board, it makes some sense that we should establish it at a level that is commensurate and, somehow or other, related to the anti-inflation levels established by the Anti-Inflation Board; and also the levels that govern the wage increases of the majority of people across the province—excluding members of the Legislature, of course.

I just think that if the government is going to be honest with the tenants in the province of Ontario, and I know it wants to be, then it should say it is prepared to accept the Anti-Inflation Board guidelines at six per cent, and say that that is what it is going to establish. It is going to do it for the very good reason that that's what is set out in the anti-inflation legislation for this coming year.

That's a good figure. It may, in fact, turn out that on the basis of all the information, once it's gathered, six per cent will be too high. But then the tenants could always appeal that. It may turn out, in a few isolated instances, that six per cent will be too low, and, of course, the landlords can appeal that. But I've got to think that there is as much relevance and sense to the six per cent figure as there would be to seven per cent or eight per cent or ten per cent. In fact, there's more, because there is, at least, the Anti-Inflation Board guideline to fall back on.

So we urge the minister, as many of us have done already, to give very serious thought to establishing that as his figure for the base. I think he would find then that there would be a lot of support for that. I want to say, while talking about it, that I note with interest that the Liberals put forward a position where they seem to be—I'm not absolutely sure what their position is—but they seem to be in support of six per cent. I'm not positive because two have said yes and one has said no—so I'll wait and hear it.

Mr. Grossman: So, what else is new?

Mr. Breithaupt: You'd better read the amendment.

Mr. Deans: But I read it. It says that on April 19 the hon. member for Perth said he will be proposing an amendment that truly relates this bill to the AIB guidelines, and

would reduce the rate of increase to six per cent in October 1977, or at such time as the AIB guidelines are reduced.

I would assume that—given we have to deal with the bill now, and given that we're faced with the possibility, if not the probability, of an election—the Liberal Party would be prepared to support six per cent. I think we should put it in the bill and let you come back if you want to change it.

Mr. Kerrio: It's our amendment, you have got to support it.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this would be an appropriate time—since I have extensive remaining remarks—for me to adjourn the debate.

On motion by Mr. Deans, the debate was adjourned.

Mr. Kerrio: I'd like to speak to the issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time has expired. The debate is adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Before the motion to adjourn the House, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just announce what the House leader told me about the business of the House tomorrow. I understand we will be proceeding with second reading of Bill 31, following question period.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since we do have a late show under standing order 28(a), a motion to adjourn is deemed to have been made, and I now recognize the hon. member for Welland-Thorold for up to five minutes.

[10:30]

NIAGARA REGION OFFICIAL PLAN

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see the Minister of Housing come in, because he made decisions last February on the urban development boundaries of the Niagara region which were nearly meaningless in preserving the fruit and grape land there. Since then, significant new information on lower projected growth rates have come into his possession which shows the pattern of growth in Niagara will not change at all unless he makes some new moves to reduce those boundaries in the unique land area. To prove this, I want to make three brief points.

First, the pattern of growth in the Niagara region has been a steady increase on to the unique lands until, in the last five years, 80 to 85 per cent of the development has taken place there. These unique lands comprise only about one-quarter to one-fifth of the land in the Niagara region, but they do include north Thorold and north Niagara Falls and I suggest we can't leave out north Thorold and north Niagara Falls. They're class 1 and 2 lands.

The research at Brights Wines found the soil immediately above the Escarpment in these municipalities had deeper topsoil and better air drainage than grape land below the Escarpment in the Niagara-on-the-Lake area. Two grape kings are located in this area of Thorold, yet the minister is prepared to allow unlimited development on this land which can grow grapes and a wide variety of crops in great volume and quantity. So I repeat that 80 to 85 per cent of the growth in the whole Niagara region is now taking place on the unique lands below the Escarpment and immediately above it. That's the trend and the regional planners' figures confirm that trend.

Secondly, I want to point out that the urban boundaries are significant, because urban boundary limitation on the unique land is the only technique in the whole official plan of Niagara region for shifting growth on to the poor lands in the Peninsula to change the trend. There are no servicing plans to service the poor land first. There is no public land development on the poor lands to provide lots at a cheaper price and there's no phasing of any kind, in fact, for shifting growth.

The minister recognizes that, because in his letter of February 16, which he sent to the Niagara region, he said: "We would like to suggest that the region actively consider a strategy for redirecting urban growth south of the Escarpment." This means that either the urban development boundaries on the prime unique lands are pulled in tight enough and firm enough so that a large proportion of the growth can't go there or there is, in fact, no preservation because there's no other way of preserving it.

I come to my third point, which is this: The urban boundaries which the minister has approved on the unique lands are so extensive that they won't change that pattern one whit. The growth can go on in the same old way. Let me prove that assertion, using exclusively the Niagara region's own report, the DPD 750, 916 and 917, and the report of Peter Barnard Associates, a report which was commissioned by his ministry and reported to him in late February or early March.

There are now still 23,000 acres within the Niagara region urban development boundaries. Niagara region says 11,000 of this is

unique and class 1 and 2 land, most of that 11,000 being unique. Barnard says only 8,000 acres will be needed for housing in the Niagara region by 1996. Maximum land for all purposes will only be 14,500 of the 23,000 that he has put in, and the regional planners basically agree with this projection. They point out that the population growth densities on the land in the northern part of the Peninsula, in St. Catharines and those municipalities down in the area of the unique land, are much higher than in the rest of the Peninsula. So if most of the growth goes into the north, substantially less land than the 14,500 acres will be required.

Extrapolating their land requirement and growth figures, which they say are likely high, we find that almost all the growth, something like 95 per cent can go on the unique and class 1 and 2 land, and 75 to 80 per cent of that can go on the unique land during the next 20 years. I say, what preservation—when we have within those same urban boundaries 12,000 acres of poor land where that growth could be accommodated?

I hope the Minister of Housing will deal tonight with these kinds of statistics and not the phoney comments that he and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) make that we in the NDP want to freeze all the land.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Swart: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can I just conclude by saying to the minister that his whole land preservation posturing is a façade and a sham and the Niagara region is the worst.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. minister has the floor for up to five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to say that I understood this debate tonight was to deal with what the hon. member felt was an inadequate answer to the questions that he asked earlier today in the question period. At no time during that rather disjointed presentation did he even refer to the questions that he placed before me. So in order to place it in a proper perspective, I will respond to the questions that he asked me earlier today.

First of all, there's a basic difference between the hon. member and myself. The basic difference is that I have the responsibility to make the decisions, he does not.

Mr. Swart: Unfortunately.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: His responsibility, from some of the things he said recently, both quoted in the newspapers and elsewhere—

Mr. Worton: Give it to him, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —it is very evident that what he would like to see is a total and complete freeze of any development—

Mr. Swart: I knew you would say that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —around certain communities in the Niagara area, primarily St. Catharines for one, and in a very parochial way would like to see the development all funnelled over toward the city of Welland, of which he is a resident and a representative. What he is really doing is attempting to create a real problem because in order to accomplish some of the things he would like to see done, we would end up having to do away with the community of Thorold. I hope the good people of Thorold recognize he is going to be, and could be, solely responsible for Thorold becoming a part of St. Catharines, if amalgamation is forced, and he will have to answer that.

Mr. Bain: Don't you ever answer a question in a straight manner?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The hon. member asked me today whether I would confirm here in this House his request—

Mr. Bain: Get back to your radio show.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and the request of others for referrals to the OMB. I will repeat my answer from today—all legitimate requests for referral will, of course, be honoured and they shall in fact be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Mr. Swart: What was the supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He has asked for five areas to be referred. If we have proper documentation from the hon. member—and I trust we will have—then of course those areas will be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board, along with others we have received.

I also say to the hon. member regarding the assessment of that particular area, I think we have done that. I think we have assessed that very carefully and we have made a decision. That decision has been made available to the people who are the local representatives of that area, and I am not going to follow the New Democratic policy of trying to impose my will over and above the will of the people of that area.

Mr. Bain: Tell us about regional municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Of course, I know that is what the hon. member would like to have done. I suggest to him that he take his problems to the Ontario Municipal Board, present his case to the Ontario Municipal Board, and the only thing I can say for his benefit is I trust he will be able to present a much better case to the OMB that he has here in the House tonight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I deem the motion to adjourn to have been carried.

The House adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 21, 1977

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, on second reading 757

Debate re answer to oral question on Niagara Region Official Plan, Mr. Swart, Mr. Rhodes 787

Adjournment 789

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)



No. 20

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Friday, April 22, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1977

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand, Pauline M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1978, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, April 22, 1977.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

HOME BUYERS GRANTS

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Today's Globe and Mail article concerning the payment of a home buyers grant to Mrs. Otto Jelinek gives the misleading impression that the ministry was uneven in its treatment of this case and in particular that the Jelineks were inconvenienced because the ministry "had second thoughts" and asked for repayment of the grant after having approved Mrs. Jelinek's application in the first place.

I should like to correct the Globe's story by setting out the relevant details of the chronology of our investigation of Mrs. Jelinek's application and the reasons for disallowing the grant. These are outlined in a letter sent by the Ministry of Revenue's director of legal services to Mrs. Leata Jelinek on December 1, 1976, which reads in part as follows:

"Dear Madam:

"In the summer of 1975 you submitted to this ministry an application for a grant under The Ontario Home Buyers Grant Act, 1975. The application was dated June 25, 1975 and was made with respect to your purchase of a home at RR 2, Carp, Ontario, and contained your signed statement that neither you nor your spouse had previously owned a housing unit that either of you had inhabited as a principal residence. The grant applied for was paid on the strength of the information provided in the application and the certification made as to the veracity of those statements.

"In the fall of 1975, it came to our attention that your husband had for some time prior to April 8, 1975, owned a proposed condominium unit at 60 Southport Road in the city of Toronto. No reference to this housing unit was made in your application.

"On December 12, 1975, Mr. Charles Calarco of our ministry's special investigation branch interviewed both you and your husband in Ottawa to determine from you the facts concerning the Southport Road unit, The information given to Mr. Calarco by your husband at that time was that the Southport property had not been resided in by your husband as his principal residence, but had been rented out to tenants, and that your husband had used the property only during the election campaigns in 1972 and 1974.

"On the strength of the information we obtained, we concluded that the Southport Road property had not been resided in by your husband as his principal residence and that, therefore, his ownership of that property did not disqualify you from the grant that had been paid to you.

"Although the matter of previous ownership of proposed condominium property, and the matter of residence in such property as a principal residence was under discussion in the interview with Mr. Calarco, no mention was made by either you or your husband of ownership of, or residence in, unit 73, level 1 at 1532A Beaverpond Drive in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. During our post-audit review of the home buyer grants programme, the existence of, and your husband's interest in, the Beaverpond Drive property came to our attention and has been investigated.

"Our information with respect to this property is as follows:

"1. An agreement of purchase and sale of the Beaverpond Drive property was entered into in October, 1973, by your husband and Home Smith Properties Limited.

"2. Interim closing of the purchase of this proposed condominium unit took place on October 15, 1973, and you and your husband occupied the property together soon thereafter. The purchase price was approximately $34,000, most of which was provided by your husband's agreement to assume a mortgage on the property.

"3. Since the proposed condominium unit was not registered under The Condominium Act at the time of the interim closing in October, 1973, your husband paid occupation rent to the owners of the proposed unit from November 1, 1973, as provided in the agreement of purchase and sale.

"4. Shortly before your marriage to your husband in 1974, he directed that title to the Beaverpond Drive property be taken in your name.

"5. Shortly after taking possession of the property, disputes arose about repairs to be made. Certain repairs were effected by the developer in January, 1975, and you executed a document indicating that these repairs had been performed.

"6. You and your husband continued to live in the Beaverpond Drive property until some time in May, 1975, when you gave up possession. At about the same time, your husband was negotiating the purchase of the Carp property with respect to which you subsequently applied for a home buyers grant; and

"7. In June, 1975, your husband issued a writ against Home Smith Properties Limited claiming damages for injury to certain of his property kept on the premises during the occupation of them. Section 1A of The Ontario Home Buyers Act, 1975, defines a housing unit to include: 'A proposed unit within the meaning of The Condominium Act and a unit in the building of a co-operative housing corporation.' "

And the next few paragraphs outline further details of the Act, Mr. Speaker. The letter continues:

"On the basis of the foregoing information, your husband, Otto Jelinek, owned, within the context of The Ontario Home Buyers Grant Act, a proposed condominium unit at 1532A Beaverpond Drive prior to April 8, 1975. Had you raised the matter of the Beaverpond Drive property with Mr. Calarco at your interview with him in December, 1975, we would have been able to explain to you your disqualification from entitlement to the grant more fully at that time.

"On behalf of the Ministry of Revenue, I request that you immediately repay to the province of Ontario the sum of $1,000 improperly paid to you under The Ontario Home Buyers Grant Act, 1975, and that such payment be made within 10 days from your receipt of this letter. If payment is not made the province will be obliged to take action in the appropriate court to recover the grant improperly paid and applied for."

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: "I trust that such action will not be necessary."

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I think these details clearly demonstrate that the ministry acted properly and as quickly as possible in dealing with this case, once it became aware of Mr. Jelinek's previous ownership of the property at Southport Road, Toronto, and particularly of the Beaver Farm property in Ottawa. Had the Jelineks informed us of their ownership of these properties, the grant would have been denied in the first instance.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's right; you were misled.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Jelinek came to the ministry on December 15, 1976 and repaid the grant as had been requested in the letter. He stressed that he did not have any intention to defraud the government or to do anything wrong, but only to obtain what he thought he was entitled to.

GROUP HOME PLACEMENTS

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House of steps being taken in response to the decision made yesterday in the Supreme Court of Ontario with respect to the placement of juveniles in group homes.

First, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a priority of mine, of my ministry and the government, to ensure the continued well-being of children receiving care and treatment in group homes, both in those homes directly affected by the decision and in homes across the province. While the decision may not affect existing orders of the family court, other than those in issue in the specific case, it does raise important questions regarding the placement of children coming before the court.

I have asked the administrators in the municipalities that no precipitous action be taken that would disturb the placement of these children without consultation with officials of my ministry. I requested their co-

operation and commitment to ensure that these children will continue to receive the proper care that they require.

My staff is in the process of setting up a meeting as soon as possible with representatives of the agencies and group homes involved for consultation and discussion. As well, I have been in consultation with the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) with regard to the legal implications of the decision.

The decision in the Supreme Court focuses on the issue of funding for the costs of placing juveniles in group homes, a matter that has been of continuing concern to my ministry.

Mrs. Campbell: When does it start?

Hon. Mr. Norton: This concern was reflected in a step announced last week by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) and myself. That step was a commitment made by this government to reimburse municipalities for 50 per cent of the costs of juveniles in group homes, those committed by the courts, for the fiscal year 1976-77. Moreover, I would reiterate that the decision to create the division for special services for children and youth was made in order to enable the government to deal with such matters effectively in a comprehensive manner.

I will be continuing to deal with this matter, Mr. Speaker, and in the course of doing so I will keep the House informed of the progress.

ORAL QUESTIONS

BENEFITS RATES

Mr. Lewis: May I begin, Mr. Speaker, by asking the Minister of Community and Social Services a question on another matter, reminding him of his driving social conscience to which the press has alluded in previous articles? How does he possibly justify an announced increase of eight per cent to cover literally two years of delay for GWA and FBA recipients, that, is roughly four per cent a year, when he knows that their shelter costs alone in many instances have gone up three and four times that amount; that the cost of living in that period has gone up twice that amount; and that these are the most vulnerable groups and families in the entire province? Why was it necessary to submit to that punishing level at this point in time?

Hon. Mr. Norton: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would take exception to the implication that this is a punishing level of increase.

Mr. Lewis: It's four per cent.

[10:15]

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would agree that had the resources been available to us that we might well have considered a greater increase in view of the events of the past two years. However, I wish to point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that with this increase—and I think it's important to bear in mind that in addition to the specific level of support there are a number of areas in which there is 100 per cent coverage of such essential matters as the medical coverage for the recipients—we do, in fact, pay not only the allotted amount for heating costs, for example, but will pay the full amount of heating costs and we are presently working on a system to try to do that on a monthly basis where there would be a lag of no more than a month in the payment rather than the present system. But in addition to that, I think if the members look at the level of income support in this province by comparison with other provinces that we fare very well; in fact in the case of family support we rank in several categories second only to the province of Alberta and in some other areas we rank third or fourth.

In any event, I think the level of support that has been determined for the ensuing fiscal year is one which will ensure that the residents of this province who are in need of this kind of support will be able to live without the threat of being below the poverty line.

Mr. Lewis: Significantly below.

Hon. Mr. Norton: And I would also point out, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cassidy: You should resign.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —that those people who are in a situation where the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —allotment does not cover adequately their shelter costs—if, for example, they are in a situation where they are paying exorbitant shelter costs—that we do have under the general welfare assistance programme in this province—

Mr. Martel: Try to get it.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, try to get it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —assistance whereby that may be supplemented so as to assist them and I can assure you that no one in this province need go without the necessaries and we will ensure that. I believe that this—

Mr. Warner: You inherited all James Taylor's speeches.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —increased percentage of support will also go towards ensuring that.

Mr. McClellan: Supplementary: Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that in the last fiscal year the ministry was underspent in its social assistance budget by some $31 million and that had it put that into an immediate increase it would have amounted to something in the order of a nine per cent increase anyway?

Ms. Gigantes: Shame!

Mr. Lewis: That's what happened. You held it back and you got away with it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is not true. I am just looking for the precise figure of the total amount of this increase. In fact I believe that the eight per cent constitutes a commitment for an increase of almost $50 million in income support programmes in the province of Ontario—

Mr. Laughren: You are toeing the line.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —so what has been suggested would not be true.

In specific response, I don't know the precise figure of what excess may have remained at the end of the year. I would point out that especially in areas such as this where there is an element of projection and prediction involved in determining the budget for the period of the fiscal year that it is not uncommon that there would be some excess at the end of the year. It is difficult to predict levels of unemployment, to predict the circumstances in the economy that might lead more persons in our community to require this kind of assistance. To take the step without having predicted what the costs into the future would be and what the needs of the individuals into the future would be, simply dumping excesses as you have suggested I think would be irresponsible. I think one has to plan for these—

Mr. Lewis: Dumping? Dumping? You gave them nothing.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: What was suggested is that whatever excess there was at the end of the year should have immediately been applied.

Mr. Lewis: Sure. Well, you gave them nothing last year.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I suggest that to do that without adequate planning and without consideration of what the future fiscal commitment might be, would be irresponsible.

Mr. Warner: Just like his predecessor.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Would the minister not agree, Mr. Speaker, that since we are dealing with people who are living at what is agreed to be a subsistence level in our society—and we have come through a very difficult winter and a couple of years of dreadful inflation in this country—that the very least he could do is introduce this eight per cent increase starting April 1 and not have to drag it out until July? It is a great hardship on these people. Why not start the thing now and at least give them some hope?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As the hon. member I am sure is well aware, there is a time lag out of necessity between the actual decision and the implementation of this because of the problems that are faced in terms of processing the changes in cheques, for example. As it is, my ministry processes something like 28,000 changes per month in these programmes.

Mr. Lewis: Tax write-offs for corporations take effect immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The earliest that we can possibly do it is by the dates that have been suggested.

Mr. Cassidy: You can back-date the cheques.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The reason for the two separate dates, in terms of June for family benefits and GAINS D and July for general assistance, is so that the cheques will in fact go out at the same time, since one is paid at the end of the month and the other at the beginning of the month.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: Does the eight per cent apply to everyone? It hasn't in the past six years to my knowledge. How can the minister continue to argue, as he did recently in correspondence with me, that indexing, or periodic adjustments rather, are

better than indexing because it's fairer, when in fact the cost of living has probably gone up 16 per cent and the ministry has only given eight per cent for almost a two-year period? Only indexing will prevent that.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I'm sorry, would the hon. member repeat the first part of his question?

Mr. Martel: Does the eight per cent apply to everyone on GWA and FBA, since it hasn't in the past six years?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The eight per cent will apply at the maximum rates—

Mr. Lewis: What?

Mr. Laughren: You are too much.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: As a result of that, those persons who have some other source of income, and therefore may not be receiving the maximum rate, will receive more than eight per cent.

In other words, someone, for example, who is receiving less—say their total entitlement might be in the neighbourhood, just as an arbitrary figure $200, and they have supplementary income of $100—

Mr. Lewis: That's not the poverty level, of course.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I'm just using these hypothetical figures and I'm sure the hon. member realizes that.

The increase to the person receiving the $100 supplement to the other sources of income, would in fact be more than eight per cent because the increase would constitute more than eight per cent of the $100.

Mr. Martel: It would be under $300.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Kitchener-Wilmot have a supplementary?

Mr. Martel: Would the minister answer the second part of the question?

Hon. Mr. Norton: With respect to the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I can say that it is still the policy of this government that the fairest and most flexible way in which—

Mr. Laughren: Fairest?

Hon. Mr. Norton: —to approach these increases is by periodic review—

Mr. Lewis: Is four per cent a year!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —as opposed to a fixed indexing.

Mr. Martel: That's nonsense, you've just shafted them.

Mr. Lewis: Boy, are you a generous guy.

Mr. Ferrier: Just like that guy on your left.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary: Specifically, will this increase apply to those people who are on Ontario pensions, such as permanently unemployable or permanently disabled; and secondly, will the recognition on the ministry's part that an increase is needed also lead to the discontinuance of the practice of deducting from someone on an Ontario pension the amount that the spouse gets on a federal pension?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The answer to the first part of the member's question is yes, it will apply to those persons to whom he refers.

With respect to the second, that is not something, as I am advised, that we can arbitrarily deal with. The agreements that we have with the federal government with respect to income support require that the income support level be established and that where other sources of income increase, including federally-funded programmes, that adjustments be made so as to maintain that level of income support.

As I understand it, it is not something where we can say that if there is an increase in their federal pension we can ignore that at the provincial level. I can assure the member it's something I have been concerned about and am checking into.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary: The minister will be aware that at the present time permanent disability Workmen's Compensation Board payments are deducted from the amount given in general welfare. In view of the miserly increase that has been given, would the minister be prepared to give consideration to giving the same kind of exemption on moneys received from Workmen's Compensation Board as now given for moneys received from labour, namely the $50 and the $100 a month?

Hon Mr. Norton: I am sorry, I am not sure that I understand the question. Could the member restate it, please?

Mr. Lewis: Ask Jim Taylor, he will be helpful.

Mr. Swart: Perhaps I can explain it a little more fully. The employables, those on welfare now, are permitted to make $50 a month if they're single or $100 a month if they're married, and that amount of money is not deducted from the welfare payments. However, everything that a person gets from Workmen's Compensation Board is deducted. Would the minister be prepared to give consideration to treating that money from Workmen's Compensation Board the same as if it were money earned?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would certainly be prepared to consider that, provided there are no legal constraints that would prevent me from doing so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener-Wilmot—a final supplementary on this for now.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, coming back to the minister's response to the second part of my question: Surely the minister, realizes that the practice that he described means that a couple gets no increase at all. That's what we're asking him to discontinue. Would he please respond to that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are not debating answers. Is there a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Yes, I understood the thrust of the member's question, and I trust that he understood the thrust of my response. I think we have to bear in mind that there is new legislation at least in the drafting stage at the federal level with respect to social assistance, and I would hope that—

Mr. Good: Get Jack Horner to speed it up.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Well, that isn't our legislation, that's federal legislation. Yes, now that Jack Horner has joined the ranks he may speed things up a little bit. I would hope that that might allow us that added flexibility, although I caution the member that we are concerned there may be tighter restraints upon us with respect to those arrangements.

FISHING LIMITS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the designated Minister for Northern Affairs?

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: I think that's the exact description.

Did he notice that his colleague, the Minister of the Environment, had indicated in response to questions a day or two ago that fishing might have to be cancelled entirely in various lakes because of the levels of some contaminants and pollutants in Ontario? In view of his previous portfolio and the present one, has he discussed that with him, and what are his own personal views, and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I can only say that I have discussed this with the hon. minister and he tells me that the press reports were not entirely correct. He might want to direct the question to him to clarify it.

Mr. S. Smith: That really helped the other day, I'll tell you.

Mr. Lewis: I don't want to redirect, Mr. Speaker. Instead I'll ask the Minister of Northern Affairs a supplementary.

How much further has the cabinet submission document which went out under his name on July 27, 1976, dealing with the proposed provincial policy for sport fish and land management when sport fish are known to contain contaminants and the various implications for angling across the province, and the various findings he made, and his interesting recommendation—how much further has all of that cabinet document gone to the finalization of policy?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If my memory serves me correctly, I believe that the information package to which the member is referring has recently come before the CCRD just last week, so it will be moving up to cabinet for finalization. I think the deadline for the presentation to the public of that information package, dealing with all the lakes in northern Ontario—in the province, in fact—should be about the end of June. So it is moving ahead. It will be a totally comprehensive information package in regard to contaminants, be it mercury, PCBs, or Mirex.

Mr. Lewis: By way of one quick final supplementary: The minister will recall that he made certain specific recommendations about angling in this document and where it would be permitted. He was prepared to let it be permitted anywhere, even if there were known contaminants. But to what extent has that proceeded?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would like to check on that, Mr. Speaker. I believe it did get through the cabinet committee. As to where it stands now—it went out with my old portfolio, but I can check on it.

Mr. Foulds: How much effect has the presentation of the Northwestern Ontario Chamber's of Commerce recommendation that the English Wabigoon River system be fished out by the Indians and the fish sold to foreign enterprises affected the process of the minister's recommendation in this document?

[10:30]

Hon. W. Newman: He didn't say that at all.

Mr. Laughren: Put your campaign manager to work.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I can report to you that while that particular suggestion might not be received in this area as well as it would be received in northern Ontario, one of the bands is seriously looking at the idea because of its desire—

Mr. Lewis: You are seriously looking at it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, they are—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —because of the employment opportunities that would be generated.

Mr. S. Smith: The poison export business.

Mr. Lewis: To sell contaminated fish abroad.

Mr. S. Smith: You will become mercury exporters.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think the member is just taking it out of context completely. He didn't understand the whole presentation. I'll forgive him for that.

An hon. member: Don't go out of your way.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But the chamber of commerce did indicate to us at that time that it would be submitting it to us in a formal way. To my knowledge, I don't think it has been received as yet.

USE OF SEWAGE SLUDGE

Mr. S. Smith: I'd like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment regarding the guidelines for sewage sludge utilization on agricultural land. Could he indicate to the House whether these guidelines will be adopted soon and whether he'll release the report prepared by the pollution control section of his ministry entitled, Assessment of the Impact in Implementing the Provisional Guidelines for Sewage Sludge Utilization on Agricultural Land? I ask this question in view of the fact that a number of heavy metals and other toxins are alleged to be in sewage sludge that is used at present on agricultural land.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is an interministerial committee now assessing the report of my ministry in respect to implementing these guidelines. The report isn't completed as yet, nor has the interministerial committee formally reported on the in-house report, shall we say. However, in the meantime the guidelines are being applied in the province to those areas where there is sludge removal, particularly where removal is by private contractors from plants and the sludge is being disposed of in different disposal sites—for example, North Bay. As soon as the guidelines have been formally accepted and adopted, that report will be available to the public.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, does the minister admit that these guidelines have been in final draft form since at least a year ago, that 63.2 per cent of the sewage sludge in the province is being used on agricultural land, and that an examination of 54 plants has indicated only 19 that would be acceptable under these guidelines? Why the delay? Surely the dangers to human health are sufficient to alarm the minister into somewhat quicker action.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There is no delay whatsoever. As I say, the guidelines are being used now. Even at this preliminary stage they are being applied to the haulage and disposal of sludge from our various sewage treatment plants. This is an ongoing study involving an interministerial committee and with representatives from the University of Guelph, for example, where the whole study started in the first place. As far as the report is concerned, that report will be released when the actual report is completed and it is updated as a result of the study and the comments of the interministerial committee. But in the meantime the guidelines are being applied.

Mr. S. Smith: Just to be clear about this, on a supplementary; it's really a point of clarification. Is the minister saying all sewage sludge in Ontario now being applied to agricultural land falls within the guidelines of that report?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That is what we are implementing right now, yes. I'm not saying

the guidelines are being applied to every haulage contract, for example, or the actual process of haulage from the various plants. But this is being done on an ongoing basis and we hope within a very short time that every plant will be adhering to these guidelines.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that in other jurisdictions where the sludge is used on agricultural lands, mainly the state of Wisconsin, there are now significant signs of polychlorinated biphenols showing up in the milk from cattle grazing on that land?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I know that PCBs have been a part of the problem as far as sludge disposal is concerned, yes. That's one of the reasons we're applying the guidelines.

Mr. S. Smith: I wonder if I could ask a quick supplementary: The minister says he is trying to implement things and so on. I would like confirmation of this. Is it a fact that on some land tested where this sludge is being used as much as six times the limit of cadmium as the guidelines propose is presently being found? And since at the moment 63 per cent of the sewage sludge is going on to agricultural land without control, what percentage today—right now—is going on without control? That is what I want to know.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I will get that information. I question whether 63 per cent is actually going on agricultural land. Much of this sludge is being disposed of on land owned by the hauler. The land is not used for agricultural purposes. But I will get that particular figure for the hon. member.

UTDC MORTAGE LOAN

Mr. S. Smith: A question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Can the minister confirm reports which suggest that the Urban Transportation Development Corporation made a mortgage loan of something over $85,000 at five per cent interest to a former vice-president as part of his benefits package? What I would like to know, if he can confirm that, is whether that is the normal practice of government agencies? Could he tell us what the salary of the individual was?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I can confirm that a mortgage loan was made available for one employee of the Urban Transportation Development Corporation to accommodate getting the services of that particular individual for the corporation. That individual is no longer with the corporation. The mortgage loan was shown in the annual Auditor's statement that I tabled in the House several months ago. That loan is no longer on the books. It was paid back to the corporation when the employee left UTDC. I cannot tell the member what the salary of that individual was, but I can find that out if he would like.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of brief supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Snow: If I could explain; I don't think I had fully answered the question. It is not the policy of the corporation to carry out this practice. It was an individual situation. As soon as I saw the matter myself, I inquired into it and wanted all the details.

Mr. S. Smith: Basically, I just was going to ask the minister by way of supplementary, whether he has taken steps to be sure that this is not happening in that particular agency. Considering the Auditor's concerns about UTDC generally, the test track programme, supplementary estimates and the Auditor's allegations regarding certain deferred expenses, is the minister intending to give a full and complete statement to this House on the state of UTDC finances and management?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I expect we will be fully discussing that matter when we come to the estimates of my ministry. I hadn't planned on any statement, but if there is any specific information that the hon. member wants I would be pleased to get it.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, perhaps it was overlooked but the minister didn't respond to my leader. Was the mortgage lent at a rate of five per cent? If so, was that part of the incentive package? If it was part of the incentive package, does the minister think that is appropriate?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Off-hand I can't tell the member what the interest rate on that particular mortgage was. It was a year, or at least many months, ago that I looked into it.

Mr. Bullbrook: When the rate was 12 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It was part of an accommodation for this individual whose services the corporation wanted to get and this arrangement was made. As I say, the mortgage has been repaid. I can get the full details on it and table them, if the member would like me to.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: I don't pretend to have known anything of this until it was raised, but curiosity prompts me to ask a question. Perhaps the minister could tell us, when he is answering these other specific details, what caused the termination with UTDC of this individual, since obviously it does call into question the judgement of UTDC that they should arrange such an extraordinary accommodation—double entendre meant—for this man, and then find him no longer in their service a few months later?

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I can't tell the hon. member how many months this individual was with the corporation. I believe he was a very highly qualified individual who had been with—

Mr. Lewis: Krauss-Maffei in Germany.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No. He had been with the space research organization—

Mr. Lewis: With NASA? You would pay mortgages to former employees of NASA? You are—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting valuable time here.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The hon. member says how extraordinary this situation is.

Mr. Lewis: I certainly do.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't think it is particularly extraordinary at all. Many major corporations, when they transfer or bring individuals into their employ—

Mr. Haggerty: They are making profits.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —from outside the country or outside the province or even within the province, make such accommodations to arrange housing for them. It happens every day of the week.

Mr. Germa: It is tax evasion. You know what that means?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have taken almost 30 minutes now in the two lead-off questions which is too long in the question period. We'll have a new question.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If there is time we will come back to whatever question you wish, but I think we should get on and give other members a chance to ask new questions.

GROUP HOME PLACEMENTS

Mr. McClellan: I want to ask the Minister of Community and Social Services a question with respect to his statement this morning. Given that the minister has said in his statement that Judge Holland's decision may not affect existing orders and given that my understanding was that Judge Holland's decision has voided the placements of hundreds of children placed in group homes by family court judges or, at least, leaves each placement open to litigation by a municipality, would the minister not agree, that to protect these placements and these children, he should reimburse municipalities 100 per cent of the cost charged to them by the courts in order to avoid further litigation and the possible disastrously harmful consequences to kids?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am learning very quickly that it would be very dangerous to agree with the member when he invites me to, as he has on a number of occasions. The point in my statement was that the decision of Mr. Justice Holland applied, I believe, to three specific cases that were before him. The best legal advice that I can get at this point is that that decision in itself does not void—probably does not void the other orders.

Mr. McClellan: Do you know or not?

Mrs. Campbell: Where do you get that advice?

Mr. Warner: His track record isn't too good.

Mrs. Campbell: I wouldn't rely on it.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would agree that even if it does not void the other orders, the probability is that other applications will be brought and, as a precedent, that means they might well fall. But the point I want to make is that it does not mean that as of today, for example, that there are 250 children across the province who are not receiving proper care or for whom there is no funding.

As I have indicated to the member, this came to my attention yesterday evening. Contact is being made at the moment with municipalities across the province and with the agencies who are affected by this. And in the course of the next few days we hope to be able to work out a satisfactory arrangement for the provision of those children.

There is no way that we will see those children not provided for. I want to assure the member of that.

With respect to your proposal as to a specific solution, I will certainly take that under advisement but I am not quite willing to agree with you at this point.

Mr. McClellan: You will eventually.

Mr. Foulds: When you are in opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George is, I believe, asking a supplementary.

[10:45]

Mrs. Campbell: In view of the uncertainties which the minister does express with reference to the effect of this decision how soon is he prepared to move to implement those things which are needed to be done to eliminate this kind of uncertainty? In other words, are we to see introduced next week the legislation which can at least move some way to bring within his ministry all of these units, so that then he can look at them and be absolutely certain that he is catching all of these children in these places, since there isn't any accountability in the boarding homes and the minister knows it?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As to how soon are we going to move, in fact as of last night we began to move, as soon as I heard of this particular decision. With respect to the member's question on the legislation, I would anticipate we will be in a position to present it to the House next week.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would point out to the hon. member, even though that legislation may be before the House and passed next week, the effective date of the transfer will still be July 1.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I'm not concerned about any lack of co-operation in this matter. I think everyone with whom I have spoken at this point perceives the potential problem that is faced by many people as a result of this decision. I am sure I can count on the full support and co-operation of the other ministers in whose ministries some aspect of this may come and also of the private agencies and the municipalities that are affected.

Mrs. Campbell: And the boarding homes?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would hope so. Those are among the people with whom I will be meeting as soon as possible—I hope on Monday or Tuesday.

ENTERTAINMENT TAX

Mr. Breithaupt: In the absence of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), I have a question of the Premier concerning the budgetary decision made to deal with sales tax removals for public events where ticket prices are over $3. Is the Premier aware of the severe financial problems this proposal may cause for organizations, such as symphony orchestras and amateur sporting associations, which formerly were exempt totally from the collection of sales tax, and which now may have to change ticket prices or suffer losses unless exemptions are continued, particularly with the sale of tickets already announced and under way for the coming season? Would the Premier also ensure that the various amateur hockey associations, the Arts Council and the other groups are able to make comments concerning the changes of exemption policy, if there are any, so that their financial patterns will not be upset?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can assure the hon. member for Kitchener that the intent of the budget, quite obviously, was to increase the admission exemption figure to $3. There is no intention of changing policies that already exist for exemptions for a number of those organizations. They can rest assured there is no alteration in this approach.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Natural Resources has the answer to a question that was asked previously.

UNITED ASBESTOS PLANT

Hon. F. S. Miller: In my absence last week, the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Bain) asked a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle) concerning progress in the reopening of the Matachewan mine. I'm pleased to make a few comments on it at his request.

All the appraisals I have seen to date of the mine's future are optimistic as an operating entity. These are those prepared by Clarkson Gordon and Company—I haven't seen a formal presentation from them but just their comments—and those prepared by my own staff after a visit to the mine site. Not only that, general world asbestos sales are good and appear to be good for the long-

term future insofar as we can tell. Therefore, from an operating point of view, the mine's future appears good. In the meantime, I've been having discussions with the three partners in the current negotiations, Clarkson Gordon and Company representing some of the creditors, the Mercantile Bank, one of the largest creditors, and the chairman of United Asbestos, representing the shareholders of the company.

I have to be honest and say that there's a complex legal tangle holding up the reopening of the mine more than any other factor at the present time. I have directed my energies towards negotiating some way out of the present impasse which could go on, in my opinion, for a long time unless some kind of negotiation is made. This puts me in the position of being privy to certain information from the various trading partners that I really can't divulge in public but which I am quite willing to discuss with the three partners on an individual basis. I hope the member understands that, because I'm trying to effect the role of an honest broker, in a sense, to bring them together.

The fact appears that a number of willing partners or future owners of the mine are in the wings. These people appear to be both experienced in the mining field and sufficiently well financed to take over the operation without any kind of government assistance. However, I have not at any point said that government might not be willing to consider monetary assistance if some was needed for another operator. It appears it will not be needed.

I'm going to continue these discussions with as much energy as I can in an attempt to shorten the time between now and the eventual opening of the mine.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you run it until they're ready to settle?

Hon. F. S. Miller: If I had the money I would.

Mr. Foulds: That is a change from the previous minister.

Mr. Bain: Supplementary: I appreciate the minister's comments. He mentioned his own ministry's study. Will such a study be tabled? I'm curious about it. He mentioned that the operation was very viable and profitable. I want to know, on the basis of this, if a private company doesn't reopen it, why the government will not consider investing in the mine with the creditors on the basis that the creditors and the government will get all their money back? Why won't the minister consider investing? Is he making that decision on the basis of sound economics or because he is rigidly adhering to a particular political philosophy?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Probably the latter.

Mr. Cassidy: That's honest anyway.

Mr. Laughren: Be doctrinaire.

FIRE PREVENTION

Mr. Foulds: I have a question of the Solicitor General. Did I interpret his statement of last Saturday at the UCANO conference in Thunder Bay as meaning that two additional staff members would be taken on the fire marshal's office staff for instruction for fire prevention techniques and voluntary fire fighting departments in unorganized territories in northern Ontario? Is that what he said?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Yes. We are attempting to obtain the assistance, not necessarily of staff—if that's the question the hon. member is asking—but, on a contract basis, of two people who are familiar with fire service activities and fire prevention to work in the unorganized areas in northern Ontario. They will not necessarily be limited to unorganized areas, but will be there primarily, to do instructional work and promotional work in connection with the distribution of our smoke detectors.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Can I have the commitment that the two contract people or staff or whatever they are will be full-time? Because I believe that the ministry currently is thinking of only employing these two on a part-time basis so that the amount of time expended on this extremely important activity will amount to a mere eight weeks? Does the minister not think that that time scale is woefully inadequate in an area that large, that has a death rate by fire at least three to four times the average for the province, while the average for the province is much in excess of that for the western world?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I have not been involved in the direct negotiations with these two people. It is difficult to find knowledgeable people. I didn't know that there was a chance that they were just going to be on a part-time basis but I will make inquiries. I think we want to get their services as long as we can. If they are available, I would hope it would be for longer than what the

member is suggesting. I'll certainly make inquiries.

Mr. Foulds: I didn't suggest it; it is what the fire marshal is suggesting.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: It's a case of their availability, I believe.

NANTICOKE WATER LINE EXTENSION

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment in regard to the water intake at the Nanticoke hydro generating station in the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk. I believe it was put in during the construction of the Hydro station. Could the minister tell the House what area it is designed to serve, how much money has been spent on the intake around the water system to this point of time, the eventual capacity of the water intake and the rates that are expected to be charged to the region, which will be the initial user?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I don't have all that information with me or in my head. The area, I believe, would certainly include the Townsend area and the Jarvis-Hagersville area. I suppose it could even go as far as Kitchener if necessary.

There has been about $4 million spent so far, mainly on the new industry that's located on the shores of Lake Erie. The rate still has to be established. It will be somewhere around 85 cents I believe. That's just off the top of my head, but about 85 cents, in that area.

Mr. Nixon: Can't lose much more from there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now just a minute, let's not get personal.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I will take note of the hon. member's question. I have a letter from him raising these questions and a number of others, and I believe there is a reply in the mail to him, but in any event I will get that information in more detail.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Supplementary: Why would the rates be 85 to 90 cents for that particular line when it was supposed to be put in to save money for the municipality, and I believe the average for Ontario utilizing the system is about 50 cents, and Stelco indicated it could put in its own line and supply water at 50 cents per 1,000 gallons?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't know why Stelco would say that. If so, I don't know why they didn't go ahead and do it. They had that opportunity.

As far as the average is concerned, if the hon. member is taking the whole province that may be so. There are certainly areas of the province where the rate is higher than 85 cents.

Mr. Good: Supplementary: Realizing that the original intake was oversized, as the original question suggested, is the minister now saying that the extension of that intake to serve the Townsend and the Haldimand-Norfolk region will be large enough to extend that same pipeline up the Grand River at some future date to serve the Kitchener-Waterloo area, or would that require twinning of the work that would be done now to serve the lower end?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The size of that line at the present time would be adequate to extend up to the Grand, at least initially. Depending on the development and the number of people who would tie into that pipe, it may require a twinning at some later time. Certainly initially, and over a short period of time—five or six years, depending on the progress of the line—it would be ample to serve that area if this plan was carried out.

BUDGET PRIORITIES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Can the Premier explain the sense of social priorities of the government which has led the government to increase welfare assistance by eight per cent over the 1975 level for people who have no resources while it has raised the exemption from succession duty to 100 per cent over the 1975 level; that is, from $150,000 to $300,000?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the hon. minister dealt with the first part of that question at some length here this morning. I am sure the hon. member for Ottawa Centre listened very carefully to the questions and the answers that were given, and I think there is no point in having a further debate on that part of the question at this moment.

If the member for Ottawa Centre is objecting to the proposed increase in exemptions for succession duties, I will understand that, and when his party votes against it we will also understand it, and I will not be provocative this morning here and remind him that

in his great sister province of Saskatchewan with the same sort of philosophy, they have eliminated succession duties altogether.

[11:00]

Mr. Good: Ontario and Manitoba are the only ones left.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Are we to conclude from the Premier's reply that it is the government's opinion that beneficiaries of estates worth more than $250,000 are in greater need than people on welfare assistance?

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, good heavens.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's called a non sequitur.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the hon. member knows the answer to that question.

Mr. Cassidy: Not from answers, we don't.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only say to the hon. member he is attempting to be controversial here this morning—

Mr. Breithaupt: He is being political.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —it's Friday, it's a nice day today and I don't intend to be provoked.

Mr. Nixon: Has the Premier been outside?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Really, his question is very silly—he knows that—and I don't intend to add anything to it.

I can give him a few examples if he wants me to. I can give him a few examples, now that I've decided he wants some. Ask some of the people here on this side of the House who represent some of the farm communities; the hon. members opposite don't have that experience so they don't know some of the problems the farmers face.

Mr. Eakins: He has a home on the Island, Bill.

Mr. Bain: How dare you by that statement write-off the farm communities in the north?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'll just give the hon. members opposite a little lesson on the farm community: Talk to some of the farmers who are sitting with land that is assessed at, say, $1,000 an acre—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this is awful; it is becoming a debate. Why did you allow the question or the answer? It's about time you acted like a Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Throw out the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question was pretty hypothetical—

Mr. Cassidy: No!

Mr. Speaker: —and the answer is going to be the same. We're wasting time.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: There's one law for the rich and one for the poor.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We'll hear the hon. member for Quinte.

Mr. Lewis: This is just a dry run for Middlesex tonight.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Quinte only has the floor.

HIGHWAY 33

Mr. O'Neil: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Could the minister tell us whether any plans are under way for the rerouting of Highway 33 north of Trenton, in particular the stretch between Glen Miller and Frankford?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I'm not familiar with whether there are any particular plans for that, but I'll look into it and get the answer for the hon. member.

Mr. O'Neil: Supplementary: As parts of this stretch of highway run within feet of the Trent River, would the minister have his officials in the area check the condition of the guard-rails as there are sections that I believe are in need of additional barriers and certain other sections where repairs are needed?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, I will get that information.

BUDGET BRIEFING

Mr. Ziemba: In view of the absence of the Treasurer, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Revenue. Can the minister arrange to table the names and occupations of the individuals, other than accredited press gallery people, allowed into

the pre-budget press lockup? At the same time, would she also indicate how many of these individuals were permitted to leave before 8 p.m.?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ziemba: Supplementary: Could the minister also explain why the customary oath of secrecy wasn't required this time around?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I would be pleased to.

GO TRAIN STATIONS

Mr. Cunningham: My question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not his ministry or its operating agency, TATOA, has made any changes in the status with regard to those stations planned for the Richmond Hill to Union Station GO train line?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I wonder if the hon. member could be more explicit as to what he wants to know?

Mr. Cunningham: I am asking if the minister would indicate to the House precisely how his ministry could justify a capital expenditure of $350,000 for a GO station to be located on the line at Leslie and Finch, when the location is 1.5 miles from the next planned station at Sheppard and Leslie, and two miles from the Finch station?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The justification or building a station on the GO train line, of course, is to allow people to get on and off the trains.

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: Supplementary: Is the minister reconsidering his decision not to open a GO station at De Grassi Street in the riding of Riverdale?

Mr. Lewis: Stop laughing at him.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No.

HIGHWAY 401

Mr. Breaugh: I would like to try a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications—not about a GO station.

He announced this week that he would be putting out tenders for contracts for the expansion of the 401 through the city of Oshawa. Could I have the minister's assurance that he still intends to meet with those residents groups that the ministry have been meeting with in Oshawa before a final design is struck? That would reflect on when the tenders were let. Will he still do that? Can ministry officials assure us that this will continue to be the process?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am not too sure what the hon. member is asking. I have not been requested, I don't believe, to have any meeting—I have no meeting scheduled. There have been a number of meetings carried out regarding that contract. It is in our programme; it was published in our green book earlier this week. I believe the proposed tender call date is later on in the fiscal year.

I don't know just exactly at what stage the design is at this moment but I know that although we have a contract proposed in our published programme, there's always the possibility of slippage in a particular programme if there's a delay for land acquisition or in design. I know that one major concern of that particular contract was the noise barriers, and I have established a new policy on the noise barriers. The Oshawa contract, I believe, will be the first under this new policy where the noise barrier will be constructed as part of the construction contract. That part, I think, has been clarified. I didn't know there were any further problems. I'll look into it.

Mr. Breaugh: I want to assure the minister that he was invited, if he could make it to that meeting.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. Breaugh: The ministry staff have agreed to come back with a final design to the residents. I would simply like the minister's assurance that they will do that before he puts these contracts to tender.

Hon. Mr. Snow: If there is a commitment made by my staff that they will be back for further meetings, I can assure the hon. member that commitment will be kept.

YORK REGIONAL COUNCIL

Mr. Stong: In the absence of the Treasurer, I have a question for the Premier. Can the Premier give the House some indication when The Regional Municipality of York Act will be amended to provide an extra seat on the regional council for Markham, which has oft sought this amendment, and which seat is much needed in that area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'll be delighted to check this with the Treasurer

(Mr. McKeough) on Monday and try to give the hon. member an indication as to when amendments might take place, and whether this is contemplated as being one of them.

TRANSPORTATION OF MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Martel: A question to the Minister of Community and Social Services: Can the minister indicate when the government is going to announce a policy with respect to funding busing for the mentally retarded to and from home to shelter workshops, and so on—something that's been under study for at least four years now.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am not in a position to make a prediction as to a precise date, but perhaps the Provincial Secretary for Social Development would be in a better position than I to answer that at this point. Discussions relating to that have been taking place involving the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and our policy secretariat.

Mr. Martel: To the provincial secretary: In view of the fact that the government has been studying the question of funding either municipalities or organizations for the transportation of the mentally retarded to and from sheltered workshops, schools, and so on, can the minister indicate when an announcement will be made with respect to a definite policy regarding a transportation allowance?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I think this will be part of our overall transportation for the physically handicapped and mentally handicapped for the province. We do have, as you know, some experimental programmes under way, and we are looking at those very closely and evaluating them before we make a policy decision for across the province.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary: On the timing of that, should positive announcements be made by at least next fall, in terms of the extension of that pilot project across the rest of the province—by at least next fall?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The pilot projects were for two-year periods. We feel we need a two-year period in which to do a proper evaluation of the needs of that particular programme.

Mr. Martel: That's nonsense.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food: In view of the drought problems being experienced by farmers in northwestern Ontario, will the freight subsidy for hay—the cutoff date at the moment being, I think, May, 31—will that subsidy be extended this year? Will the minister undertake to see that all the farmers in that area are notified of the terms of the ministry's plans, especially for crop insurance? Many farmers told me the other day in Thunder Bay that they were not aware of the plan.

Hon. W. Newman: I thought the member would never ask, because I've been waiting. I'd like to point out that we did have a hay assistance programme last year.

Mr. Mancini: Slow down, Bill, slow down.

Hon. W. Newman: I was in northern Ontario last July. I said I would bring forward a crop insurance programme for the farmers in northern Ontario. We have put together a programme. We have announced the programme. We have had a tremendous response from the farmers in northern Ontario. As a matter of fact, we have more than 700 policies already taken out. The coverage will provide insurance of up to $200 per acre where drought affects the farming community in northern Ontario.

I'm very proud of the fact that we've been able to bring this programme forward this year for the farmers. I have a group working with the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) to look at the total water problem in northern Ontario and at the supply of water to farmers in that area. And, of course, there are other programmes we are looking at for the people up there. Also, we did make extra funds available to the agricultural committee to deal with that matter. It really concerns me when those people in the opposition try to tell us that the agricultural committees are not working well, and that we should be doing the work from down here.

Mr. Martel: You wrote it off in your northern report.

Hon. W. Newman: I'll tell you—you people don't believe in local autonomy.

Mr. Martel: You wrote the north off.

Mr. Speaker: Order; just answer the question please.

An hon. member: Tell them about the insurance, Bill.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: I appreciate the minister's efforts. I wonder if the minister would just make a note. There are three small parts to this. They need very brief answers. First, will he continue the hay subsidy? Second, would he make sure that the farmers have all received the information? Many of them, good farmers, have told me they didn't receive the information at their own address. I wish he would do this. And the third question is simply this: Since the money due to farmers under the crop insurance plan will presumably not be received by them until later on in the year and because they've got to pay out money now, would he be willing to make some form of loan available in the interim to assist those people in making their payments?

An hon. member: Interest free.

Hon. W. Newman: I'll be glad to answer that question. As far as deferring payments, I will look at that matter. But as of an hour and 20 minutes ago, it was very cloudy in northern Ontario. We do not know at this time how much rain they are going to have up there. And to say we're going to provide a hay assistance programme—

Mr. Moffatt: You are supposed to know.

Hon. W. Newman: We have an insurance programme in place—I think that's the route we should be looking at. But if we do not get rain as we move down the road, of course we're going to look at the problems of northern Ontario. Does that answer the member's points?

Mr. S. Smith: I asked about a hay subsidy, about more information, pay and loans. God, they are pretty simple questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The time for oral questions is past.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Bounsall: On a point of privilege, the Speaker has made himself very clear on the attendance of cabinet ministers for questions on Friday morning. Could he investigate and make himself equally clear to the cabinet ministers that the question period has, in fact, been extended. The tendency is for those cabinet ministers who are here to wander out before the end of the question period—

Mr. Singer: Why don't you lock them to their desks? Nonsense, nonsense.

Mr. Bounsall: —which means that questions one would normally expect to ask have no opportunity to be asked.

Mr. Breithaupt: Life is often unfair.

[11:15]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a point of privilege. I am sure any message contained in those remarks has been heard and will be heeded.

Mr. Singer: It is not a point of order. It is not a point of anything.

Mr. Lewis: Point of order. We are so gratified by the increased attendance of the cabinet this morning, at least at the outset of the question period, so pleased by the absence of obstructionism and the government's new spirit of co-operation, that we are disinclined to call the election at this stage. I want the government to know that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand that what the Leader of the Opposition is saying is that he will now support the budget, and all the other measures that are before the House, and he has now decided he is not ready yet to fight an election. I am delighted to have that information from him.

Mr. Lewis: Not for a week or so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we have been straying.

Mr. Martel: Not until Monday.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: We are wasting time. That is 10 minutes of motions.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 56, An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide additional employment opportunities by establishing the regular working day of eight hours and the regular work week of 40 hours.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ESSEX COUNTY FRENCH-LANGUAGE SECONDARY SCHOOL ACT, 1977

Hon. Mr. Wells moved second reading of Bill 31, An Act to require the Essex County Board of Education to provide a French-Language Secondary School.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, this is a unique piece of legislation. I have searched the records and cannot find any parallel to it. This is a piece of legislation presented to this assembly to require a local school board, to whom we have given the authority to build a school, to build that school.

As I have said many times and in many different places, there comes a certain time and a certain place when certain action must be taken. The one thing people of this province know is that this government has never been found wanting when that time or that place arrives and action is necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Never found wanting when it comes to procrastination.

An hon. member: How about Peel now?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The bill that is here today, Bill 31, An Act to require the Essex County Board of Education to provide a French-Language Secondary School, is, I think, one of those pieces of legislation that at this time and in this place is an absolute necessity. I think it is an absolute necessity that this Legislature pass this bill unanimously, and that we say to the people of Ontario and the people of Essex county that for whatever reasons the debate and the feelings that have gone on down there have occurred, they should now be put to one side.

We should get on with the job of providing for a minority in that community, a facility that we have said is the right of minorities in this province. I think the presentation of this bill is strong evidence that the province is thoroughly committed to the principle that English-speaking and French-speaking citizens have a right to receive their education in their own mother tongue.

Our resolve to ensure that our French-speaking pupils are afforded the opportunity to be educated in the French language really, I guess, became evident back in about 1968 when the Hon. John Robarts introduced legislation permitting the establishment of French-language schools or classes at the secondary level. The government's intention of meeting the legitimate educational aspirations of French-speaking Ontarians was restated by the present Premier in a May, 1971, speech. He said:

"We will provide education, whenever feasible, to students of the French-speaking and English-speaking minority in the language of that minority. We will also provide them with the means to acquire a good command of the language of the majority."

These of course were not idle words. They were accompanied by strong action, not only by the government but also by communities all across this province, and that is the point that I would like to stress today. Although legislation making mandatory the establishment of French-language programmes at the secondary level was scheduled for 1969, it's interesting that many school boards introduced French-language programmes in 1968 before the actual legislation was passed. In fact, the committee on French-language schools in Ontario, formed to prepare the legislation in 1969 for the establishment of French-language secondary schools in this province, reported that the events had outdistanced them and that to a great extent their deliberations and recommendations were already being accepted.

However, in spite of the general acceptance of French-language secondary schools throughout the province it became necessary in 1972, because of several disputes, to review the 1968 legislation in the light of the experiences that had occurred. The Symons commission was formed at that time and it recommended a number of legislative and administrative improvements.

If we are still experiencing isolated problems in the establishment of French-language schools or classes in the province, one of the causes can be attributed, I think, not to bigotry and not to narrow-mindedness on the part of the opponents of those schools but probably to a misunderstanding of what French-language schools really are. I want to stress that—much of the problem is not bigotry and not narrow-mindedness on the part of people in the communities, but more to a misunderstanding of what French-language schools really are.

Let me refer to the Symons report and try to make it clear what a French-language school is and what a French-language school is not. I am going to quote from the Symons report:

"This commission shares the belief, which is widely held by Franco-Ontarians, that the establishment of French-language schools in

which the language of both communication and administration is French best meets this two-fold need: to preserve the language, customs and culture of the francophone student, while enabling him or her to contribute fully in due course to the cultural life and economic progress of his province and country.

"The specific remarks and recommendations of the 1968 commission on French-language schools, as well as the public comments made at that time by the Prime Minister of the province and also by the Minister of Education and others, make clear that this was the spirit and intent of the legislation providing for French-language secondary schools.

"There have, however, been areas of uncertainty and even of conflict arising from a lack of clear definitions of terms and of authority.

"There has, in particular, been understandable confusion over the precise definition of such terms as 'French-language schools' and 'bilingual schools'. French-language schools are not necessarily and only those in which all subjects, except English, are taught in French, which is the restrictive definition that some of their opponents would like to impose upon them. A variety of subjects, in addition to English, may be taught in English in a French-language school. The decision in regard to the language of instruction in various courses in a French-language school must properly rest with the French-language community that it serves, working with and through" the French language advisory committee, "the board and the teaching staff in the school.

"Each area and each school must decide for itself what its needs are in this regard. For the French-speaking community, the key element in a French-language school is that the language of communication and the language of administration, and hence the total ambience of the school, should be French. Provided that this is the case, a variety of specific subjects could be taught in English without the school seeking to be a French-language school."

I continue quoting from the Symons report:

"In somewhat the same vein, there are misconceptions surrounding the term 'bilingual school.' In particular, the frequent use of this term to describe essentially English-language schools that have a number of francophone students taking some courses in the French language has caused both concern and confusion. Such schools are, in practice, less 'biligual' than French-language schools which offer some courses of instruction in English.

"The simple fact that English-speaking and French-speaking students may be attending the same school building still does not make that school bilingual. The teaching and learning of a second language is a highly complex matter and it is a gross oversimplification to assume that all one has to do is put anglophone and francophone students under the same roof and that they will then learn each other's language. Quite on the contrary. There is evidence that doing this may, in at least some circumstances, have exactly the opposite result. As most francophone students in Ontario are usually bilingual already because of circumstances outside of the classroom, whereas most anglophone students are not, what nearly always happens in such mixed schools is that the language of communication and administration, and indeed thus the overall atmosphere, proves to be English. Much more often than not, the mixed or so-called bilingual school is a one-way street to assimilation for the French-speaking student.

"By contrast, the French-language school provides a setting within which francophone students will have a better opportunity to come to know and to understand and to strengthen and develop their own culture and heritage. This is essential if they are to maintain their identity in a province where the language of the vast majority is English. It is indeed important for all students both English-speaking and French-speaking that they should during their formative school years be given an opportunity to root themselves securely in their own language and culture. If this is the case, the process of interaction with those of other languages and cultures will proceed more naturally and more fruitfully, both then and at later dates."

There are 24 such secondary schools in the province of Ontario at the present time, that is, 24 homogeneous French-language secondary schools. They have a total enrolment of about 21,500 students. There are a further 36 French-language secondary school instructional units, that is units which are classified really as small French-language schools in a larger building with an English-language school. There are attending these schools, approximately 10,000 students.

It's interesting to look over the list of these schools and the communities where we will find them: They are: Ecole secondaire

de Hanmer, in Hanmer; Ecole secondaire Macdonald-Cartier in Sudbury—

Mr. Martel: Great riding.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —Ecole secondaire Rayside in Azilda; Ecole secondaire Cité des Jeunes in Kapuskasing; Ecole secondaire Algonquin in North Bay; Ecole secondaire Sainte Marie in New Liskeard; Ecole secondaire Franco Cité in Sturgeon Falls; Ecole secondaire Therriault in Timmins, and even Ecole secondaire de Paincourt with 98 students in Paincourt, which I think is located in the riding of my colleague, the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough).

Then there are Ecole secondaire Georges Vanier in Hamilton; Ecole secondaire Confederation in Welland; Ecole secondaire Etienne Brulé in North York, Metropolitan Toronto; Ecole secondaire Garneau in Orleans; Ecole secondaire André Laurendeau in Ottawa; Ecole secondaire Belcourt in Ottawa; Ecole secondaire Cartier in Ottawa; Ecole secondaire Champlain in Ottawa; Ecole secondaire Charlebois in Ottawa; Ecole secondaire De La Salle in Ottawa; Ecole Secondaire de Casselman in Casselman; Ecole secondaire d'Embrun in Embrun; Ecole secondaire de Rockland in Rockland, and Ecole secondaire la Citadel in Cornwall.

Mr. Speaker, I purposely beg your indulgence, or I should have before I read this list, because I wanted to read this list again to emphasize that there are 24 of these French-language homogeneous French-language secondary schools at present in this province of Ontario.

[11:30]

What we are asking for in Essex county is not something new; it's not something unique. It's not something, as some of the people down there tell me, that means we are embarking on a programme of establishing a unilingual French-language school, some new type of creature for this province of Ontario that will have a divisive effect. We are suggesting through this legislation that what has occurred in 24 other areas of this province occur in the section of this province known as Essex county. I think anyone who looks over this list, including the hon. members who are from the areas where these schools are located, will know the kind of school we are talking about. They'll know what a homogeneous French-language school is and will know they present no threat to those communities.

Many people have expressed concern also about the learning of English in French-language schools. This, I feel, is a legitimate concern because an inadequate knowledge of English in Ontario would be a major drawback for anyone who wishes to obtain employment or to simply integrate into the total social context of this province. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that French-language schools are not unilingual schools.

In a brief presented to the Ontario government, the Association Canadienne Française d'Education de l'Ontario stated very clearly: "The secondary school graduate"—and this is from the French-language school—"must have obtained a knowledge of English so that he will be able to communicate effectively with English-speaking compatriots to compete on the labour market and to take part in the political and social life of his province and of his country."

To emphasize this point, also let me again quote from Symons report. It said: "There should, however, be no impression that the intention behind French-language schools has been, or is now, to create conditions that would limit or restrict the opportunities of their students to learn English. Franco-Ontario educators and leaders recommend that a complementary and adequate knowledge of English is essential if the French-speaking person is to participate fully in the life of Ontario and of Canada, and indeed of North America. The objective of the French-language school is to provide a process whereby French-speaking students in Ontario will be taught in their own language and at the same time be equipped with a knowledge of English and the capacity to live and work in a predominantly anglophone province without abandoning their identity and their culture.

"Although I am well aware that most people understand our French-speaking compatriots' desire to preserve their culture and linguistic heritage, I would like to reiterate some of the reasons why Ontario is so strongly committed to guaranteeing the educational rights of francophones residing in Ontario." This statement of Professor Symons echoes the sentiments of this government and is fully agreed to by this ministry and this government.

Again, quoting from Symons: "The first and most important reason is that citizens of Ontario are, first of all, citizens of Canada, a country which the Hon. John Robarts described in a 1967 speech as 'a partnership of two societies and two founding peoples, in addition to our citizens of Indian and Eskimo heritage'."

In an article entitled, Ontario's Quiet Revolution, in a book called One Country or Two, Professor Symons again had this to say about Ontario's decision in the late 1960s to extend the French-language school system. I think these words have particular significance today.

"This realization that the potential importance of Ontario's actions during a period of national tension was, fortunately, a constant factor in the thinking of most of the province's leaders throughout the 1960s. There was, in particular, an understanding that Ontario was equipped to make a significant contribution to an improvement in the relationships between francophone and anglophone Canadians by its geographic position neighbouring Quebec, with a shared boundary running for more than 600 miles; by its size and population, which alone amongst the predominantly English-speaking provinces of Canada are of the same order as those of Quebec; by its resources and wealth; by its large and growing French-speaking population; by its close and continuing historic relationship with Quebec; and perhaps by virtue of the special place that it occupies in the minds and thoughts of Quebec as a substantial partner in its marriage with English-speaking Canada.

"For Canada, this meant an increasing acceptance of the view that the duality of two major cultures is one of the bases upon which this country was founded."

Of course, Ontario has some very important and practical reasons of its own to permit a higher level of knowledge and understanding of French among many more of its young people. As I said the other day, it often comes as a revelation to people to learn that the number of French-speaking Ontario citizens is close to half a million. In fact, there are more Ontario citizens whose first language is French than there are French-speaking citizens in all other provinces in Canada combined, with the exception, of course, of the province of Quebec.

There are almost as many citizens of French origin, about 737,000, in the province of Ontario. This means that this 730,000 is greater than, say the entire population of Newfoundland, which is about 522,000; or New Brunswick with 634,500 or; Prince Edward Island with 111,000 people; and almost as many as Nova Scotia with 788,000. Except for Nova Scotia, there are in this province as many citizens of French origin as there are total citizens in these four other provinces.

In other words, even if we look no further than our provincial boundaries, there are very good strong and ample reasons, on human and educational grounds, to promote a higher degree of understanding and appreciation between our two founding peoples. Quite simply, it is an excellent way to promote the continued strength and vitality of our total population.

This large and well-established French-speaking community of Ontario, as expressed in the 1968 report of the Committee on French Language Schools, has always looked upon education as one of the most important forces, if not the most important force, for its survival as a cultural group.

The French-speaking community in Ontario is, I think, justifiably frightened by the very real threat of assimilation that is menacing it. It is frightened by this threat and it wants to stave it off. Consider these figures from the 1961 census. At that time in Ontario, in 1961, there were 647,941 citizens of French origin, yet only 425,302 reported French as their mother tongue. The 1971 census did not show an improvement. A total of 737,360 people were reported to be of French origin, while 482,045 said that their mother tongue was French. Only 352,460 indicated that French was the language most spoken in the home.

There are other practical reasons, Mr. Speaker, why Ontario is committed to the provision of French-language educational programmes and therefore French-language secondary schools where the community wishes one. Professor Symons, in the article that I referred to a minute ago, in the book One Country or Two! said:

"The Carnegie Study of Identification and Utilization of Talent in High School and College followed the secondary careers of all the students enrolled in 1959 in grade 9 of almost all the public, private and separate schools of Ontario. The study revealed that much less than half of the French-speaking students reached grade 11 and only three per cent completed their schooling by graduating from grade 13 without repeating a year. By contrast, over half the students from anglophone homes reached grade 11, and over 13 per cent completed grade 13 without repeating a year."

I am still quoting from the article: "There was no reason to think that these students were intellectually inferior. Rather there was cause to conclude that the basic objective of equality of educational opportunity was not being achieved for the children of this large and historically significant group, which numbered some 10 per cent of the province's population."

As Dr. Stacy Churchill of the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education wrote in a

recent article: "The immediate effect of the 1968 legislation enacted by the province of Ontario was spectacular. Enrolment in French-language high schools which had previously been private except for grade 9 and 10 doubled, then tripled, within three years. Enrolment in 1966-67 in French-language secondary schools was 8,739; in 1967-68 itw as 9,680. Then in 1968-69 it moved to 16,984; and it reached 25,212 in 1970-71. In 1974-75 the total enrolment of French-speaking students in French secondary programmes was 30,906, indicating a participation rate in most areas approaching that of the English-speaking school population. This year the enrolment of French-language secondary schools or secondary school teaching units is 31,472.

The French component, as I have said, has of course been part of the Ontario picture for a long time. In fact, there are claims that the very first school established in Ontario was a French-language school at Fort Frontenac, which is in the Kingston area, in 1678. These schools continued to thrive at the time of Confederation.

The French presence in Ontario is particularly interesting in the context of this bill and the Essex county dispute. I say that because from the establishment of Fort Pontchartrain—Le Détroit—by Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac in 1701, and the subsequent founding of Assomption, which is now Windsor, the French colony expanded and flourished along the banks of the Detroit River and Lake St. Clair. In those early days of colonization, the French and the Indians worked together side by side as fur traders and farmers in that part of Ontario.

It was from these humble beginnings that French settlements then prospered deeper inland. In 1767 La Paroise de l'Assomption was established to accommodate the religious needs of settlers and their families. Educational needs, of course, were not forgotten, and in 1786 the first school was opened in the parish for 13 female students. It should not be surprising that the language of communication in that school in that part of Ontario was French. My intention today is not to present a history lesson to the members of this House, but simply to remind them of the fact that Essex county boasts a French background and tradition. One has simply to examine the names of many of the streets in that area to realize this.

I think it's also interesting to note, since we of course are members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, that the Journal and Proceedings of the first Legislative Assembly of the Province of Upper Canada recorded the fact that on Monday, June 3, 1793, the House adopted a resolution: "That such Acts as have already passed or may hereafter pass in the Legislature of this province be translated into the French language for the benefit of the western district of the province and other French settlers who may come to reside within the province." Of course, the western district referred to was the district down to and including Essex county.

In the article I referred to a while ago in the book One Country or Two?, Professor Symons also records this historic information: "The use of French as a language of instruction in Ontario can, in fact, be traced to these early French settlements, and for many years primary schools in which classes were conducted in the French tongue were established readily and naturally, as the need arose, and without any acrimony or debate."

Indeed, Dr. Egerton Ryerson, the Chief Superintendent of Education in the province for more than 30 years, and in many ways the founder of Ontario's school system, took the view that French was, as well as English, one of the recognized languages of the province and that children could therefore be taught in either language. This view was put clearly by Dr. Ryerson in a letter of April 24, 1857, to the trustees of School No. 3 in Charlottenburgh township, near Cornwall.

[11:45]

This is the quotation of Dr. Ryerson in his letter: "I have the honour to state in reply to your letter of the 16th, that as French is the recognized language of the country, as well as English, it is quite proper and lawful for the trustees to allow both languages to be taught in their school to children whose parents may desire them to learn both."

And still quoting from Professor Symons: "Ironically, it was probably in part at least, because there was so little difficulty or debate surrounding the use of French as a language of instruction in schools in Ontario prior to Confederation, that the question was not specifically dealt with when The British North America Act was drafted."

Of course, we can only surmise that was so, but it is certainly the feeling of many scholars today.

Mr. Conway: Separate schools filled that vacuum.

Hon. Mr. Wells: However, this peaceful and harmonious relationship, which perhaps led to the overlooking of the question of

French as a language of instruction in The British North America Act, started to deteriorate during the latter part of the 19th century; and, of course, restrictions were applied to French-language schools. I guess it was in 1912 that the government of that day dealt its hardest blow to the francophone community by promulgating Regulation 17 which forbade the use of French as a language of instruction in all schools in Ontario.

Mr. Conway: A bunch of Tories made a premiership out of that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Since 1927, however, this trend has been reversed. I think that what we need to do today is not look at the reasons why this transformation occurred in the early days of the province, but rather that under the successive governments of the Hon. John Robarts and now the present Premier (Mr. Davis) the educational rights of the francophone, or Franco-Ontarians, are being restated and guaranteed to the same degree, I might say, as they were before Confederation.

That brings us specifically to the Essex county situation and the need for this bill. I have tried to sketch this background in order to indicate why this is an important issue and why at this time and place this bill is necessary, as a further indication of the stated policy of this government toward French-language education for francophones in this province.

I suppose the difficult question that will have to be answered by some members of this House—indeed, by all of us—because I have had to answer it as I have gone through the process of deciding, is how we should handle this situation, and how we could guarantee the rights of the minority in this part of the province, balanced against other legislation which provides at this point the responsibility for establishing this school with a duly elected local school board.

I guess it has been my feeling that, hopefully, we could achieve the guarantee of the rights of the French-language minority in the Essex area to have their own school without having to do it by way of legislation, but by using the good offices of this government and this ministry. By working with the people in that area—and working closely with them—we could endeavour to have them come to the decision to build the school without any mandatory legislation. As, indeed—and I point this out—as, indeed, has occurred in those other areas—the 24 areas—that I indicated to hon. members.

That has not happened. This dispute goes back to about 1969, when the French language advisory committee decided to undertake the study for a need for a French-language secondary school in the Essex county area. The reasons for that study—the reasons for the desire for that school, of course—I think I have indicated in my earlier remarks concerning the historic traditional background of Franco-Ontarians in that particular part of our province.

In 1972, Mr. Speaker, the Essex County Board of Education accepted a recommendation from its French language advisory committee which recommended the building of a school and a feasibility study in connection with the Windsor Board of Education. At that time, as I understand it, the Essex county school board and the Windsor school board decided to look at the matter of building the school jointly and establishing whether the need for a such a school existed.

In 1973, the matter was under consideration and the studies were taking place. In February, 1974, I met with trustees and officials of the city of Windsor and the Essex county board and we talked about the rights of the francophone minority in the area to have a secondary school.

In April 22, 1974, there was a motion that the Essex Board of Education file with the Ministry of Education a building proposal to construct a school of 824 pupils' places and that the school be erected in the St. Clair Beach-Tecumseh area. This motion was discussed with the board—people from our ministry discussed it with both the Windsor and the Essex boards. No decision was arrived at at that particular time. The decision to go ahead and build the school was not arrived at.

The Essex county French language advisory committee, in May 1974, submitted the case to the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario. The Languages of Instruction Commission had been set up under legislation in 1973, as I recall, to provide mediation and a problem-solving mechanism where there was a dispute between a French language advisory committee and a school board—the French language advisory committee wanting one thing, the school board not agreeing with their request.

The Languages of Instruction Commission had just been newly appointed and one of the first tasks it had was to intervene, to mediate, to attempt to arbitrate this dispute between the Essex county board and the

French language advisory committee over the need for a French-language secondary school in Essex county.

I would like to read the report sent to the Essex Board of Education on September 4, 1974, from the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario. It was sent to the chairman of the board, Mr. Woodbridge, and it said:

"As prescribed by section 88d(1) of The Schools Administration Act, the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario has conducted an inquiry, including the careful study of all pertinent documents in the matters submitted to the commission by the French language advisory committee of the Essex County Board of Education.

"Despite sincere efforts to bring about an agreement between the two parties concerned, Dr. Hugh Auld reported"—Dr. Hugh Auld, incidentally, was the mediator who had acted in this matter—"reported that he was not successful in his mediation.

"The education of French-speaking secondary school students in the Essex-Windsor area has been a concern for a number of years. The establishment of French language advisory committees in both Essex and Windsor provided the structure for a careful study of the situation. The commission is aware and appreciates the great amount of effort put into the numerous meetings involving parents and trustees, the petitions and the surveys that were made in order to arrive at a solution which would best meet the needs of these students. The Languages of Instruction Commission commends the boards, the committees and the parents involved for not allowing their differences of opinion to develop into open conflict.

"Both boards are also to be commended for their efforts to provide programmes for English-speaking students at the Belle River District High School, the Sandwich Secondary School and the Windsor School of Commerce.

"It is evident, however, that the present programmes do not provide the French-speaking secondary school students with an appropriate milieu or adequate motivation to make use of and enrich their knowledge of the French language.

"The commission is pleased to note the following with respect to the board of education for the city of Windsor.

"1. The board has agreed to purchase education from the Essex county board for its French-language secondary school students if a French-language secondary school is established in the county.

"2. The board has assured the Essex county board in writing that they will discontinue the bilingual programme at the Windsor High School of Commerce when such a school is established.

"3. The board does not disregard the possibility of reconsidering its general transportation policy for secondary school students at a later date.

"The commission has carefully studied the statistics and projected enrolments for a French-language secondary school in the Essex-Windsor area. Ministry of Education statistics show that as of September 30, 1973, there were 2,179 French-speaking pupils enrolled in French-language elementary classes in Essex county and 1,192 in the city of Windsor. A French-language secondary school attempting to serve the French-speaking population of Essex and Windsor would then have a pupil base at the elementary level of 3,371 students. In the 24 French-language secondary schools of Ontario actual enrolments have surpassed the projected enrolments in almost every case.

"Having carefully reviewed all the available information with regard to: Present educational services available in the French-language to secondary school students in both Essex and Windsor; the problems of location, distance and transportation; past surveys, petitions and projected enrolments; the French-speaking pupil base at the elementary level in both jurisdictions; current provincial trends; projected needs for secondary school space for both English and French-speaking students in the jurisdiction of the Essex County Board of Education"—having considered all these—"the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario unanimously recommends the following course of action to the Essex County Board of Education:

"1. That the Essex County Board of Education file a building proposal with the ministry to construct a secondary school of approximately 850 pupil spaces in the St. Clair Beach-Tecumseh area.

"2. That the school be designated a French-language secondary school.

"3. That the designation of this school be reviewed if necessary at the end of three years of operation.

"4. That a principal be appointed well in advance of the opening of the school and that he be available for consultation at the planning stage.

"Although meetings had to be arranged on short notice and at a rather awkward time,

the chairman and members of the commission were very pleased with the attendance and the interest shown by the large number of people who took time from busy schedules to meet in Windsor.

"We wish to thank most sincerely the chairman and the members of the Essex County Board of Education, the senior officials and the chairman and members of the French-language advisory committee for their excellent co-operation in the course of the work of the commission."

That letter to the Essex county board was signed by Mr. B. J. Kipp, the director of the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario, and represented the decision of that legally constituted body. That letter was sent on September 4, 1974. On September 16, 1974, the Essex county school board rejected the commission's recommendation.

At that time, as members of this House are well aware, there was no provision in the legislation for the enforcement of that decision. The legislation setting up the Languages of Instruction Commission provides for them to offer a decision. Our feeling at the passing of that legislation was that with the process of mediation that would go on and the stature of the commission, the process of the hearings held by the commission would encourage both sides to accept a decision of the Languages of Instruction Commission when they made a decision. However, there was no legal provision for that decision to be implemented and no legal provision for the Minister of Education to cause the decision of the Languages of Instruction Commission to be implemented.

Therefore we had, on September 16, 1974, the board rejecting the decision of the commission that a French-language secondary school be constructed, having no legal basis upon which to force the construction of that school. I decided however—because as the members know at that time I fully believed the school should be built—to involve the ministry very completely in using the good offices of the ministry and the people whom we had at our disposal to try again to achieve the building of that school in Essex county.

Mr. Foulds: Is this a filibuster?

[12:00]

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it is not a filibuster; it's a historical outline of this whole situation which I think has to be put on the record, considering all the misinformation about it that is floating around.

Mr. Foulds: I didn't realize you had this fine sense of history.

Mr. Sweeney: Considering what you have done since 1969.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They probably don't even know anything about the events that I am now going to unfold to them. They will if they have read the compendium—

Mr. Foulds: Oh yes, we have.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —but they wouldn't if they hadn't received the compendium.

Mr. Foulds: It is only because of the paucity of Canadian history in our school system.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, I am making my little contribution to it now.

Mr. Foulds: Carry on.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What I am now indicating is that, even lacking legislative authority to implement that decision, and because the Minister of Education of the province at that time felt that that French-language school should be built in 1974, I involved people in the Ministry of Education in a process to see if we couldn't bring the parties together and achieve the resolution of this problem.

So one of our key employees, Mr. Doug Lawless, who many of the members will now know as the executive director of the Education Relations Commission, but in that time was the head of supervisory services branch in the Ministry of Education, was assigned to go to Essex county to work with the French language advisory committee, the Essex county board and the Windsor board to see if he could get a resolution to this problem.

On November 4, he met with the various boards. The boards agreed to consider the establishment of a joint committee in November 1974 to look at this problem and see how a French-language secondary school could be built in the area.

In 1975, of course, it became obvious that parts of the concern were financial matters, and Mr. Lawless spent a fair degree of time meeting with the boards to outline the various grant proposals and the kinds of things that would be available to the school.

I think it is fair in saying that certain concessions were made by the ministry to assist the Essex county board in building that school. As I recall, we recognized for grant purposes, or indicated we would recognize for grant purposes, the total cost of the school rather than a lesser amount. We gave them a guarantee that we would include in that

certain costs for servicing of the land and other costs concerned with getting the site ready for the school.

We also hurried ahead capital approvals for some other projects, because the feeling was that with a project of this magnitude other needy smaller projects in Essex county might be neglected because the total allotment of money for that area would be used on this one school.

These things were all arranged at that time and we then arrived at April 7, 1975, when the board passed a motion agreeing to build the school. I think the members have that in their compendium. The motion was passed by the Essex county board to build a French-language school, and I think that perhaps it might be well to read that into the record:

"It was the decision of the committee, though not unanimous, to recommend to the board the construction of a French-language secondary school with rated capacity of 750 students, to include composite school facilities on a site deemed readily accessible to the students from Essex county and the city of Windsor, the target date for the opening of such a school to be September 1977. It is a condition of the recommendation that during the school year 1979-80 if student projections for September 1980 are less than 450 students, that is inclusive of the 125 guaranteed by the city of Windsor, the designation of the building as a French-language secondary school shall be reviewed for purposes of considering alternative programmes and space utilization.

"The committee agreed to recommend, as well, the following sequence of events:

"1. A 10-year agreement to be signed with the Windsor Board of Education whereby a minimum of 125 students annually will be guaranteed.

"2. A site to be selected as soon as possible following the signing of the agreement above.

"3. An architect to be appointed to work on preliminary drawings (on condition that the proposal is approved by the ministry).

"4. A building proposal to be filed with the Ministry of Education. The timing should be such that construction might commence in the winter of 1976 with the school completed, equipped and ready to open in September 1977. In the initial year the school should plan to operate with students in years one, two and three.

"5. The principal for the new school to be appointed to be effective January 1, 1977.

"6. As of June 1977, courses in français in the Sandwich Secondary school and French-language courses at the Belle River District High School to be phased out."

That, Mr. Speaker, was the recommendation of the committee which went to the Essex County Board of Education and passed by the board. At that time also, the agreement referred to concerning 125 students from the city of Windsor was signed between the two boards. Built into that agreement was a backup commitment by the Ministry of Education that we would guarantee that there would be grants covering 125 students from this source even if the actual number of students from Windsor sank below the 125 level. So for the next 10 years the Essex county board was guaranteed either students or payment for students equivalent of 125 from the city of Windsor.

In August 1975 we allocated $3.8 million to the Essex county board for the construction of the French-language school. In November 1975 the board presented a building proposal to our regional office. The regional director of education issued an approval on November 25, 1975, to the board for the proposed construction of the French-language school. The estimated cost was to be $3,810,591.

On December 18, 1975, we sent out to all school boards our financing plans for 1976, and as hon. members will recall there were some changes in rates of grant support in those new plans for 1976. We were in the midst of a restraint programme and the rate of grant per capital building at that time was changed from an average of 95 per cent to 77 per cent across the province. I think the reasons were outlined very clearly at that time.

Subsequently, the Essex county board indicated to us that because this change in rate of grant would apply to the Essex county school, they would have to reconsider the matter. I think it should be pointed out here that to the best of my knowledge I can recall no other board in this province reconsidering capital plans that they had in the works at the time of our proposal, notwithstanding the fact that our rate of grant was going to be different. I think that has to be said.

Indeed, I think the opposite was true. Most boards, notwithstanding what our new rate of grant would be—which incidentally meant that we had a little more money to spread out for a larger number of projects—were asking us for more approvals than we could

approve rather than drawing back and saying, "Because you've changed your rate of grant, we will not go ahead with the project which we had planned."

However, such was not the case in Essex, and as I recall the matter was brought up and I had at least one meeting with the board and members of the French-language advisory committee.

On February 13, I wrote this letter, which I would like to read, to Mrs. Ashton, who is the chairman of the board:

"I wish to thank you and your colleagues for meeting with me on February 6 to share some of your concerns regarding the construction of a French-language school in Essex county.

"I hope that your board will stand by the original motion approving the construction of the school.

"As you know, the rates of grant for extraordinary expenditures announced by the ministry applies uniformly to all school boards in the province. I am sure that you will appreciate that an exception cannot be made for the Essex County Board of Education since many other jurisdictions would likely present a very strong case for similar consideration.

"The province does not have the resources at this time to accommodate such requests. Also, I should point out that at no time has this ministry ever guaranteed the rate of grant that was in effect when a project was being considered, or indeed when it received final approval that that rate would remain in effect for the full life of the debenture repayments.

"The impact of this year's rate of grant, as it relates to the construction of a proposed school would indeed be minimal. You will recall that the reconciliation of our respective calculations showed an approximate increase of $1.35 per household per year for this project. You will also recall that some months ago I agreed to recognize for grant purposes the total costs of the project, as mutually agreed upon between the board and the ministry with every economy and planning and design being achieved.

"In addition, the ministry has advised the Windsor Board of Education that it would recognize for grant purposes the tuition fees for a minimum of 125 students paid to the Essex County Board of Education for the purchase of French-language education even if the number of students from the Windsor Board of Education who elect to attend the Essex French-language school falls below that mark.

"Further, you will recall that the board's capital allocation for 1975 was increased by some $500,000 to accommodate immediate needs that were brought to our attention. These capital projects were Belle River High School, Kingsville Public School and Essex District High School. At our meeting on Friday you expressed concern about the need for local improvements brought about by the construction of the new school. In this regard, I have asked Mr. R. F. Laughton, our chief architect of the ministry, to review the matter with your board and, where your board is able to substantiate the need, such expenditures will be considered as part of the cost of the project for grant purposes.

"I appreciate the concerns of all parties in this matter but I trust that the board will see fit to proceed expeditiously with this project which would not, in our opinion, impose an undue hardship on local ratepayers.

"Kindest regards,

"Cordially,

"The Minister of Education."

On February 19, 1976, Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the board, by a vote of four to three, recommended that the board proceed with the construction of the school. However, at a meeting of the board on February 23, 1976, the board defeated two resolutions, the first of which was as follows:

"Due to the severe restrictions recently imposed on all boards of education in Ontario, that the Essex County Board of Education cease all planning in regard to the construction of a French-language high school in Essex county."

That resolution, and I read it deliberately so that the members would understand the wording of it, was defeated 12 to 6. That was a resolution that they cease all planning on the school. The next resolution that was put to the board was:

"That the board proceed as planned with the motion of April 7, regarding the construction of a French-language secondary school." That motion was defeated on a tie vote 9-9.

Students began boycotting classes and certain problems occurred very soon after that in Essex county. It again became obvious to us, recognizing that we had no legal authority to force the building of that school, that we had to attempt to find a way to get the school built. Again, the ministry became involved in appointing another mediator, this time Mr. Robert A. McLeod, who is the

retired director of education from the Niagara South Board of Education, a board which incidentally has a good record in the provision of French-language programmes for Franco-Ontarians in its area.

Mr. McLeod on May 19 became involved in the situation and since then until the end of 1976 and early this year attempted to see whether there was a way to encourage the board to proceed with the undertaking which it had passed and decided to proceed with in 1975.

[12:15]

Mr. McLeod recommended to the board in early 1977 that the school be built and, as hon. members know, because this process has gone on for such a long time, the board—and in this case a different board because there had been elections—a different board, after listening to Mr. McLeod and after the presentation of his report which recommends the building of the Essex county French-language secondary school, decided not to proceed with the building of that school.

Mr. Swart: That is the kind of people we have in the Niagara region.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's right. Mr. McLeod is a very fine gentleman. He was a fine director of education. He tried very hard not to write just a report but to see if there wasn't a way he could bring the people together—the French-language advisory committee and the members of the school board—to get them to proceed with the school which they had passed at one time and which for financial reasons, so the board put it, was not now proceeding with.

The only other thing which must be stated is that earlier this year I met with the board as a result of some of our ongoing studies in French-language education and in connection with some of the changes that we were making in this particular area. It was decided that the rate of grant for French-language secondary schools would go to 95 per cent. The general need on behalf of all the people of Ontario for these schools for the minorities —and I say French-language schools in this context, although in other parts of the province this could just as equally apply to an English-language school if that were the minority-language school—the need for that and the desire to have the people of this province as a whole pay a much greater share of the cost of those schools than the regular majority-language school, brought us to the decision that we would pay a 95 per cent grant, and I so informed the board.

I had a meeting with the full board on March 3, 1977, and outlined that change in grant. I must say, I really believed that having outlined that change in grant procedure, the school would proceed. Following our changes in grants for 1976, it meant that rather than $117,000 a year over the 20-year life of the debenture being levied against the Essex county ratepayers, only about $24,000 a year would now have to be levied under the new grant formula for French-language schools coming into effect.

I felt that having laid that before the trustees, the financial hurdle was out of the way and the project could proceed, knowing full well that preliminary plans, as a result of the earlier motion, had already been proceeding. There had been an architect appointed, sketch plans were in a preliminary stage and certain sites had already been acquired. However, it was not to be the case. After my meeting with the board, the board subsequently met and, by a vote of 12 to 5, voted against the building of a French-language secondary school in its jurisdiction.

I feel, as I stated earlier, that there comes a certain time and a certain place where action is necessary, and in this particular case I think this bill is necessary. We have in Essex county two groups—the French-language minority represented by the French-language advisory committee, and the duly elected Essex county school board. We have a dispute. We have a province which guarantees—and all of us in this Legislature represent that guarantee—French-language education to that minority group in this particular area. We have a precedent across this province for that happening; this is not a new, unique situation. We have, at this point in time, a moral obligation to settle that dispute here ourselves. We've tried mediators, the ministry has been involved, there's been a long process of encouragement and help with all parties to try and get a resolution to this. We now are at the point where the body that's going to settle this dispute is going to be the Legislature of the province of Ontario.

As for the Essex county board—and, as I said, I think a lot of the problem is a misunderstanding of what the school really is and what a French-language school is—having outlined to them exactly what it is, and that this is not a new, unique precedent for Essex county, the members of this Legislature, by passing this bill, are going to say, "We are now the mediators in this dispute; here's what we think should be done. We believe that you will respect the wishes of the Legislature."

I guess the thing that bothers me most is that, talking with some of the people down there, they say it doesn't matter whether we pass this bill or not, the school won't be built anyway. That bothers me and I think it should bother every member of this Legislature, because at a certain time and a certain place we have to take this kind of a role, and here we are acting as the mediator between two groups. We're going to express the opinion on behalf of all the people of Ontario concerning the Essex county school, and I firmly believe that it should be adhered to by the Essex county school board, and I hope that it will be.

I believe that if we unanimously support this bill we say to the Essex county board, "We realize your problems but that school needs to be built, indeed, must be built for the francophone minority in that area. We have acted as the mediator, we're resolving the dispute for you now, here's the solution, carry on, go ahead and build the school."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that all members will support this bill and that we can then proceed to have the school built and open in as short a time as possible in Essex county.

Ms. Gigantes: I rise in support of Bill 31 and I do so with a mixture of pleasure and pain. The pleasure I feel comes from the knowledge that after eight years of being denied, the francophone community of Windsor and Essex will have access to a French-language secondary school. The pain I feel comes from the knowledge that it has required an Act of the Legislature of Ontario to ensure that the school be built.

The eight years of events which the Minister of Education has retraced for us and which have brought us to this debate, are a testimony to failure. The French-language secondary school of Essex county should now be six years old, and its students and its graduates should now be living proof that cultural diversity is cultural and social strength.

The people of Windsor and Essex county should now be enjoying the satisfaction of having worked together to create a French-language school second to none in this province; but none of this is the case and the bill before us is a bill which must cause us to reflect on our failures.

I draw to your attention section 2 of the bill, which reads: "On the day upon which this Act comes into force, the board is deemed to have passed a resolution to construct a building suitable for a school to accommodate 750 French-speaking secondary school pupils." These are sad words, Mr. Speaker. By an Act of this Legislature the Essex County Board of Education will be deemed to have passed such a resolution. It will be deemed to have passed the resolution because it has refused to pass the resolution, and the people of Ontario, represented here in this Legislature, have decided that the resolution must be passed and the school, which should now be six years old, must finally be built.

I doubt there's a person in this province who would find it easy to vote for a bill which represents the overriding of a clearly expressed local and democratic decision of a board of education. It's a painful decision. It represents the majority of this province declaring to the majority of a local community that the majority of the local community must comply with the decisions of the provincial community on a question which has always been decided by local communities.

As the minister has noted, this is not the first time in the history of our provincial community when we have seen division and misunderstanding about the need for a French-language school—not by a long shot—but it is the first time in the history of our provincial community when we've had to have an Act of the Legislature to guarantee the building of a French-language school.

In my own mind—and I am sure I'm in good company in this House and in this province—the only reason, the only conceivable reason that would bring me to support a bill of this kind is that I feel it is the only remaining method of ensuring the protection of a minority whose legitimate rights have been denied.

The bill before us is a denial of democracy at the local level. We have to be clear about that. We are, in supporting this bill, dismissing the considered, the too-long considered, decision of duly elected representatives of the majority of electors of the Essex County Board of Education. We cannot do that without a decent, solid and defensible reason, and the reason must be that we are committed to a decent, solid and defensible principle of democratic society: that the majority must respect the rights of the minority.

Let me speak to this principle with some of the passion of a person who was raised in a minority group. I grew up in the Ottawa Valley on the Quebec side of the Ottawa River. My home life, my school life, my social life, my medical life, my legal life,

my work life all were carried on in the English language. My family background was anglophone for several hundred years and the history of that family and all its literary and spiritual supports were anglophone.

The dates of births and deaths in the old family bible were recorded in English. The bible itself was the lovely version of King James. The stories of my forbears were passed from one generation to the other in the same language that my forbears had spoken. My parents took delight in the richness of that language and now, in times of parental need, I quote my father's favourite phrases from Shakespeare and the King James version to my child.

I am old enough now to appreciate that all these elements of language and culture are an important part of me as an individual. They are the means through which I can feel my roots as a person. They gave me the security and confidence to question passing fashion and to search for the goals of the spirit. They are vital to me as a person.

Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, I was raised in the province of Quebec. Do not think for a moment that my experience was unique. In every part of Quebec the children of the English-speaking minority have enjoyed this same cultural experience for centuries. We did not even consider it a luxury; we thought it was a natural right. There was much that we did not understand.

[12:30]

This was no natural right that we enjoyed. It had to do not with the King James version, but rather with St. James Street and the incredible power of high finance controlled by an elite group of English-speaking people in the city of Montreal. We were ignorant of that fact and, with all respect to my dear parents, they too were ignorant of that fact.

It's really too much to ask that a coal miner from Cape Breton and a teacher from Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, be capable of analysing the political and financial determinants of a comfortable anglophone cultural life in a town like Aylmer, Quebec, in the 1940s. But I, with my much easier life, have a responsibility to look back and reflect, or so I feel. I feel I must acknowledge the richness of my personal background, and I must pay tribute to the confidence of the cultural heritage which I enjoyed. And all this was in a province where the vast majority of people spoke French.

It was a dream world and we thought it operated on something akin to natural rights. How naive we were and how well we can see it now, now that the francophone majority in Quebec is finally asserting itself through the ballot box. The francophone majority has finally come out of its own dream of eternal existence and begun to recognize that its cultural roots will disappear in the next two generations if no positive action is taken. But what they will decide is their decision alone, in my view. The luxury of cultural confidence I enjoyed as I lived in the province where they were the majority is something to which I will pay tribute for as long as I live.

At this point, I'd like to throw in a bit of specific information about schools in Quebec. I attended an English-language school, right through to junior matriculation, in the small town of Aylmer, Quebec. It was one of many English-language schools in the province of Quebec, well funded and with a good educational programme. It was something we expected. We are told now, and we know now, that we have constructed and run programmes of French-language instruction in 24 high schools throughout the province of Ontario. The French-language minority in the province of Ontario and the English-language minority in the province of Quebec are roughly equal in numbers. In Quebec at the moment there are 183 English-language high schools. And I think it is important to add that piece of information to this debate.

Let me hypothesize, Mr. Speaker. Let me suggest that I might have come into this world as the child of French-speaking parents in the province of Ontario. Would I even be participating in this debate? Could I feel secure that my grandchildren would understand something about me because of stories told in the language I now speak? These things are vital to individuals; they are vital and they are often neglected by majorities which do not understand that the true measure of a democracy is the fate of the minority.

A few weeks ago a young man came to see me, accompanied by his brother. The young man is deaf, and his brother came with him so that I'd have a translator of sign language. This young man is one of the few totally deaf people in Ontario who has a full-time job. He works for the Post Office and, on the side, he is a long-distance runner of some note. He would like to participate in the Silent Olympics, being held this year in Caracas, Venezuela, and he came to see me because he needs government funding.

He learned to read and write at the Provincial School for the Deaf in Belleville. He's a beautiful, happy, ambitious and disciplined person who is a kind of supermodel of how

a person who is handicapped by deafness can add to this world. He comes from a francophone family. When he learned to read and write and talk through signs in Ontario, he learned in English. His brother who worships him, has had to train himself to sign language and the sign language they speak is English.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly bear to watch them communicate without crying out in anguish. They sit there and they talk to each other in English sign language. Why should this be happening in Ontario? Surely we are confident enough of ourselves that we can be more feeling? Surely we are sure enough of being a confident, understanding majority that we can take positive initiatives to ensure that individuals who are born into a minority group in this province are treated with individual respect?

I would like to read a short section from an infamous paper. This is the infamous white paper on language rights in Quebec. I would like to read a section because I think it relates directly to what I am trying to express here.

"French must become the common language of all Quebeckers. This first principle leads to a second, which is in no way a giving in, still less any sort of machiavellian concession; that is, respect for minorities. Any vital society must look upon the contributions made to it by reason of its own diversity as an indispensable source of enrichment.

"One need only consider what the culture of our first inhabitants, the Indians, has given us and which Quebeckers have integrated into their own lives without, unfortunately, always realizing its source. The same must be said of the culture of the English, the Italians, the Jews, the Greeks and many other ethnic groups which affect the lives of all Quebeckers.

"Although Quebec wishes to be a French society, it has never been, nor would it wish to be, what some call a tribe. In this respect, as in others, Quebec must not be merely tolerant, it must expect and invite from other cultures which constitute it the essential vitality inherent in them. In effect, the fact that Quebec is exercising its right to be French in no way prevents groups and individuals from knowing and speaking another language or even several other languages.

"The minority groups—this ambiguous expression must be used not only because it is in common usage, but also because nothing better has yet been found—will, of course, be able to preserve their language and pass it on to their children. English in particular will always hold an important place in Quebec, not only because it is the language of communication in North America, as we hear repeatedly, but also because it is part of the cultural heritage of Quebeckers.

"Nevertheless, in a Quebec which lives in French, it is natural that all its citizens, whatever their ethnic and cultural origin, should be capable of expressing themselves in French, participating fully in a French society, and conceding that French is the common language of all Quebeckers.

"The government recognizes that an English population and an English culture exist in Quebec. Even though they have for too long been isolated in a network of institutions separate from but parallel to those of the French, this population and this culture constitute an irreducible component of our society."

From another section, the final section of the language white paper: "During the Riel affair, or the historic battles for French schools in the Canadian west and in Ontario, or the conscription crisis, whenever there has been serious political tension, French-speaking people have been the ones to entreat, to beg, to rebel, or to passively resist.

"Never before have they had such firm political leverage to ensure that French rights are respected. With such freedom to act, however, French-speaking Quebeckers must also be aware of their new responsibilities. As long as they could play no other role than that of members of a begging minority, their claims were only a problem for the conscience of those in power. As soon as they become members of a majority, however, they come of age and must assume responsibility for the rights and the respect of the minorities."

I read you this white paper, Mr. Speaker, perhaps as a token of my appreciation of the fact that the sentiments expressed in those two sections are sentiments which in my life, growing up in English Quebec, I found supported in everyday ways. Quebec has always behaved in that way. We hope the sentiments expressed in the white paper will ensure that Quebec continues to behave that way, but what it calls for from us here in Ontario is to set a model of behaviour on our own.

This bill, Bill 31, is a tribute to our newfound principles. I suspect the motives for this new discovery. I suspect those motives are involved with the defence of traditional power in this country. I suspect we are about to pass this bill because traditional power in

this country is challenged and it is trying in a hurry to clean up its image.

I support this bill on old principles; for example, the old principles that have to do with doing unto your neighbour. I have been a minority neighbour; I have been well treated. I will insist, when I am part of the majority, that my minority neighbour deserves those same personal rights. They have been vitally important to me, and I think I am very much like other people.

I reject all political excuses for this bill. This bill is before us because the government of Ontario has failed to foresee its responsibility to talk about the important issues in a real democracy—the rights of the minority and the importance of conserving individual cultural roots.

For a Conservative government, this government is a simple mockery of conservative principles. Just at the point when the general populace in true democratic fashion is beginning to insist on conservative values, this government has turned into a small-l replica of the big-L Liberals: whatever is, is right. Levesque is in power in Quebec, so the Essex school is deemed to have been chosen by the Essex County Board of Education. What nonsense and what a failure.

How could this 34-year-old government have arrived at this point? Why did it fail to speak of the rights of the individual and the rights of minority groups years ago? Why did it not set about to enlighten the locals in Essex county about these principles, these important Conservative principles, way back in the days when the Minister of Education was the man who is now Premier?

I support this bill, but I support it with resentment. If the Premier were a true Conservative and a true Conservative leader, we would not have to face a bill such as this. If he had a real feeling for Conservative values, for the cultural rights of the individual person and for the rights of a minority group in a democracy, we would now be congratulating ourselves for six years of excellent francophone education in the Windsor-Essex area.

There is an extra bit of irony to all of this. In 1974 the separate school board of the county of Essex passed a resolution in which it declared it would be more than happy to build a secondary school for the French language in Essex county. As we all know, this idea is unacceptable to the Conservative government. That particular bit of irony also makes me very angry.

[12:45]

It is almost more than I can bear to listen to the Premier of this province and his Treasurer when they talk about Conservative principles in their Throne Speeches and budgets. Those are not principles; those are kowtows to power, brute power. Nothing more, nothing less. When the Premier and the current Minister of Education discover the Conservative principles in the eight-year battle about the French-language school in Essex, I feel bitter. I ask myself, "Where is the power play today?"

Mr. Speaker, I will support this bill. I am a conservative in the old sense. I support the principle of individual rights, individual rights to a cultural security and the rights of a minority in a democracy. Therefore, I will support this bill. Therefore, also, I will call upon this government to have some mercy for the local majority which is about to be called a provincial minority, in this bill, in Essex-Windsor.

I beg this government to give some special consideration to the crushed majority in Essex-Windsor which would welcome some special funding so that its children could have the opportunity to learn French. I feel that it is exceedingly important for this government to make special funding provisions for the teaching of second-language French to the sons and daughters of people in Windsor-Essex. It would be common decency, it would be a decent conservative move.

My colleagues in the official opposition will add many other points to this debate. Each one of us who speaks will speak from personal experience of and personal conviction toward the principles of this bill. We speak with the belief that the bill, sad as it is in its implications, is a bill which must now be passed because of our past failures. We speak with the hope that we will know how to avoid such failures in the future.

We speak in the belief that the future will find Ontario prepared to defend conservative principles for the sake of those principles, and that our ability to identify and preserve conservative principles will help us to create a province of energy, co-operation and harmony. We have faith in the people of this province and we support this bill to reaffirm that faith and to turn the last page in a painful chapter of our past failures. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith: In leading off for my party I will try to make these remarks reasonably brief. In many ways this represents a sad day for the Legislature of Ontario. To have to take action that we now are forced to take is evidence that collectively we've let this situa-

tion get out of hand to a point where an honourable and equitable solution at the local level could not be made.

The only bright side to this matter is that it gives this Legislature an opportunity to affirm its support for the principle of minority rights and, in particular, for linguistic rights in the province of Ontario. In a liberal democracy such as ours minority rights are essential, and especially in Canada on the issue of language.

I want the position of the Liberal Party clearly understood. We support the purpose and intent of this bill. In fact, both the opposition parties called for such government action earlier, once it was clear that a fair local solution could not be found, and it was only after the two opposition parties spoke in this way that the hon. Minister of Education made his decision.

Our decision has been made more difficult because if there is anything that we as Liberals feel very personally dedicated to it is the concept of local autonomy. We feel that altogether too many decisions are made centrally and imposed on local communities. We feel that one of the great failings, for instance, in the regional government idea—which in itself was not a bad idea—was in the way in which decisions were removed from local people and put into another level of bureaucracy, more distant from people. So, it is not easy for a Liberal to take, without the greatest of misgivings, the steps proposed in this bill. However, in this case, it is very clearly our view that the principle of fair and equitable treatment of Ontario's francophone population must take precedence over the matter of local autonomy.

We trust that the government will not see the passage of this bill as being all that it has to do for the Franco-Ontarian community. I have this gnawing feeling that I've been through this before—although not as a member of the Legislature—when the government, as a substitute for a decent transportation policy in Ontario, chose the symbolic issue of Spadina and then went around during an entire election campaign recommending themselves as experts on transportation, as the consequence of that one decision. I suspect we're going to see the same thing with regard to land use. As you know, in that area the government is lacking a policy—has a rather abysmal lack of policy—and I suspect they will trumpet about the few acres of Niagara that were saved as a great indication that they're experts in these matters, that they have nothing more to worry about.

I have a great fear that the national debate with regard to the future of our country will in some way be subverted by the government constantly pointing to the fact that they brought in this Essex bill as some indication that they think their record with regard to Franco-Ontarian rights is an excellent record and one with which we can be satisfied. I don't think it is. And I said, as long ago as December 16 and even before then, that we in Ontario have made some progress with regard to the rights of our Franco-Ontarians and the services available to Franco-Ontarians. I welcome the progress, but we have a very long way to go, even to get to the level of services and rights enjoyed by anglophones in the province of Quebec.

I feel that this action must not become a sort of Spadina decision, a mighty rocket salvo which soon fades, leaving little of substance behind. I hope this government knows that much more must be done in the area of justice—where francophones can, today, obtain trial in the French language only in Ottawa and certain experimental situations. I believe that it's on Thursdays in Sudbury. That is disgraceful and has to change.

I trust that the government also understands the need to improve Franco-Ontarian services in health; that has been documented very well in the Dubois report. I trust that it understands these shameful discrepancies between this province and our neighbouring province of Quebec, in terms of the minority language provisions in post-secondary education. This discrepancy is something over which Ontario needs to hang its head. So, whenever the matter of Franco-Ontarian rights and services are brought up in the national context—and in Quebec, and in Ontario, and in any election that might occur—I trust we're not going to have the government beat its breast and point to the Windsor matter as evidence that it is really on the ball, because it most certainly is not in this regard.

The government knows that it will have the support of both opposition parties when it moves forward in the area of Franco-Ontarian rights.

I want, as an Ontarian, to give the lie to Premier Levesque's attempts to cut back on English language services in Quebec because, as you know, they always state there that Quebec will be as French as Ontario is English. By our actions in this Legislature, we can demonstrate clearly that our French language rights and services can serve as a model for language equality in Canada. We

should not be lagging behind. We should be up to that level and ahead of that level; I've said this before in this Legislature, as you know. Let's not give the separatists any ammunition to use against us and against Canadian unity. Let's all work collectively and co-operatively to expand language rights.

What is sad about this piece of legislation is that it need never have been introduced. The preamble to the bill itemizes a sorry record of government hesitancy and inaction which finally forced the issue to its present conclusion. Had the ministry moved to assist in April, 1975, when the board voted in favour of the school, the whole situation could have been settled with less turmoil. If the Premier had gone in, as I requested him to do, and lent the important prestige of the office he holds in trying to explain to people in the area what was needed and why and what the situation was, then the matter might have been settled.

Let me say this. I can understand how the people of Essex county must feel. I have been there very recently and talked with the people of that county and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they see themselves as being unjustly attacked as bigots. They feel they are being held up as examples of bigotry and prejudice and they don't like it.

I can understand why they don't like it, because my experience with those people is that they are not bigots. They are reasonable people living their life much as all of us try to do, doing what they think is best and what they think they understand. They have their own ideas about how they can live together with their French neighbours—I am speaking now of English-speaking people in Essex—and the French-speaking people have some of their own ideas as well, and not all of them, of course, are necessarily of one mind on the subject.

These are fine people and they are caught in a web which was essentially brought about by lack of clear government action. Our party would have preferred general legislation that did not single out Essex county but which would have changed in the various Acts the word "may" to "shall," so that every francophone in Ontario would know what the grounds rules are and would know that there are minority rights which apply everywhere in the province, and not simply leave it to the local jurisdiction to decide as it is now and then single out Essex county and make it an example of some kind and deem that it has made a decision which it has not made.

We would have preferred general legislation and such general legislation could have received the support of our Essex members and many more of the Essex county residents themselves. Nonetheless, we recognize, in the nature of the present situation, the need for action.

At the time the Minister of Education announced that he would ensure the establishment of this school, when I congratulated him, and he will remember that, I said: "If we are going to convince the ordinary citizens of Quebec that they can be first-class citizens in Canada, Ontario has to be the showplace. If we can't do it here, we can't do it anywhere in the country."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party will support this bill. We feel the school must be built. We will continue to support the government on any action it takes to expand and to enhance language equality in Ontario.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would someone care to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Bounsall moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Wells, the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 22, 1977

Transmitting estimates of certain sums required, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 793

Home buyers grants, statement by Mrs. Scrivener 793

Group home placements, statement by Mr. Norton 794

Benefits rates, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Lewis, Mr. McClellan, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Martel, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Swart 795

Fishing limits, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds 798

Use of sewage sludge, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Kerrio 799

UTDC mortgage loan, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Lewis 800

Group home placements, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. McClellan, Mrs. Campbell 801

Entertainment tax, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Breithaupt 802

United Asbestos plant, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Bain 802

Fire Prevention, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Foulds 803

Nanticoke water line extension, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Good 804

Budget priorities, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy 804

Highway 33, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. O'Neil 805

Budget briefing, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Ziemba 805

GO train stations, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Renwick 806

Highway 401, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Breaugh 806

York regional council, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Stong 806

Transportation of mentally handicapped, questions of Mr. Norton and Mrs. Birch: Mr. Martel, Mr. Bounsall 807

Crop insurance, questions of Mr. W. Newman. Mr. S. Smith 807

Point of privilege re question period, Mr. Bounsall 808

Employment Standards Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 808

Essex County French-Language Secondary School Act, 1977, Mr. Wells, on second reading 809

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wells, agreed to 825

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)



No. 21

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Monday, April 25, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

HOME RENEWAL PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, later this afternoon at the appropriate time I will be tabling a report entitled, An Evaluation of the Ontario Home Renewal Programme. This report contains the findings of an independent survey carried out by the consulting firm of Peter Barnard Associates.

In reading the report, members should note that the survey is based on statistical data gathered from the more than 400 municipalities that have participated in the Home Renewal Programme. In-depth interviews were conducted with municipal officials and other persons in 25 municipalities and a questionnaire survey of residents was carried out in six municipalities—Cornwall, Kenora, Sarnia, Sudbury, Toronto and Windsor.

The results of the survey indicate that the Ontario Home Renewal Programme has been highly successful and has been a valuable tool in helping my ministry meet its objective to help to preserve and upgrade the existing housing stock in the province.

As with any programme, there are areas where changes can be made, and this report contains recommendations for modifications and minor refinements. It also recommends that the programme be continued.

The government announced earlier this year that the Ontario Home Renewal Programme would be extended for one more year, that is until March 31, 1978. But before any decisions are taken for beyond that date, I think it is important that those communities involved in the programme be given an opportunity to respond to and comment on this evaluation.

I will therefore be forwarding copies of this report to all municipalities which have participated in this programme and ask them to give me their comments by May 30 of this year. The report will also be provided to the members of the Provincial Municipal Liaison Committee and to the hon. members of this House.

Mr. Kerrio: How about a statement by the Premier?

Mr. Lewis: I will defer to you if you would like to make a statement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't thought of one, but I will think of one.

Mr. Lewis: Okay. Well, we'll still be here at 6. Don't worry.

Mr. Reid: Just one word: "Go."

ORAL QUESTIONS

LAKE POLLUTION

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of the Environment the following: Does he recall that back on July 27, 1976, in a private memorandum to cabinet, the Minister of Natural Resources, dealing with fishing in waters where fish were contaminated, made the following recommendation—and please forgive me for using his preposterous words—I quote: "Do not prohibit angling on any water where it is known that at least some of the fish are contaminated, and continue to make available for leasing for private and commercial recreational purposes." On September 17, 1976, the cabinet committee on resources development had a memo which indicated that it agreed with the general approach proposed by the minister.

Can the Minister of the Environment confirm that this is now government policy, and what further specifics flow from that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member asked the question of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) last Friday—as it was issued over his signature when he was Minister of Natural Resources—I made some inquiries and what the hon. member has indicated was generally the discussion that took place. As far as government policy is concerned, the answer to that is no, that still has to be approved by cabinet and by the government. I expect it will be dealt with

very shortly, as the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs indicated on Friday.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, since the minister, according to the memorandum I have covering a number of divisions within the Northern Affairs and Natural Resources ministerial areas, appears to have taken this rather further down the road, and since obviously there is increasing concern in Ontario, will the minister not now in advance of his compendium release all of the information on the levels of contamination in various species in various lakes, since obviously he can't wait another two months while anxiety is heightened?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker—I shouldn't say no. The answer at the present time would be that up until now, we have issued bulletins or releases dealing with approximately 90 lakes. Thas has been an ongoing release of information that was handled by the Ministry of Health until the first of this year and has subsequently been handled by my ministry.

As the hon. member no doubt has seen, a number of these releases or bulletins deal with various lakes in certain parts of the province. This information is released just as soon as we have the analyses from the Ministry of the Environment laboratories which have the responsibility of analysing fish. This has been going on now for a couple of years and I expect to release another bulletin within a week covering 23 more watercourses, which will make the total about 107.

The booklet or guide to which the hon. member is referring will contain roughly 150 to 160 lakes and rivers. I will make sure that the difference, which obviously is available now, added to what has already been released by way of bulletin, is tabled in this House within the next week.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the fishing season opens within about three to four weeks, can the minister indicate when this booklet, with the compendium or without it, is going to be made available to the people who are fishing on these lakes?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As has been mentioned on a number of occasions, it is not a question of releasing the booklet as some of the media indicated, it's a question of getting it printed in sufficient quantity to distribute around the province. We're hoping that will be available in June. But in the meantime the information we have, dealing strictly with fish levels in specific lakes, can be issued before that time.

Mr. Ferrier: Supplementary: Other than further testing of fish to determine the mercury levels that may be there, is the ministry making any study as to the source of the mercury—whether it's natural or whether there is an industrial or other source of it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When we completed the analysis of fish from Lake Simcoe last fall and subsequently from the Muskokas, the Lake of Bays, where there are no known sources of mercury contamination by conventional industrial sources, we have undertaken a study of those areas to find out just what the possible source can be and whether it's more than a natural source or rock formation or sources of that kind.

The study we've undertaken in Simcoe started in January and has been extended to the recreation lakes in Muskoka because of the findings there. I would assume that it could be very well just a matter of manpower to extend it to the Timmins area as well.

Mr. S. Smith: In view of the fact of my question of last November regarding a list of lakes that contain fish with unacceptable levels of pollutants—in view of the fact that the fisheries branch in the Ministry of Natural Resources now says that they prepared an answer to that question last December—could the minister tell me whether it's his ministry or the Ministry of Natural Resources that's suppressing the publication, or at least the giving to me of the answers that the fisheries branch provided for the minister about last December?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That information should come from the Ministry of Natural Resources—

Mr. S. Smith: But you're not suppressing it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, we are not suppressing it, certainly.

Mr. Nixon: It is the Minister of Natural Resources. Great suppressor.

Mr. Bain: Could the minister indicate what criteria he uses in judging whether mercury contamination is natural or non-natural? I use the example of Lake Timiskaming. On various occasions he has said its contamination is natural and then on other occasions he said it originates from the mills that used to be the Cobalt area. I was wondering when the people might have a definitive answer on Lake Timiskaming.

[2:15]

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I'll have to look at that particular lake, Mr. Speaker. It's quite possible that the early information indicated it was from a natural source. I think that a natural source may be part of the problem in the hon. member's area; however, old mill tailings areas and old mining operations, of course, are always a possible source of mercury content.

OECA PUBLICATION

Mr. Lewis: Never knowing how much time is left around here, I must ask the government House leader this question: Does he know, or is he aware, that there is a document circulating through the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, called The Political Climate—1976-1980: A Planning Overview, prepared by their corporate division in May 1976, which indicates an obsessive and slightly paranoid preoccupation with politicians, the use of moulding political behaviour and opinion, gratuitous comments on politicians and on the councils that are advisory to the OECA? Has the document been brought to his attention?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, might I ask the minister to read the document and comment on observations such as: "The Ministry of Education: OECA's main difficulty in connection with this ministry is Tom Wells." Or on the Conservative Party: "At best, Mr. Davis will remain leader for another three or four years, which means a change in the leadership of the party within our five-year planning horizon even if the Conservatives remain in power"—

Mr. Breithaupt: It may mean a divorce for the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett).

Mr. Lewis: —and a limitless corps of observations of that kind strewn throughout the document, albeit some obviously perceptive?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We'll be here for another four years, yes.

Mr. Lewis: I would therefore ask the minister, could he possibly follow this up fairly seriously, given the often strange and disconcerting behaviour of OECA as they deal with politicians and the public and their various advisory councils? I'll send him a copy.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It's obvious that I'm not on the mailing list for the brown envelopes that are distributed throughout government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Touché.

Hon. Mr. Welch: But, number two, I take it, we need very little further evidence of the autonomy of the board of OECA.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Who needs freedom of information?

Mr. Lewis: Brown envelopes have begun to flow again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I suspect it was a friend of the Leader of the Opposition who wrote that report.

LAKE POLLUTION

Mr. S. Smith: I would ask the Minister of Natural Resources if he would please explain how it is that the fisheries branch of his own ministry had prepared an answer to my question of November regarding the polluted lakes in Ontario and that he had still written me in March saying that he and the Minister of the Environment are still working on the answer? Why has that answer not been given to me?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I believe, Mr. Speaker, there was not only a letter; I thought there had been some oral communication telling the hon. member that we were trying to prepare the whole package. And it wasn't just two ministries; a number of ministries, including the Ministry of Health, were involved in preparing a reasonable package to inform the public, not only of the specific information about mercury levels in specific lakes but also of the risks of mercury and a number of other pieces of information which we thought would be of very real value to the people fishing or likely to be eating the fish. This is taking a fair amount of time. In fact, it is being proceeded with as quickly as possible; that much I can tell the hon. member.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, there's always the chance that I don't quite understand the answer, but let me ask the minister whether he thinks it's reasonable that an elected member like myself should ask for information, that the information should be ready and available and yet that it should not be given to me as an elected member? Is that reasonable while the minister works on some pamphlet that he wishes for public distribution? Is that the way the minister treats the Legislature?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, contempt, indifference.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is not, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I think my record in giving information in this Legislature is pretty good. I intend to keep it that way.

Mr. Ruston: Like closing hospitals.

Mr. Roy: In fact, it's too good; that's why you are there.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I thought the hon. member understood that we would have a package of information available that was useful in a very broad way for a number of people. I'll be glad to check to see, for the member's personal use, if some part of it may be raised at once.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Going fishing?

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: Can the minister indicate what information will be available through his offices and licence issuers to people who buy fishing licences for the season starting on May 21?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That has nothing to do with the original question about the polluted lakes and what have you.

Mr. Reid: If I may, Mr. Speaker, it has to do with the pollution in the lakes—so that the people know what lakes are polluted—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is an important question. We can come back to it later.

BINGO REGULATIONS

Mr. S. Smith: I will ask a question of the Minister of Culture and Recreation, Mr. Speaker. Can he explain why one of the officials in his ministry informed the church-affiliated sponsors of the nightly bingo at the International Centre on Airport Road that it must stop busing people from Hamilton, Brantford, Toronto, Acton and Collingwood to attend its charitable bingo operation?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, that question should be directed to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Speaker: Do you redirect it?

Mr. Nixon: Does he run the bingos?

Mr. Speaker: The question is redirected by the minister.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I don't know about the specific instance, but there have been rules issued that those people who are running bingos must keep their expenses within a certain percentage of the gross—I believe it is 20 per cent—and must return 15 per cent to the charity that they are supposedly supporting by the bingo.

I don't know that particular case. I would be glad to look into it to see whether or not that is the reason why. But the busing costs money, and if the busing brings them over the expense limit, then it may have been very well suggested that's one way they can get within the limit.

Mr. Nixon: You let the Jockey Club bring them in from all over.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary: Would the minister kindly look into the fact that it is alleged that a Mr. Fisher and a Mr. Don Spade of his ministry informed a Mr. Doyle that it was not permitted for people in one community to play bingo in another community? Furthermore—you know, big daddy government is getting bigger all the time—

Mr. Nixon: They can't drink beer but they can play bingo.

Mr. S. Smith: —they renewed the bingo licence only to June 30 on condition that buses are stopped by that time?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, shame. Resign.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister only, please. Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: I recognize it isn't as important as internal memoranda on the OCEA. I recognize that, but it does affect a number of people.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into those allegations.

AID FOR HAMILTON

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier: Since Hamilton has unfortunately not been able to acquire the Pan-American Games and since the province of Ontario indicated a willingness to make up

to $17 million available for the purpose of providing facilities—

Mr. S. Smith: Could we have it anyway?

Mr. Deans: —and other matters related to the Pan-American Games—

Mr. Shore: Will you settle for $12 million?

Mr. Deans: I will settle for $12 million; is that an offer? Would the government—

An hon. member: You get Marvin as well. That's the problem.

Mr. Deans: —recognizing that part of the initiative surely was to create employment in the area—

Mr. S. Smith: How about $6 million and a draft choice?

Mr. Deans: —consider three projects: A hospital in the east end of the city to meet long-standing needs—

Mr. Reid: Sounds like an election question.

Mr. Ruston: Here is his campaign speech.

Mr. S. Smith: You could call it the Pan-Am hospital.

An hon. member: And he wants to keep one choice until after the election.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's get the question, and then the answer.

Mr. Deans: I am just waiting for a break. A hospital in the east that has been approved by the Ministry of Health—

Mr. S. Smith: And a partridge in a pear tree.

Mr. Deans: —additional senior citizen accommodation in the east end which has been proven needed—

Mr. Nixon: That's good.

Mr. Deans: —and a stepping up of the sewer project in Winona which the minister agrees is required but for which there was no money available? Would the Premier use the money for those purposes and create the employment and meet the needs of the community in the meantime?

Mr. Breithaupt: And a new firehall in case—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What riding is all that in?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I won't make one observation about the Winona request that I could. In that these requests are all, of course, indirectly non-related to the hon. member's riding, I can understand him asking the question. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, in the same general way the question was asked, this government is always prepared to look at any reasonable request from any municipality, any board. We are most reasonable people on this side of the House and certainly we look at any reasonable request.

Mr. Nixon: You gave Hamilton a new arena before the last election. What are you going to do this time? You can use the money for an election.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Any allocation of funds, of course, has to relate to the priorities and the availability of money. I should also point out to the hon. member, who wasn't that enthusiastic about the Pan-Am Games initially—

Mr. Deans: Oh, not so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, well, I am sorry. I thought you weren't. I can only say to the hon. member that there is no question there would have been employment created but if memory serves me correctly the design for the major facility was to be a 15,000-seat arena, I think, for most of the indoor events, and the architectural work and so on hadn't started, so that there would not have been, in this current fiscal year, any capital expenditure. The funding, of course, was to be provided out of certain lottery proceeds.

There was no money in this year's budget to accommodate the possibility of the Pan-Am Games in the city of Hamilton—

Mr. S. Smith: But there is for an election. It's about the same time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I really can't say to the hon. member that there is any funding there that is not now being used that we could use for other worthwhile purposes.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Am I to assume from what the Premier has said that if the city of Hamilton and the surrounding municipalities making up the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth were to request funds for the purposes that I have asked about, since the government was prepared to spend up to $17 million on the Pan-Am Games it might be prepared to entertain such suggestions for those projects, since they would equally create employment and provide needed facilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think there were three projects that the hon. member was anxious that his constituents know he had expressed an interest in, and I understand that. I think the funding for the servicing in Winona might be available, as it should be in other parts as well, on a one-third, one-third, one third basis, and I think the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Deans: You said no.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With respect to the possibility of a Hamilton East hospital, I think that's a matter being discussed by the health council in that community. As I pointed out, the funding for any of those projects would have to be out of general tax revenues. As I tried to explain to the member, none of the funding for the Pan-Am Games was coming from that source and none of it was in this current fiscal year.

As I say, this government is prepared to try to help wherever it can within the priorities and the financial limitations that are imposed upon all of us in this House.

QUEBEC LANGUAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. Roy: If I may preface it by applauding the Premier's statements of late on the question of economic association with Levesque, may I ask the Premier this: In view of the fact that he is apparently seeking a legal opinion on the question of the white paper, and in view of the fact that he has made a full statement in this House in his commitment on Monday, April 4, how does he hope to acquire credibility with the majority of the people of Quebec or even with the majority of Franco-Ontarians when he still has on his books legislation that reads such as this—and I am reading section 127 of The Judicature Act, which states: "Writs, pleadings, proceedings in all courts shall be in English only."

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think they are two rather distinct issues, and the hon. member, with his legal training, I'm sure would understand that. I don't want to get into any sort of provocative discussion—I don't mean provocative in terms of the House—but I made my observations as related to the option that has been presented by the Premier of Quebec and some of his ministers and, I assume, the government, as to the question of economic union or association.

I made my statement in Montreal; I repeated it here a week ago this evening, although it was somewhat lost sight of in the midst of other discussions, and I restated it very clearly. That was based on the concern that I felt that the Minister of Finance or Treasurer from the province of Quebec had really stated in so many words in this province that the debate about separation, in his view, was over.

[2:30]

I very simply stated that no Canadian has the right to make that statement or express that point of view, and that as far as I was concerned that debate was not, is not and, in my view, will not be over for some period of time. If anybody in Quebec, in the government—and I emphasize in the government—felt that because there had been no prior statement, the option of economic union or association had some slight attraction, I went on to say—I hope I'm right in this—that the people of this province are very committed to national unity; are very committed to having Quebec as part of Confederation; and would be prepared to assess any restructuring of the constitution or how this country functions; I think that the people of this province would approach that in a very positive frame of mind. This is my point of view and I hope I am expressing it on behalf of all of us.

I did point out at the Empire Club that I thought that frame of mind, that feeling, would not be the same if the issue we were discussing was solely that of economic union; and, as I have said—that is not an option open, as far as I'm concerned.

The hon. member is trying to relate that to my concern with respect to the white paper. I must emphasize that the white paper, as I understand it, is in the process of being re-assessed and put into the form of potential draft legislation. I will not comment in advance of the legislation.

As I pointed out on a number of occasions, people who try to relate what we are doing in a very progressive, logical way with respect to the French language being used for the Franco-Ontarian minority in this province—as it relates to the legal and traditional position in the province of Quebec—are dealing with two different situations, not only in law but in terms of the tradition and practices in this province.

I understand that the member for Ottawa East is concerned that we move more expeditiously, or more rapidly in some of these

areas. I see nothing contradictory in what we have been saying, in what has been and is the policy of this government; but I would point out to him that I think there is a contradiction in the question that he has asked me, and the position of his colleague, the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini), as it relates to another issue that is before the House.

Mr. Breithaupt: Just like your candidate in Essex South.

Mr. S. Smith: Point of order. I believe the answer that the Premier just gave does not have any bearing on the precise question being asked. In fact, it was a very unfair statement to make at this time. I would draw his attention to this clipping about his candidate in that particular riding—

Mr. Ruston: Yes. Going to get a new candidate Bill?

Mr. S. Smith: —it is headed, "Please Condemn Wells Over French school." Show the clipping to the Premier and bring it back to me.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me it was quite a broad question in connection with the Judicature Act and I wasn't sure of the connection between the two.

Mr. S. Smith: The answer certainly had nothing to do with it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A supplementary from the hon. member for Ottawa East?

Mr. Roy: I preface my supplementary by saying this: I had not intended to make the association between the Premier's statement on economic association and the Judicature Act. I said I applauded his statement on economic association.

Mr. Speaker: Your supplementary, please.

Mr. Roy: My supplementary is this: Recognizing that the Premier is one of the leaders of this country fighting for Canadian unity, how does he expect to have credibility with the people of Quebec, which his predecessor Mr. Robarts had, when talking about Franco-Ontarian rights—and in his statement he says that his commitment to Franco-Ontarian citizens, to their educational, language and social rights will not be diminished—as long as he keeps legislation such as this on the books of this province?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that's the same question. Is there a different answer?

Mr. Roy: It wasn't answered.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting time when we repeat the question; the answer has to be repeated as well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand on my answer to the first question. I agree with you that the second question is exactly the same.

Mr. Ruston: You didn't answer the first question.

Mr. Nixon: Take another look at it, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the hon. member, I'm really not concerned in that sense about my credibility. I am very concerned about the future of this country. I apologize to no one for the positions I have taken, and I say to the hon. member, unlike perhaps some suggestions made by others during this discussion in this province and elsewhere, that in the remote possibility—

Mr. S. Smith: Here comes another cheap shot.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that something were to happen in the province of Quebec, nothing is going to diminish the rights of the Franco-Ontarians in this province as long as I have anything to do with it.

Mr. S. Smith: What rights? Their rights to a trial in French maybe?

Mr. Roy: Don't you call this a right, to a trial in French?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was suggested the rights would diminish.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're wasting time with this calling back and forth.

Mr. S. Smith: The Premier gets lower every day.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: What about Hatfield? Is the Premier going to bring him up next?

Mr. MacDonald: With reference to the original question and dead on it, since this government 10 years ago, following the B and B report, got a task force report on the extent to which French could or might be used in our courts, would the government now table that task force report so that the Legislature might judge the adequacy or inadequacy of

what Robarts or the present Premier has done in the last 10 years in that area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't speak with as much specific knowledge about the courts. I will look into that information. The hon. member knows what we've done. But I think it also would be relevant perhaps to trace, if this were to be done, the total—

Mr. MacDonald: Will you answer my question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I won't undertake to table it until I myself have seen it.

Mr. MacDonald: That's all I ask.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I say to the hon. member I think it is relevant that there be an understanding of all the programmes that have been developed for the Franco-Ontarians in this province, including the field of education, where somebody I know rather well had a very direct hand in bringing it about.

Mr. Lewis: What was that? Somebody you know rather well?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Lewis: That's another gem of self-effacement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SALES TAX EXEMPTION

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I I would like to respond to the question asked by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer) on Thursday, April 21, concerning retail sales tax exemptions to underground utility cables.

Underground cable for electrical utilities will continue to be exempt from retail sales tax, regardless of whether the cable is to be used in-duct or is buried direct. I informed the OMEA of this decision in my letter to them of March 8, which they then acknowledged on March 24. There has been a delay in finalizing the enabling regulation due to discussions among members of my ministry, the OMEA and representatives of municipal utilities. The regulation has now been revised to incorporate their suggestions and is being processed through Management Board and cabinet. When it is approved it will be retroactive to June 1, 1977.

MULTILINGUAL TRANSLATIONS OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Labour. In view of the concern expressed by the francophone community in my riding, will the minister see that The Workmen's Compensation Act is translated into French and made available to them in French?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, there have been directions issued to the Workmen's Compensation Board about multilingual translation of certain documents. I shall certainly approach them about the possible translation of the entire Act into French for their consideration.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary: When translating them into other languages, will the minister also make sure the documents translated are understandable?

Mr. Breithaupt: They are not understandable in English; it's unfair to do them in other languages.

Mr. S. Smith: You don't want them translated, you want them rewritten.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I gather there has been some newspaper discussion about the understandability, if you will, of certain of the Workmen's Compensation Board documents.

Mr. Reid: Understandability? There's the problem.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I have asked specifically that the documents be looked at so that indeed they will be made clear to all those individuals who have to read them. The staff of the board stands ready at any time, however, to help anyone who is having difficulty understanding the documents.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Is it possible to produce for the House the documents that the minister intends to have translated and to tell us into which languages she intends to have them translated? Do they include The Construction Safety Act?

Hon. B. Stephenson: We were talking about The Workmen's Compensation Act, and that does not include The Construction Safety Act, which is an Act under the Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Deans: I understand that.

CHILDREN IN UNLICENSED HOMES

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought it might be.

Mrs. Campbell: Considering the fact that the minister's answer given to me the other day regarding unlicensed children's boarding homes suggested that many Children's Aid Societies won't use unlicensed homes, will the minister tell the House whether he can give the same assurance for family courts? Are there, in fact, children sent into unlicensed homes from family courts; and who, if anyone, is looking after these children's welfare?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The hon. member, I am sure, is well aware that the family courts in this province do not come within the jurisdiction of my ministry, although the question of many of the group homes and boarding homes for children do. I cannot give the member the assurance that she asks at this point in time, but I can assure her that the whole area, as she is aware, is under review, and will be under the jurisdiction of the new children and youths services division of the ministry. One of the reasons for the reorganization was to look at precisely the kind of problem that I know concerns her and underlies the question that she has asked.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Do I take it, then, that at this point in time this ministry cannot answer as to who is responsible for the welfare of those children in unlicensed homes; and that no such assurance will be available, at least until the minister has introduced the legislation transferring responsibility of all of these facilities in his ministry? Is that the thrust of his reply?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not and I don't think I really need to elaborate on that. The hon. member did in fact ask a question with regard to how many children were being placed in these homes under the jurisdiction of the court. She did not ask me the question at the time about who was concerned, who was responsible for the welfare of those children. Obviously our ministry bears the responsibility for the welfare of those children, and will continue to do so, through whatever agencies are available, Children's Aid Societies and so on, across this province. The question of those group homes which are presently not under the purview of the legislation is under review and we will be developing means of closer supervision.

Mrs. Campbell: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the minister that I did in fact ask who was supervising and it was as a result of his answer that I asked my supplementary. Could he, then, now tell us if he is responsible for these homes, as his answer indicates, how many of them are there, to his knowledge, which do not comply with the standards of health and safety, either of the municipality or of his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question at this point. I will try to find that information. If the hon. member has information about any or all of the standards in such group homes, I would be quite happy for her to pass that information to me and I would be quite happy to investigate it.

SALES TAX EXEMPTION

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I referred to the retroactivity of a regulation for The Retail Sales Tax Act as being June 1 of this year, and of course it is January 1 of this year. I am afraid my mind was on other events.

Mr. S. Smith: Other events?

Mr. Reid: That's the ninth.

Mr. Breithaupt: June 9.

Mr. Lewis: That certainly answers the question.

NORTH PICKERING PROJECT

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier with regard to North Pickering land acquisition royal commission: In view of the fact that last week the Premier promised there would be an early answer to those owners who have been dispossessed and are awaiting a decision, and in view of the fact the hearings have now been postponed, may I ask the Premier what specific steps he has taken to ensure there is a speedy answer for these people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we are moving expeditiously to make sure the hearings get under way very shortly and we'll have something to say in the next day or so.

[2:45]

Mr. Godfrey: Supplementary: Perhaps the Premier did not hear what I said, I asked what specific steps were being taken. Has he approached the Lieutenant Governor to reconvene the board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not a question of approaching the Lieutenant Governor to reconvene the board.

BINGO REGULATIONS

Mr. Kerrio: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Will he tell the House when he expects the new ceilings on administrative cost for bingos to be implemented; and can we expect a report from him on the effectiveness of this new initiative in the early stages of its implementation?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: My understanding is that the administrative ceilings, the so-called cost of operation regulations, have in fact been implemented and that many people are being given an extension of their present practices so that they can phase into the new conditions of operation.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary: Has the minister considered speaking with the Minister of Culture and Recreation concerning the 15 per cent ceiling, not only on private enterprises but on the province's own Wintario lottery which has administrative costs above 15 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes. As a matter of fact, I have discussed this with the minister along with my other cabinet colleagues. All I can say is we found many instances where bingos were being operated for the full benefit of the promoter when it should be for the benefit of the charities. We are trying to help the existing bingo operations to meet those guidelines.

Mr. Reid: For whom is Wintario being operated?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: So far, to the best of my knowledge, no licences have been cancelled.

NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Moffatt: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. In view of the statement tabled in this House about two weeks ago by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor), which indicates that in the short term we are going to be more dependent upon nuclear power as a source of energy for quite some number of years, has the Ministry of the Environment any plans with regard to stating general policies and specific measures to be taken with regard to the disposal of nuclear waste, the construction of plants, the siting of plants and their adaptability and fitting in with the general industrial complex of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes. My ministry works very closely with the Ministry of Energy as far as nuclear power and the disposal of waste from nuclear plants are concerned. There is an interministerial committee which involves those two ministries, as well as Health—and there is one more that I can't think of off the top of my head—in long term policies. It involves also Environment Canada. So there is no question that both ministries are aware of each other's position in respect to nuclear power and, more importantly, the disposal of waste from that source.

Mr. Moffatt: Supplementary: In light of that I would like to ask the minister what his response is going to be to the application to have the Darlington generating station exempt from the terms of The Environmental Assessment Act, in light of the fact that Ontario Hydro went to the town of Newcastle and bought an agreement with them that they would not pose any objection to that kind of application.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't understand what the hon. member says when he says Hydro bought an agreement from the town of Newcastle. There must have been a price tag on it or some sort of a document.

Mr. Moffatt: That is correct. That is exactly what it was.

Hon. B. Stephenson: What is it you are alleging?

Hon. Mr. Norton: What are you alleging?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As far as Darlington is concerned, there has been no decision with regard to any move to exempt that project from the Act.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary on the subject.

Mr. Moffatt: The minister apparently does not know that Ontario Hydro extracted from the town of Newcastle a commitment that, in return for signing a document which gave them certain sums of money for the development to go ahead, the town would not ask for any environmental assessment under that Act with regard to the Darlington station.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Has the member got that document?

Hon. W. Newman: You are accusing the council of selling out to Hydro.

Mr. Speaker: There doesn't seem to be any question to that. There's a rebuttal of an answer.

JOBS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. Riddell: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Can the minister clarify for us and give us details of the types of jobs that are to be created in the agricultural sector, as outlined in the budget, which indicated that new funding will be provided for job creation in agriculture infrastructure?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, I can give the member a fair number on the list right now. As he knows, $2 million additional was allowed for tile drainage, which would increase the work there. There will be a certain amount of research work done at the University of Guelph by the use of students and others and in our agricultural colleges the junior agriculturalist programme will be extended. We will probably work on an abandoned orchard programme, probably in eastern and maybe northwestern Ontario.

We are also looking at some other programmes of cleaning up, removing abandoned farm buildings, the windbreaks programme and several other programmes, plus the other part of the budget that includes the summer youth programme to subsidize summer farm labour jobs; part of that is included in the overall budget.

May I just finish, Mr. Speaker, by saying there also may be other programmes we're working on right now.

Mr. Bain: Supplementary: Could I ask the minister what specific programmes and jobs he has in mind for agriculture in the north in the light of the fact that the north has unique problems that aren't covered by general blanket provincial programmes?

Hon. W. Newman: I would disagree with the hon. member's comment to start with, Mr. Speaker. We have special programmes for the north and we are looking at special programmes for the north. I outlined in this House last Friday, I believe it was, many of the programmes we have for the north. We're very much concerned about the north because we think there's a great potential there.

Mr. Bain: What new jobs in agriculture?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: We will be working with the municipalities across this province to work out programmes in conjunction with them. As the hon. member knows, we have a team working right now on the water problem. And I'm aware of the problems of the north; I'm going to have a look at them later on this week, as a matter of fact.

An hon. member: Are you doing anything about them?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McKessock: A supplementary pertaining to jobs available to farmers for hiring youth: Is there going to be anything different to last year as to the junior agriculturalist programme, or is it just going to be the same as last year? If it is going to be different, when will we know about it?

Hon. W. Newman: The junior agriculturalist programme is already in place. There was a lot of applications this year and, as a result of the additional funds we have, we'll be allowing more junior agriculturalists to have that great experience of going to work on a farm for the summer to find out what it is really like to work on a farm, and we're glad we're able to extend that programme. The students who were picked before already have been picked; we will now be extending that programme.

Mr. Speaker: I'll allow a final supplementary.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary: In view of the attempt to produce more jobs in the north and the water problem in northern Ontario with agriculture, can the minister explain whether the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of the Environment or the new ministry responsible for the overall programme will deal with the water problem if we have another dry summer in the north?

Hon. W. Newman: As I said last Friday in this House, we're working on it right now. We have a preliminary report; it's working through the secretariat. But the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of the Environment are also involved, as the hon. member knows, in looking at ways and means to try to cope with this problem if we do not get the necessary rain that we need in northern Ontario.

QUEBEC MILK

Mr. Samis: Another question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Is the minister aware that 750 pounds of poor-quality milk from Granby Co-op in Huntingdon, Quebec, and 250,000 pounds from Co-operative Fédérée de Quebec, in Fédérée Mont Laurier, Quebec, are being processed weekly in eastern Ontario? Can he tell us what assurance his ministry can give the consumers of Ontario that the quality standards of Ontario will be maintained?

Hon. W. Newman: We have quality standards for all milk processed in the province of Ontario, wherever it comes from, through the Milk Marketing Board. The plants that received that milk know of our standards of quality, and the milk is tested here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Samis: Supplementary: Since the officials of the Milk Marketing Board themselves, plus farmers in the area, have described the milk by saying, "We had dark milk coming in from Quebec all winter," can the minister give us some indication of the extent of this importation over the past few months and his projections for the upcoming months?

Hon. W. Newman: We're very much concerned about the high standards of milk quality in this province, and I think it augurs well for all of us that we do have very high standards.

Mr. Bain: Answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: The specific problem that the hon. member is talking about is being looked into at this moment.

RICHMOND HILL NURSING HOMES

Mr. Stong: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Will the minister consider giving assistance, in terms of licence and funding, to two nursing homes in the town of Richmond Hill, Elmwood Manor and Country Place Nursing Home, both of which have ample space and beds available and both of which have waiting lists?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will be glad to give an answer on that in a day or two. I had a complete report on that based on a newspaper report which I just happen to have in front of me, of March 16, 1977, and about the rather interesting history of those nursing homes with additions built without permission and that sort of thing. I'll give a complete answer in a couple of days.

PEEL TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. Sweeney: A question of the Minister of Education: Given that as of this morning both the teachers and the board in Peel county seem determined to close the schools either by a strike or a lockout, is the minister prepared to see 28,000 students go without their final exams, particularly when it means that a large number of them will lose their year because they need the final mark to complement their year's work?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Of course, the answer is no, I would not be prepared to see them lose their final year. I don't believe that that would lose the final marks for this year and I don't believe that will happen. I believe that solutions will be found.

My friend should know, if he read the paper this morning, that the teachers have put forward a final position suggesting "Med-Arb"—mediation-arbitration—a process that's been used in other jurisdictions and has been recommended by the chairman of the Education Relations Commission for use here in several disputes—which has been accepted by the teacher negotiators. They're having a general meeting tomorrow afternoon to get the backing of all the teachers for this method of settling the dispute. It then will be presented to the Peel board of education and if they will accept it as a method of settling the dispute, I think the sanctions can be lifted and things can be back to normal and a process for settling those items remaining in dispute will be in motion.

These steps are all taking place at the present time. The Education Relations Commission is very deeply involved in them and I'm hopeful that they will result in a conclusion to the problems in Peel.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary: While these processes are going on, regardless of what their outcome is, is the minister prepared to tell both the teachers and the board that they have an obligation to be sure that the students are evaluated—an obligation, not a choice?

Mr. S. Smith: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that what I would want to do is speak personally with the teachers in this case to find out exactly what they're talking about. My friend is referring to some generalizations, perhaps, that have

appeared in newspapers in this particular situation. It may not be exactly as it appears in the newspapers. The Peel teachers are in a legal strike position—

Mr. S. Smith: Why don't you know?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They're exercising what they think are their prerogatives in that strike situation. The board, on the other hand, has it within its power to do certain things also, and I think that both sides are concerned about the welfare of the students. They always are. But it is also a teacher-board labour dispute, and these kinds of side effects very often come to be. None of us like to see them but I think that we have to do everything we can to get the parties together to get the matter settled and that's the best way to bring to an end any of the unpleasantnesses that may be being caused there.

BRANT COUNTY TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. Makarchuk: A new question of the Minister of Education regarding the fact that in the dispute between the Brant County Board of Education and the OSSTF one of the matters under dispute is the matter of increments—whether they should be referred to the Anti-Inflation Board for consideration in the wage increase, or whether they should not be referred. Is the minister prepared to instruct the boards in Ontario to the effect that they should leave out that portion as a negotiable matter, or is he prepared to let it be a matter that can be kicked around by the two sides?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I know the matter the hon. member is referring to. I'm not sure that it matters what I think in this particular matter.

These disputes are between the teachers and their employers, the school boards. It's incumbent upon the school boards to fill out the forms they submit to the Anti-Inflation Board, not the Ministry of Education nor the Minister of Education. Even if I might express my preference in this particular matter, it's still the prerogative of the school boards to handle it as they see fit. Therefore, in certain cases in this province it has become an issue as to whether the increments will or will not be counted in the percentage increases they report to the AIB.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary: In this case, in view of the fact that if this matter was removed from the bargaining table either way, whether it was decided that it should be considered or that it should not be considered it does not become a matter for dispute. The minister would be in a position to defuse a lot of potential arguments or strikes in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Your question?

[3:00]

Mr. Makarchuk: Is the minister prepared to move in that direction?

Hon. Mr. Wells: What I'm saying to my friend, Mr. Speaker—and I'm sure my friend knows enough about labour-management relations—is that I can't remove anything from the bargaining table. If it's a negotiable item and one of the sides wants to bargain over that particular item, I can't wave a wand and remove it.

CITIZEN COMPLAINTS AGAINST POLICE

Mr. Singer: A question for the Solicitor General: I wonder if he could tell us whether we are going to see the new bill dealing with police complaint procedures? If we are likely to see it, is he going to follow the recommendation of Mr. Justice Morand and Arthur Maloney or is he going to have the view that he enunciated to the press just a few weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I hope that the bill will be introduced shortly. It is presently going through the legislative procedures again.

Mr. Reid: Which Parliament?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ruston: Third time around.

Mr. Nixon: You are smiling, John.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: But it will have embodied in it many of the recommendations that Mr. Arthur Maloney proposed and some of the recommendations that Mr. Justice Morand proposed. As I say, I hope it will be before the House very shortly.

Mr. Roy: I wonder if I could ask if it is the minister's intention and the intention of the government to see this legislation passed before the next election?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When is that?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That may be beyond my control, Mr. Speaker, but it's certainly my intention.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Minister of Labour? With the new emphasis on occupational health, has the Minister of Labour endeavoured to inform the various community colleges that have courses in industrial hygiene or matters related, to provide in their advisory councils a reasonable cross-section of the community so that various voices are heard when sorting out the content for the programme?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not communicated directly with boards of governors—

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Conservative himself.

Mr. Nixon: In a pin-stripe.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) is getting to look like the member for Ottawa South.

Mr. Speaker: We're wasting time now. The hon. Minister of Labour has the floor.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'm sorry that the unexpected sartorial splendour of the hon. member for Ottawa Centre has had this disturbing effect upon the members, but as I said, I have not attempted to contact directly the boards nor the presidents of community colleges at this time. Because what we are at this point doing is to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is too much background noise.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —establish, with the co-operation of universities, community colleges and other educational bodies, an integrated educational programme—because we need three levels of educational programme and not simply the community college level. When we have completed that, then I am sure we will be in contact.

Mr. Singer: The member for Ottawa Centre is going to get his hair done every day.

Mr. Nixon: He's put away his sweat shirts; no more sweat shirts.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I have communicated with some of them because they have indicated to me their interest in providing just that aspect of education in occupational health and safety. We are encouraging them, of course, to do so, making sure that they are aware that there needs to be some input from both management and labour when such courses are undertaken.

Mr. Lewis: I don't think you should allow the ridicule of pin-stripe socialism, Mr. Speaker. That was the quid pro quo for the Treasurer's job. May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Roy: Did you ever think in your wildest dreams that you would ever see the member for Ottawa Centre in a pin-stripe suit?

Mr. Ruston: With a vest?

Mr. Lewis: You've been wearing vests all your life, Albert.

Mr. Reid: It is all right, Mr. Speaker. It comes from Syd Silver.

Mr. Breithaupt: It goes back at 6.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: The rates change at 6.

Mr. Lewis: Albert, you were born in a vest.

May I ask a supplementary of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we're wasting time.

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the minister in particular to pay close notice to the Industrial Hygiene Technology Advisory Committee in Lambton College, which is the signal course of of its kind in the province, where 10 out of the 13 members of the committee come from Polysar, Petrosar, Shell, Imperial Oil, Dow and Esso, not a single representative of any of the work force and three representatives from the college itself? Can the minister perhaps convey, if not displeasure at least direction that this kind of thing does not augur well for the course content we might wish in the province?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I would convey displeasure because, indeed, in the past that has been the makeup of many of the advisory committees.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the problem.

Hon. B. Stephenson: In our enthusiasm and our attempt to ensure that there is, indeed, co-operation between management and labour in this particular area, as well as in all other areas, I should most certainly convey to them my concern that there should be broader representation.

ENTERTAINMENT TAX

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Minister of Revenue. Is the minister aware of the confusion, both in her ministry apparently and in the minds of the public, with reference to the retail sales tax as it pertains to performances of Canadian talent, where formerly they used to have exemptions on an application basis? What is the status of those applications now?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, there is no confusion in my ministry.

Mrs. Campbell: There is.

Mr. Roy: It is not in the ministry, it is in the minister.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Canadian performances and productions which are produced by Canadians are, of course, exempt from retail sales tax on admissions.

ONTARIO MALLEABLE IRON

Mr. Breaugh: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Would she provide us with a copy of whatever documents she forwarded to the UIC appeal board concerning the Ontario Malleable Iron workers in Oshawa? Would she also give us some indication of what else she might be contemplating that would help those people, who haven't had a paycheque in going on two years, to either find another job or get some financial assistance in some way?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'm not sure that there is any specific documentation. There have been a number of direct telephone calls and conversations about it. That I am aware of. I am not aware that there are transcripts of those calls. I shall, however, remind the hon. member that indeed there is an employment adjustment service within the Ministry of Labour which stands ready to assist any individual found in the unfortunate situation in which many of these former employees of that company are.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

PETITIONS

Mr. Breaugh: I have a petition to present to the Legislature. The petition consists of approximately 3,000 ratepayers in my riding in the region of Durham and the petition reads:

"We, the undersigned residents of the region of Durham request the following: An immediate solution to the problems of increased water and sewer rates, high taxes and duplication of services in the region of Durham. We submit the costs of simply existing in the region have increased dramatically as a direct result of the region being implemented. As an immediate solution, we require that increased funding from the province be made available in the amount requested by the region in December of 1975 of the Treasurer of Ontario.

"Secondly, as a long-range solution, a full inquiry is required into the benefits and costs of the transition to this form of municipal government".

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member send it down to the desk?

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, I also have about 2,000 names of a petition with identical wording to that submitted by the member for Oshawa, all from the residents of the region of Durham.

Mr. Godfrey: I too wish to present a petition in the same wording as the two previous ones, numbering some 2,000 residents of Durham West.

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the petitions, those three petitions which have been presented are merely the forerunners of others which will be coming in and we simply wanted to give you notice that they are under way.

Mr. Breithaupt: Thanks for the notice.

Mr. Speaker: We will have to check and see if these three are in order first of all.

Mr. Breaugh: They are in order.

Mr. Speaker: Fine.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF DURHAM AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Breaugh moved first reading of Bill 57, An Act to amend The Regional Municipality of Durham Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses itself to what is known locally as

"The Great Water and Sewer Ripoff." This bill returns control over water and sewage services in the regional municipality of Durham to the area municipality.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 58, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this bill requires that every product offered for sale by a retailer that is marked with the universal product code must also be clearly marked with its individual purchase price. This would ensure the rights of the consumer to the privilege of comparison shopping.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to table the answers to questions 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 standing on the notice paper. (See appendix, page 871.)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TORONTO GENERAL BURYING GROUNDS ACT

Mr. Drea moved second reading of Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Trustees of the Toronto General Burying Grounds.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

CANADA TRUSTCO MORTGAGE COMPANY ACT

Mr. Peterson moved second reading of Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Trustco Mortgage Company.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

BOROUGH OF YORK ACT

Mr. Deans, on behalf on Mr. MacDonald, moved second reading of Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

WEBWOOD INVESTMENTS LIMITED ACT

Mr. Stong moved second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Webwood Investments Limited.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

[3:15]

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK ACT

Mr. Leluk moved second reading of Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of East York.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

LOMBARDO FURNITURE AND APPLIANCES LIMITED ACT

Mr. Deans, on behalf of Mr. Burr, moved second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting Lombardo Furniture and Appliances Limited.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

KEVALAINE CORPORATION LIMITED ACT

Mr. Grossman moved second reading of Bill Pr13, An Act respecting Kevalaine Corporation Limited.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

FRED LEBLOND CEMENT PRODUCTS LIMITED ACT

Mr. Leluk, on behalf of Mr. Morrow, moved second reading of Bill Pr16, An Act respecting Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

ROMAN CATHOLIC EPISCOPAL CORPORATION (DIOCESE OF ALEXANDRIA) ACT

Mr. Villeneuve moved second reading of Bill Pr19, An Act respecting The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation for the Diocese of Alexandria, in Ontario, Canada.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

VILLAGE OF ERIE BEACH ACT

Mr. Breithaupt, on behalf of Mr. Spence, moved second reading of Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the Village of Erie Beach.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

FRANK POSTEL ENTERPRISES LIMITED ACT

Mr. Drea, on behalf of Mr. Johnston, moved second reading of Bill Pr24, An Act respecting Frank Postl Enterprises Limited.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

BUDGET DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I had been led to understand that every one of the Conservative cabinet was going to be here for this particular speech.

Mr. Breithaupt: Wrong again.

Mr. Cassidy: Wrong again, yes. It's unfortunate because it might have been a helpful piece of information for them.

Ontario is passing through difficult times and it faces a difficult economic future. More and more evidence indicates we face major changes in our industrial and economic structure if we are to continue to enjoy the prosperity that has been Ontario's lot in the past, almost automatically.

The terms of trade within Canada are shifting against Ontario, and the economic pre-eminence we have enjoyed for so long in this country is weakening. The persistent increase in our unemployment rate to more than seven per cent this winter, which the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) seems to think is temporary, may well mark the start of a period of chronically high unemployment, unless there is decisive action by the government.

We believe that Ontario can continue to prosper, but the Treasurer seems to have lost confidence in Ontario. That's why the budget he brought down on April 19 is such a profoundly disappointing document for us in the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Bain: And for the people of the province.

Mr. Deans: He just doesn't understand.

Mr. Cassidy: In speech after speech since last September, the Treasurer has been laying his ground with warnings of difficult times ahead. Some of the analysis that was prepared in advance of the budget was perceptive, but to quote the Treasurer himself, "When the drains are plugged, you need a good plumber, not another public relations man."

We expected, and Ontario needed, a serious, bold and innovative budget that would show the Conservatives are as capable of managing bad times as they are of profiting politically from the good times that Ontario has enjoyed over the past three decades. The Treasurer has failed to provide that serious new approach and all of us in Ontario are poorer as a result. He intends to continue the mismanagement of the Ontario economy that has brought us to our present difficult situation.

The Treasurer has helped to create stagnation in the Ontario economy, and now he asks us to accept that that stagnation will continue. He is so caught up in his ideological straitjacket that he cannot bring himself to apply the remedies that everyone else agrees the Ontario economy needs. This steadfast disciple of simplistic laissez-faire economics honestly believes a handful of corporate executives, many responding to direction from outside Canada, can do a better job of bringing Ontario out of its economic morass than the private and public sectors working together co-operatively with strong leadership and a sense of direction from the Ontario government.

The Treasurer has provided an outrageous rationale to justify his government's accept-

ing a level of permanent unemployment which can only be described as intolerable.

Mr. Wildman: Shame.

Mr. Cassidy: McKeough is playing R. B. Bennett and Herbert Hoover wrapped into one—

Mr. Samis: Quite a combination.

An hon. member: I wish he'd said Calvin Coolidge.

Mr. Cassidy: —except that he outdoes them both in the bravado and in the bluster with which he defends the indefensible.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Better get the jeans back on, Mike.

Mr. Makarchuk: Darcyville.

Mr. Cassidy: We suspect that it's the Treasurer's ideology that has compelled him to make tax proposals that are entirely inappropriate to our needs in 1977. The facts and figures with which he defends his position are a compendium of misrepresentation and an abuse of the facts for political purposes.

Finally, we had been led to expect serious new proposals and ideas for the long-term health and development of Ontario's economy. Instead, we were treated to an analysis that was so brief and superficial that it wouldn't even pass a first-year economics test, and to a demonstration of hand-wringing in the direction of the federal government, of business and of labour that does Ontario neither credit nor good.

The Conservative government's reputation for being able to manage Ontario has been growing increasingly thin, and now it is threadbare. The emperor—or should I say the Duke of Kent—has no clothes.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Better get the jeans back on, Mike.

Mr. Breithaupt: But you have?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I have.

Mr. Bain: You have them.

Mr. Cassidy: The distortions and misrepresentations in this budget all favour a government facing re-election. They are so glaring that I feel I have to deal with them, even though I also want to talk very seriously about what we feel should be done for Ontario, both in 1977 and over the next decade.

The Treasurer is no plumber, but he is a public relations man doing his best to cover up the mismanagement of the economy by his government over the last five or six years. We can only conclude that this is the political budget for 1977 and that the real budget has been held back on the presumption that the Tories will be back in power when the election is over. Then the real medicine would come.

Mr. Philip: The one that implements Blair.

Mr. Cassidy: In his budget, the Treasurer states, and I quote: "I think there is every reason to be optimistic about the outlook for 1977." The recent federal budget, he adds, and I quote, "builds in considerable fiscal stimulation." His opinion is shared by almost no one; his facts are definitely misleading, and the figures he uses in this document are just plain wrong. Consider the following: The most basic assumption on which this budget is based is that Ontario will have real growth of 4.7 per cent in 1977. This estimate just is not credible. The most recent Conference Board estimate for Ontario is for real growth of just under three per cent, compared to the estimate of the Treasurer of 4.7 per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They are revised to three per cent, if you want to be accurate.

Mr. Cassidy: The recent federal budget forecast growth of four per cent for Canada as a whole. While the Treasurer's election crystal ball tells him there will be almost no slowing down in growth this year from the forecasts of last fall, virtually every major forecaster in the country—and I've been consulting them—has been cutting back his forecasts of growth for 1977 from what he anticipated last December.

Take the highly respected forecast of Judith Maxwell of the C. D. Howe Research Institute, for example. She says, and I quote: "The combination of restraint in monetary and fiscal policy and of controls on wages and profits has dampened the economic recovery, with the result that production has been losing momentum since the spring of 1976, unemployment has been rising, productivity growth has been sluggish, and corporate profits have been stagnating.

"If investors and consumers were confident that good days were ahead, the potential would exist for a more robust economic expansion. However, confidence was at a low ebb in 1977, reflecting the fact that the economy had been losing momentum, and the impact of longer-range structural problems faced by many industries. This has put a

damper on corporate investment and has curbed consumer spending, both on ordinary items and on new housing."

That's no socialist, wild-eyed radical. That's the C. D. Howe Research Institute's considered opinion of what's happening, and it differs a great deal from what the Treasurer has to say.

The Ontario Economic Council is equally pessimistic. The outlook is for real growth of four per cent or less, it says, and unemployment will grow to a peak of seven and a half per cent and stay near that level until the early 1980s.

Next, consider that fiscal stimulus from the federal budget, which is the Treasurer's chief rationale for not taking stimulative actions at the provincial level in Ontario. To put it bluntly, two-thirds of the so-called stimulus cited by the Treasurer is phoney, but has been brought into the accounts to make the overall picture look good.

Specifically, the continuation of the federal investment tax credit provides no new stimulus for Ontario's economy, because it was there last year. The federal indexing scheme is a way of keeping taxes from rising, but it does not represent any overall cut as put forward by the Treasurer. What the Treasurer has called a reduction in unemployment insurance premiums is in fact a decision not to increase contribution rates. The choice of a word like that is itself a manipulation for political purposes.

Finally, the Treasurer would have us believe that the $500 million in federal tax refunds is a new stimulus for Ontario's economy when it's no different from the refunds that were paid last year, the year before, or five years before that. That's really grasping at straws.

One should add that when the Treasurer is counting Ontario's own tax changes he correctly adds up about $210 million of tax increases, but that $80 million of his so-called tax reduction is in fact the continuation of the fast write-offs for business which existed last year. In net terms, that means what appears as a balance between tax cuts and tax increases in this year's budget is in fact an $80 million tax increase borne by small taxpayers. Another misrepresentation.

The revenue side of this year's budget is unrealistically optimistic. The Treasurer now estimates his 1977 revenues at $12.6 billion. That's half a billion dollars more than his official estimate last fall, even though his actual receipts during the past six months have been recalculated to $300 million below forecasts. Why the optimism? His forecast growth rate on revenues has almost doubled from 7.7 per cent anticipated last fall to 13 per cent today, despite the increasing signs of stagnation in the economy. That kind of forecast has an election smell.

Certain tax fields have been particularly inflated for reasons that we can only assume are political. For the third year in a row—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: For heaven's sake, political?

Mr. Cassidy: —that's true—mining tax revenue has been overestimated by about $50 million. After we adjust for tax concessions the government is expecting a 24 per cent increase in corporations tax revenues on a forecast increase of profits of only 6.3 per cent—and that's unrealistic.

Taken together, the mining and the capital and corporations tax may be overestimated by as much as $250 million in revenue. We strongly suspect that sales tax and income tax revenues have also been overestimated because of the rose-coloured economic forecast that the Treasurer used. Apart from blind faith, we could get no convincing rationale from ministry officials for such big revenue increase forecasts.

[3:30]

Obviously the political justification for juggling revenue figures is so that the Treasurer's press release could forecast a budget deficit of less than $1 billion. That was the game last year—but then the Treasurer came in $300 million off target. We anticipate that the final deficit this year will be even further off target than in 1976-77, and will in fact exceed $1.4 billion.

The Treasurer has so grossly distorted the real budget picture for 1977 that he has also destroyed the credibility of his stated goal of moving toward a balanced budget within three years. We know the government wants a balanced budget to be an election issue in hopes of diverting the public's attention from the record-breaking deficits that have marked the Davis government's regime and have raised Ontario's total liabilities by $8 billion between 1971 and today.

I, therefore, want to put on the record the fact that the public are being misled if they believe the Treasurer is committed to balancing Ontario's budget by 1980, and that is largely due to the distortion by the Treasurer and his people. The very first line of the 1977 budget press release says, and I quote: "A five-year plan designed to balance the Ontario budget was revealed by the Treasurer." Quite naturally, a number of the press

wrote their stories accordingly. The Treasurer's own budget statement, however, was much more coy. "Our objective," he said, "is to have the capacity to balance the Ontario budget by 1980-81." No commitment; just to have the capacity.

If we are prepared to bring the Ontario economy grinding to a halt completely, this government has the capacity to balance its budget today. Any government has that capacity at virtually any time. If we examine it closely, the centrepiece of Ontario's fiscal strategy in the budget may not be a promise at all, certainly lacks credibility, and relates far more to the Conservative Party's political needs than to the economic needs of the province. I am not alone in questioning the government's rosy forecast. The Ontario Economic Council again estimates Ontario's net cash requirements could reach $4 billion by 1981, and its estimate is based on lower expenditure increases than those that we have seen since 1971.

When it comes to the municipal taxpayers, I am not sure whether to call the Treasurer's actions misrepresentation or downright fraud. What is clear is that the municipalities are being shortchanged on the Edmonton commitment by between $50 million and $108 million, depending on how we count, because the Treasurer has refused to recalculate municipal grants under that commitment to take into account his projected higher rate of revenue increase for 1977-78.

The consequence of that piece of fiscal hocus-pocus will be yet another municipal property tax increase, and one that is as severe and as damaging as in 1976. I shall come later to the misrepresentations that underlie the atrocious decision of the Treasurer and the Ontario government to raise the full employment target for Ontario and to tolerate more than 200,000 workers being permanently unemployed.

What I want to turn to now is central to the ability of the Conservative Party to govern, because there is ample evidence of mismanagement of Ontario's economy, both by the Treasurer and by his colleagues. It isn't just misrepresentation, it is mismanagement as well. Consider the rosy forecasts that were made last year. A good year, the Treasurer said in his budget last April. He promised us 116,000 new jobs. In fact the labour force grew by less than he had expected, yet despite that, between March 1976 and March of this year the Ontario economy, under the shaky direction of the Treasurer, produced only 29,000 new jobs and added 49,000 additional workers to the permanent army of the unemployed.

That is real performance. It is a wretched start on the task that is now facing us all in Ontario, which is to create a million new jobs in this province, under conditions that are greatly changed from the booming 1960s, over the next 10 years. I don't think the Conservative Party is any longer up to that challenge.

No matter how one looks at it, Ontario has been sliding back under the Tories. Back in 1971, when the member for Chatham-Kent first became Treasurer, the unemployment rate was 5.2 per cent. Today, it is nudging eight per cent. The Treasurer has been one of the chief architects of the public sector growth in Ontario, of which he is now the chief critic. In fact, Ontario's government expenditures have risen from 11 per cent of gross provincial product a decade ago to 16 per cent of the present budget. Our net debt in Ontario has risen from 30 per cent of budgetary revenue when the present Treasurer first became Treasurer to 54 per cent today, or from four to eight per cent of gross provincial product. We are not in the bankruptcy court yet but it is a headlong slide and it's a sign of the cynical and almost irresponsible way with which the Conservatives approach Ontario's finances.

Consider now just how differently the Treasurer reacted to the slowdown of Ontario's economy in 1975 and to the slowdown we are experiencing today. The economic picture in Ontario in both years looked remarkably similar. Inflation was worse two years ago and unemployment was lower. Nevertheless, the government undertook a major programme of independent fiscal action to get the Ontario economy moving. If stimulation was justified in 1975, then it is clearly justified today.

I searched the indicators to find out why the government moved so readily two years ago and so reluctantly today. The only variable that explains their actions is the fact that in February 1975 the Progressive Conservatives were 12 per cent behind the official opposition in the Gallup poll, whereas in February 1977 they were 15 per cent ahead and didn't feel they had to try to manipulate the electorate in order to gain re-election. I think it is a measure of the Treasurer's cynicism that the chief factor that guides the government's fiscal policy is not the state of our economy in Ontario but the Conservative Party's standings in the Gallup poll.

Let's look at some other indicators. When one mismanages an economy as badly as Ontario's is being mismanaged, everybody loses. Our gross provincial product could be $3.5 billion higher and Ontario's fiscal deficit could be $500 million lower if Ontario's unemployed workers were back on the job. The mismanagement of housing policy in Ontario has given our major cities some of the highest house prices on the continent. That has held back consumer spending that could have stimulated other areas of the economy.

Whether one looks at inflation, at growth, at unemployment or at the equitable distribution of incomes, we are failing abysmally in Ontario by the standards of sound economic management which have been accepted in this country ever since World War II. This province, which is in Canada's manufacturing heartland, is running a $5-billion deficit in its manufacturing trade with the rest of the world. We are contributing substantially to Canada's balance of payment difficulties through Ontario Hydro's continued heavy borrowing abroad.

Western industrial nations are all having economic difficulties. But Ontario has enormous natural advantages, which means it should be able to do better than most jurisdictions in our present difficult times and not tag along at the rear. Running the economy of this province demands imagination and verve and also calls for a lot of careful rethinking about the ways we have been doing things, both in the private and in the public sectors. A sound manager would have embarked on this process of rethinking, but this government has lost touch with Ontario and the only direction it is willing to give to the economy is to abdicate its responsibilities and leave everything up to the corporate sector.

Let me give two final examples of mismanagement. First is the Treasurer's irresistible urge to take Ontario's sales tax off the machinery and equipment sector. He did it in 1971-72 and he did it again in 1975. Last November he extended the rebate indefinitely, repeatedly insisting that this was the only way to create jobs and get the economy back on the track.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just to correct the error, I didn't do that in 1971-72.

Mr. Cassidy: The five per cent investment tax credit in 1971 was equivalent to taking the sales tax off machinery.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They were two entirely different things.

Mr. Cassidy: Exactly the same.

Mr. Lewis: Exactly the same.

Mr. Cassidy: By now I think the record is pretty clear.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. Cassidy: Machinery investment rises in Ontario in response to demand and to a growing economy, as it did in 1973-74. It does not respond to artificial stimulus when the demand is not there. The 2.4 per cent increase in machinery investment this past year is surely evidence of that. Not one scintilla of evidence has been put forward to prove the machinery tax rebate has created a job. There is no indication that this misplaced incentive will do any better in 1977. In fact, we have asked in the House and I have asked the minister's officials whether they can prove any jobs were created from machinery tax credit. The answer consistently is, "We don't know. We aren't even asking the question."

Mr. Wildman: Blind faith.

Mr. Cassidy: Industry is now using only 81 per cent of its capacity, so there's no incentive to invest. What machinery is being installed may well be eliminating more jobs than it creates. Only two industrial sectors, clothing and cars, are currently working at above 86 per cent of capacity. So there is enormous scope for increased production if it is stimulated by consumer demand. The idea that this tax rebate is an ineffective incentive isn't just some sort of socialist fantasy. The Treasurer says as much in budget paper A, which says that the high unemployment in 1973 and 1974 was not the result of too little capital investment.

The Ontario Economic Council, which I quote with pleasure because I think it has done a good job on its papers this year—

Mr. Wildman: Being subversive.

Mr. Cassidy: —has just warned that tax incentive policies designed to encourage investment have a reduced impact because of the extent of the operations of subsidiaries of United States firms. In other words, in a time of economic slack, Ontario's $160-million handout in 1977 may well wind up as new plants and equipment in Michigan, Ohio or California. Now that's as counterproductive as any policy can get.

The C. D. Howe Research Institute has also been warning that in times like these further tax concessions to industry are likely to be quite ineffective. Is this a sound way to manage the economy? All the evidence says it is not.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not quite all.

Mr. Cassidy: When the Treasurer produces it, we'll look at it with interest.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not quite all.

Mr. Cassidy: The final example, I cite more in sorrow than in anger. It is 10 years since the Smith commission called for the reform of Ontario's property tax system, based on market value assessment. That reform has moved from delay to delay, from excuse to excuse, from one minister to another, to the point where what original value may have lain in the proposal has been almost completely frittered away.

Things seemed to be moving a year ago in the budget, when the Treasurer set up the Blair commission to recommend the best means of easing the transition to the new form of assessment.

Mr. Riddell: Before they even had the data.

Mr. Cassidy: But now the Blair report is out, the Treasurer's silence about the property tax reform in his pre-election budget is deafening. That silence contrasts with the lyrical speeches on property tax reform and market value assessment that were being made both by the Treasurer and by the then Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) up until last fall.

The mismanagement of property tax reform these 10 years is the mark of a government that has lost its grip. A lot of people, moreover, are now being hurt by the government's delay. Many of them are tenants and home owners who are being over-taxed because of the injustices of the present assessment system. Their numbers are swelled, however, by the small businessmen, by the homeowners on modest incomes and by the supporters of charitable organizations and Catholic schools for whom homes, businesses and vital community institutions are threatened by the injustice of the Treasurer's proposals as validated by the Blair commission.

The New Democratic Party has made its position on the major issues around property tax reform very clear. We should like the government to make its position equally clear before the election, rather than delaying a difficult decision in hopes it will be returned to power and then can take the action.

People talk frequently in this House about the waste of a government that pours millions into a Minaki Lodge and hundreds of millions dollars into ill-conceived land assembly at Pickering and Haldimand-Norfolk. I want to talk now about another form of waste—the waste in human terms that results from this government's mismanagement of the economy, and that means the waste, the tragic waste of Ontario's unemployed.

This winter the unemployment rate was 10 per cent in Windsor and in the Simcoe-Georgian Bay region. It exceeded nine per cent in St. Catharines-Niagara, in the Ottawa Valley, in the Peterborough-Lake Ontario region, in the southwest and in the northeast, and it averaged eight per cent across the province. One worker in every 12 was out of a job and, when you come to teenage workers —fresh entrants into the work force—one in every five was unemployed. That is tragic and that, in our terms, is unacceptable. When the number of job vacancies is less than one-half of one per cent of the labour market, you can see that unemployment in Ontario is a social and economic problem and not the fault of the people out on the street.

In addition to the 312,000 people who in March were counted as unemployed, there were another 149,000 who had recently lost their jobs or were laid off but who didn't count in the labour force survey because they had given up looking for work. The survey doesn't count people in remote locations, it doesn't count Treaty Indians, and it doesn't count the 50,00 people who in March were working in part-time jobs because they couldn't find full-time employment.

Mr. Wildman: It never counts Treaty Indians.

Mr. Cassidy: Even if you count only the 149,000 who had just lost their jobs, rather than ignoring the hidden unemployment that exists in Ontario, then Ontario is running its economy with a rate of 11.3 per cent unemployed. In other words, one worker in every nine can't find a job.

[3:45]

Moreover, these hidden unemployed aren't just some concoction created by Ed Broadbent or myself. The official unemployment insurance statistics show 40,000 more people are collecting benefits than are counted as unemployed; and the UIC totals don't include young workers who've never become eligible for benefits or a substantial number

of workers who, for personal reasons, or who, through ignorance, don't try to collect unemployment insurance, or who are not eligible.

The situation that exists is tragic and unacceptable to everyone except to the Treasurer, to his minions and to his party. Their response is worthy of Marie Antoinette. Instead of taking meaningful action to curb unemployment, the Treasurer has chosen to try to define it away. I can't tell the House how deeply disturbed my colleagues and I were to encounter this self-serving economic sophistry of budget paper A on unemployment, or to hear the Treasurer assert, and I quote: "The full employment target for Ontario appropriate for the 1970s is 5.3 per cent, up from three per cent some years ago."

Now that the budget has been published, the Treasurer knows his redefinition of unemployment is a political error of major proportions and it could even cost his party the election. He is trying to wiggle around his commitment to keep unemployment high by saying the figure might be tinkered with a little. It's all rubbish and it makes my heart break.

What Ontario's Treasurer is saying is that in order to keep the Ontario economy from overheating, it is necessary to maintain a permanent army of more than 200,000 men and women in Ontario perpetually unemployed. Moreover, his lamentable record of meeting targets in the past suggests the number of unemployed will be even higher. I say that is shocking and unacceptable.

Mr. Lewis: But typical.

Mr. Cassidy: We would never tolerate such a target if we were the government of this province. No other government, no other jurisdiction in the western world, would dare to set 5.3 per cent unemployment as a desirable economic goal.

The argument presented in the budget paper is that structural changes in the economy are combining to increase the rate of unemployment that prevails when the economy is at its maximum capacity. We've gone to some lengths in order to try to discern the meaning in a paper which is notably devoid of it. The paper argues that increases in the labour force have been concentrated in groups with traditionally higher rates of unemployment—namely, an influx of women and young people—and that their unemployment is less serious than the unemployment of prime-aged males. What's really happening, of course, it that the economy is no longer expanding as solidly as it did in the 1960s. Therefore, it is no longer succeeding in absorbing these new entrants into the work force.

Unemployment for women is not traditionally higher than for prime-aged males, and it is a misrepresentation to claim it has been. In fact, the unemployment rate for women has averaged one per cent below that of men consistently in Ontario over the past two decades. That's true whether you take prime-aged women or whether you take women of all ages. Women's unemployment exceeded that of men for the first time in 1974 only as a direct consequence of the slowdown in the economy. To say their rate of unemployment is traditionally higher is another self-serving representation.

I see the Treasurer is looking troubled. He's trying to loosen his tie. The statistics come from Ontario Statistics 1976, a very commendable book published by his ministry.

As far as young workers are concerned, they were 24 per cent of the labour force in 1972 when this government accepted the three per cent full-employment target—24 per cent at that time. Today, five years later, young workers have risen to 25 per cent of the labour force, an almost insignificant change over half a decade. Again, therefore, the only difference is the slowdown in the economy. During the 1960s, the proportion of young workers in the economy expanded dramatically but they were absorbed, and that's not happening today.

The Treasurer and his staff are misrepresenting the facts to try to prove a point that gets them off the hook for failing to create jobs. What's particularly offensive about this section of the budget paper is that it classes every woman worker as a member of the secondary labour force. This is a sexist notion, as sexist a notion as we have heard from government in this Legislature in a long, long time. It is an obvious prelude to deliberate discrimination in government economic policies between the so-called primary and secondary members of the labour force, in which the government intends to relax its efforts at job creation once it has achieved what it considers a satisfactory employment rate among prime-aged males.

I might say the degree of resentment at this second-class status to which the Treasurer relegates them is enormous and quite justified among the women workers with whom I have talked. I fail to understand how women can be put in the back seat, when at least one-third of Ontario's female work force is made up of women who are single or who are heads of families, and when most working women

work out of necessity in order to balance the family budget.

The second major reason for changing the full-employment target is, and I quote: "The worker preference changes induced by revisions to The Unemployment Insurance Act in 1971 and 1972." I have read this material again and again and I cannot find where the budget paper even says specifically that the UIC system is the cause of increased voluntary unemployment. When there are only 12,000 vacancies, it's pretty hard to argue that 312,000 unemployed people are sitting around being choosy.

The Treasurer is being insulting when he indicates he believes a lot of people are on the Ontario labour force only to take advantage of unemployment insurance benefits. If he's been listening, in fact, he could have learned as long ago as 1974 that the Ontario Ministry of Labour had determined that, and I quote; "A tax on the unemployment insurance system served mainly to divert attention away from more fundamental manpower concerns"—an opinion with which we associate ourselves—and, from the same source, that far more important than unemployment insurance in explaining the difficulties of matching workers to jobs during the 1973-74 boom was, and I quote: "the lack of training and on-the-job experience during 1971-73, regional and sectorial shifts in labour demand, and a failure to learn how to adequately utilize women, youth and various minorities."

The report went on to say that one of the main causes of the present situation was the reluctance of employers and social planners to treat labour as a resource to be developed and planned for over the long-term horizon, rather than to treat it as if it flowed from a tap. Alas, our Treasurer prefers not to be confused by the facts.

We understand why the Treasurer has resorted to this sophistry, because his statistical redefinition of unemployment is 30 times as effective in reducing concern for the unemployed in his terms than are his programmes for creating full-time jobs. The 3,600 jobs that have been promised in construction and in work with old people represent barely one per cent of the number of unemployed in Ontario at this time and one-tenth of one per cent of the total labour force. The problem of the 138,000 young people who are not students and who are unemployed has been almost totally ignored because the Ontario Youth Employment Programme and the wage subsidy to private employers is timed to be of use almost inclusively for students seeking summer jobs.

To support his redefinition of unemployment, the Treasurer has cited the Economic Council of Canada and the US Council of Economic Advisers along with the Bank of Canada. What he fails to recognize is that first, as an industrial province, Ontario should have a lower target for full employment than Canada as a whole and, second, that it is the task of government in co-operation with the private sector to find means of improving the skills, mobility and adaptability of the work force and to identify and eliminate other bottlenecks in the economy so that the potential growth rate of the economy can be improved, not worsened, and so that we can safely run the economy as close as possible to 100 per cent employment.

Once the Treasurer's people decided to say, in error, that the rate of unemployment among women was traditionally higher than men, all the figures and conclusions of this budget paper came into question.

Mr. Wildman: All wrong.

Mr. Cassidy: Frankly, I prefer the compassionate positions that were once advanced by the government, and I quote John White in 1973, "Any unemployment figure in excess of three per cent is unacceptable to this government." We'll go along with that.

I quote again: "Low income workers, young people and students and older employees have been particularly hard hit by unemployment. The real cost of unemployment to these people has been enormous, not just in terms of lost incomes, but also in terms of human dignity and family security. In addition, there's been a heavy cost to the community at large in lost output and weakened confidence." We associate ourselves with that remark as well. It was made by the present Treasurer in his 1971 budget when the unemployment rate was running at 5.2 per cent. The tragic consequences of unemployment which he acknowledged to exist then exist again today, but this government no longer cares enough even to try to get people back to work and to get the Ontario economy moving.

Mr. MacDonald: That's a more relevant quote.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to turn for one minute, and one minute only, to the announcement by the Liberal Party and by its leader that his party intends to support this budget. I do so because of the very harsh words he had to say about the government's record on unemployment during his response in

the Throne debate. The least I can do is to read those remarks into the record:

"Mr. S. Smith: In my own constituency office I have people with all levels of education—grade nine, grade 13, MAs, PhDs—unable to find work. The bitterness, the hopelessness, the frustration which these people indicate to me is something which is simply intolerable.

"I get the feeling that we have broken faith with our young people. We push them through high school and nurse them through various educational opportunities and then we dump them on the labour market to rot like so many surplus vegetables. This a time when they should be achieving a measure of independence and one in five of our workers under 20 cannot find a job.

"We cannot abandon them. The Treasurer, in his budget, must offer hope and jobs to counteract the despair, the fear and the disillusionment of 143,000 jobless young people."

He found it intolerable three weeks ago, but now the Liberal Party in Ontario finds this budget, this heartless budget, so tolerable that it intends to support the government on a motion of confidence. I simply cannot understand how a party leader with that attitude can support a government which is so demonstratively incompetent at resolving our problem of unemployment.

Mr. Roy: We want to keep the government going so they'll bring on solutions.

Mr. Lewis: You want to keep them going on forever, never mind solutions.

Mr. Cassidy: When there are no solutions there's no use in keeping the government going.

Mr. Wildman: You make up your policy decisions on a trampoline, while flipping over and over.

Mr. Roy: Now that the member for Ottawa Centre has a pin-striped suit he shouldn't be irresponsible.

Mr. Nixon: I think the word is that we want jobs not elections.

Mr. MacDonald: You know you're going to get one.

Mr. Cassidy: Let me now turn to the Treasurer's proposals, specifically for job creation. Both the promises which were made in the Throne Speech about job creation and the promise that was made in the budget a year ago, that Ontario would take appropriate action if the economy began to run off the rails, are simply not matched by action.

For the labour force generally, the Treasurer is promising to create about 3,000 full-time jobs, or about one-tenth of one per cent of Ontario's labour force. For students, he promised about 4,000 more jobs on the government's summer employment programme; plus something less than 20,000 summer jobs in the private sector which will be subsidized by $1 an hour. We suspect that many of these so-called new jobs will be last year's jobs, only cheaper for the employers.

What really counts, however, is that next to nothing is being done for the 138,000 workers under 25 who were out of work at the time the budget was delivered. I know that the students are having a hard time finding work because of the economic situation, but I think Ontario's priorities are misplaced when attention to young workers is almost totally confined to students. It seems the main reason the Treasurer chose this route was the political reason that summer jobs are easier to create than year-round jobs and the public relations impact is more visible if you're going into an election. We are concerned that the burden of unemployment is falling so heavily on young workers who are being permanently excluded from the work force as members of "Darcy's army of the unemployed."

I therefore want today to propose the creation of an Ontario youth careers programme to provide work experience and career-entry types of positions for workers in their late teens and early 20s. These jobs should be for up to one year. They should provide for significant work experience in job training, and the bulk of them should be in the private and non-profit sector. We believe private employers should bear some of the costs for this programme and that the youth careers programme should be as substantial as possible. I shall come in a few minutes to the magnitude which we think is feasible in this year's budget for such a youth careers programme.

Mr. Lewis: Kind of a Pied Piper of the unemployed.

Mr. Cassidy: We're facing two challenges in our economy: What do we do in 1977 and what are we going to do for the next 10 years?

I want to join issue with the Treasurer on the long-term questions first, because I think his response to what is happening in Ontario have been so completely inadequate.

The changes that are forecast in our industrial structure over the next few years are frightening. According to the Ontario Economic Council, employment in goods-producing industries in Ontario will shrink from 36 per cent of our labour force this year to 28 per cent in 1987, a mere decade away, if current trends continue.

To put it another way, that means there will be almost no increase in the 1.4 million jobs that now exist in the resource industries, in manufacturing and construction; and in fact there will be a natural decline in manufacturing. If the economy expands by one million workers over the next decade—and that's the forecast—the council says that all of these jobs will have to be found in the service industries and many of them in the government sector.

[4:00]

We in the NDP believe it is not good enough to simply sit back and accept further weakening of an industrial sector which is already both incomplete and vulnerable. We believe that to sit idly by while the work force in manufacturing actually declines would be to irreparably damage our future as a prosperous industrial province. Ontario would go into the next century with nothing ahead but a few more decades of resources to exploit.

The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has talked about industrial strategy on many occasions and he let it be known he would have important things to say in this budget. That's another reason we find the budget so profoundly disappointing. All the bold words of the past about Ontario industry have given way to a pageful of prattle which does little more than call on the federal government for action.

Imagine saying, for action, that, and I quote, "we badly need a national policy of income and price stabilization," when this government just last fall deliberately decided not to undertake a farm income stabilization plan which was both adequate for farmers' needs and had the full support of the farm community. Imagine calling for, and I quote, "a national policy with some vision of the economic future," when what we need is provincial policy with some vision of the economic future.

Imagine worrying about the economy becoming too capital intensive and talking about resisting subsidization and feather-bedding when this government indiscriminately hands out $160 million for investment, with no indication where it should go and no attempt to channel resources to the areas of strength in the economy.

I grant that the Treasurer had a few other words to say. He never ceases to utter his hymns to profits. When the Treasurer isn't castigating the federal government for doing not enough to develop industry, he is castigating business. Last June he told them that not only should they invest more and get out and boost exports, but that, and I quote, "with just a little more social awareness in your decision-making," they alone could resolve the problem of the inequities between rich and poor regions of the country. That's rubbish too, Mr. Speaker.

The Treasurer demeans himself by turning into a naive cheerleader for business when he should be seeking to provide leadership in very difficult times, and he demeans Ontario by constantly trying to shift the blame to labour, to the private sector, to federal government, to foreign competition or to some other bogyman. He strains credibility by saying that everybody is to blame for any problem except the provincial government.

On behalf of the government, the Treasurer says he thinks we should work now to rationalize—

Mr. Bullbrook: You can't take issue with his statement. He just asks for some social awareness on their part.

Mr. Cassidy: Well we might have some social awareness on the part of the government as well.

Mr. Bullbrook: What's wrong with that? I am glad he asked.

Mr. Cassidy: On behalf of the government, the Treasurer thinks we should work now to rationalize and concentrate around the best industries in Ontario. That's fine, but I search in vain to find how he intends to achieve that goal. He wants us to do what we can do best, but he gives no indication in what fields the government thinks Ontario should specialize.

He wants a reappraisal of foreign investment policies to permit what he calls beneficial capital inflows, but he spends too little time worrying about how we can build up strength domestically. Even the Canadian Manufacturers' Association now estimates that since August 1976 Canada has lost 178,000 jobs in the manufacturing sector. That's serious, but the response we have had so far from the Ontario government can only be described as superficial.

I want to deal now with a number of specific areas and make some specific suggestions which we believe could have been launched as part of this year's budget, and as the first steps in reorganizing Ontario's industry and economy to meet the challenges of the 1980s.

First, our overall industrial situation. We are constantly being exhorted to get out and sell on foreign markets. However, there is an increased parochialism about the world which reminds one uncomfortably of the great depression. As part of their economic strategy, many countries, and not just Ontario, are gearing up in order to create more jobs through manufacturing exports. That puts some limit on the opportunities for Ontario, since we are part of the relatively high-cost North American economy.

There is one foreign market, however, in which Ontario industry has an enormous natural advantage if we started to work hard at it. I mean, of course, the market that is now filled by imports into Ontario from foreign countries. Our imports of finished goods are worth $5 billion more than our exports, and if we include finished materials and certain foods that compete with Canadian products, there is a market within Ontario of close to $20 billion which Ontario industry and the government should take a real crack at.

We've had foreign trade crusades in the past; it might be time to have one for ourselves, both to identify products that could be made economically in Ontario and also to let Ontario consumers know how much of the dollar value of goods they buy was made in Canada. We would consider providing means to inform consumers at the point of sale of the Canadian content of goods that are offered, so that they do not wind up buying foreign products out of ignorance, where price and quality are comparable with imports.

An example of what I mean by the inadequacy of the Treasurer's approach for Ontario's future is Ontario's involvement with the automobile industry. I have to say that this is a very sad saga indeed. One in every nine jobs—or one in every six by the Treasurer's count last year—depends on the automobile industry in this province. Ontario ranks in importance with major automobile producing jurisdictions like Michigan, Ohio and California.

Last year the Treasurer spoke with great concern in his budget about the need to revitalize the automobile industry. "We can't be complacent," he said. "We must take positive action." Specifically, he called for measures to increase productivity, to give Canada a larger share of value added in motor vehicle assembly, to reduce the parts deficit and to provide for a regular review of the auto pact.

What disturbs my party is that there has been absolutely no follow-through on the very serious concerns which were raised in the budget last year about the future of Ontario's automobile industry, even though there is now more cause for concern than there was in 1976.

President Carter's energy statement last week indicates that the US government will be pressing very hard on the industry to develop a whole new generation of automobiles, based on new lightweight materials and production techniques in order to ensure better fuel economy. It is precisely in new technological development that Canada's automobile parts industry has tended to do worst. Last year, our car assembly industry bounced back from the very bad year we had in 1975 when the US car market was soft; our trade deficit in parts went from $1.9 billion in 1974 to just under $2.5 billion in 1975, and it got no better from that very serious deficit in 1976. The initial signs this year are that things are going even worse.

Back in the early years of the auto pact, Canada had very much more than its normal share of investment in the North American car industry. Its share is around 10 per cent, our investment was running much higher. Now we are running far below that 10 per cent share. With an industry that has reached market saturation, and with some turning away from car purchases because of crowded cities, because of high energy costs, because of changing social values—maybe because of Jimmy Carter—there is no sign that we will recover that position through economic reasons alone; yet that has been the naive supposition of the Ontario government.

When you have an industry as closely linked to government as automobiles, however, when you have an industry which is totally American-owned and when you have several states which depend even more heavily on automobiles for their economic prosperity than does Ontario, then the failure of the Ontario government to do more than to exhort Ottawa for action on the auto industry takes on serious proportions. When Michigan and Ohio, Illinois or California, Georgia or Massachusetts, are pressing Ford,

GM or Chrysler to locate facilities in their state, just where is the Ontario government? It isn't good enough to hope that the federal government will take action; it isn't good enough to maintain a small research unit on autos in the Treasury ministry, along with one or two junior analysts in the M nistry of Industry and Tourism, it isn't good enough for the Treasurer of this important province to make one speech on budget day about automobiles and then leave the subject alone for a year.

Yet that is precisely what happened. We have searched through the record and sought the help of the Treasurer's staff to find out what he has said since the bold initiative in the budget of April 1976. We embarked on this quest with some charity, since the Treasurer's riding of Chatham-Kent is an automobile parts town and since the industry actually feels that he has lobbied actively on their behalf. The record, alas, indicates no discernible pressure that Ontario has taken on behalf of this industry which is so important to our future and which is so seriously threatened.

Not once during 1976 did Darcy McKeough breathe a single word about the automobile industry in the Legislature once he had finished his budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You mean the provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Cassidy: I mean the provincial Treasurer. As best we can establish, the provincial Treasurer mentioned automobiles only twice in passing during the numerous speeches he made in the past year. The most voluminous reference was one page in a 30-page speech to the Conference Board last June.

We believe that part of Ontario's industrial strategy should be to work actively and publicly, using every means possible, in order to get a better break for Canada on its automobile trade. What is missing, in other words, is the political element and that is one of the major reasons we are losing automobile investments to the more aggressive state jurisdictions in the United States that are trying to keep those jobs at home.

The kind of intervention we talk about may include talking with senior executives of major automobile manufacturers. It may include going cap in hand, if it has to be, to Detroit and Washington. It will certainly include sitting down with the automobile parts industry to develop a strong joint plan to restore health to an industry which is now seriously endangered.

It isn't good enough for Ontario to abdicate in this vital field of industrial strategy and to expect the federal government to carry the burden on its own. With 90 per cent of the Canadian industry within its borders, Ontario must act at the political level to counteract the very strong political pressures which are now being brought within the US to bring production and jobs back home at the expense of the industry in this province. What goes for automobiles is true for the rest of the manufacturing industry in this province as well.

To put it in plain terms, the Conservative government of Ontario has actually abdicated its responsibility to nurture Ontario's manufacturing base. It mouths slogans about making room for free enterprise while its actions indicate it is prepared to tolerate a devastating shrinkage of Ontario's manufacturing sector over the next 10 years. I find it ironic when the Treasurer says in his budget: "We need a national policy with some vision of the economic future to help us see where we should be going."

For God's sake, we need a provincial policy with some vision of the economic future to help us see where we should be going. I don't disagree with the Treasurer's call for national policies in areas like automobiles, steel and industrial rationalization. What I deplore, however, is the total lack of comparable policies at the provincial level. The Treasurer rejects higher tariffs and industrial subsidies, he's trying to back away from government spending; but then he has nothing else to offer, his policies are bankrupt.

Mr. Warner: He should resign immediately.

Mr. Cassidy: Two years ago, the Ministry of Industry and Tourism did a detailed study of 13 major industrial sectors in this province in preparation for our submission to the federal government for the current international round of tariff negotiations. These sectoral studies provided clear indication of many industrial opportunities in Ontario which are being ignored or lost because of lack of leadership. Firm after firm, industry after industry indicated they wanted to work in closer co-operation with the government. Not surprisingly, all the sectors called out for higher profit margins; I don't know any businessman who wouldn't ask for that.

None of the reports, however, asked the government for more and better capital subsidies; nor do they ask for faster write-offs, nor do they ask for increased depreciation

allowances. Instead, the themes that come through clearly are the following:

First, domestic research and development is in desperate straits and must be encouraged, both by persuasion and by direct government co-operation.

Second, most of our industries are dominated by small and medium-sized firms which need better management expertise and access to better trained personnel. This applies in particular to the firms which are Canadian owned.

Third, domestic markets are important. It's not enough to constantly harp on penetrating foreign markets, and a buy-Ontario policy is seen as being very important.

Fourth, our industrial base is being eroded by imports. While importers and wholesalers in the service sector may be doing well in the process, our productive sector is stagnating as a consequence of the degree of foreign penetration of the Ontario market.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do you want the Treasurer to put a tariff on it?

Mr. Cassidy: Once again I repeat, these are not socialist fantasies, these are hard-nosed opinions and judgements that are made by the business sector and are reported to the provincial Ministry of Industry and Tourism. These are problems that require not the Treasurer's shotgun approach but a concentrated assault on some of our structural problems. These sectoral studies indicate that we should be using this current period of high unemployment to train more skilled workers against the day when the economy moves closer to capacity, that we have a very serious need to train more Canadian managers and to provide many more counselling services to entrepreneurs.

[4:15]

The government should facilitate the development of consortia in order to encourage specialization in certain kinds of production. We should be devoting particular attention to industrial areas where we enjoy a resource base, such as agriculture and food processing, forests and furniture, mining and metal fabricating.

Hon. B. Stephenson: That's what the Treasurer was saying. I'll examine your ears for you.

Mr. Cassidy: In all these areas, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario government's policies are not just deficient—they are downright absent.

Since the Minister of Labour has come in, I point out to her that studies by her ministry indicate that the Treasurer's gratuitous comments about workers and unemployment insurance are simply not justified by the facts, and I thank her for that very excellent survey.

Mr. Lewis: It's interesting that the minister would let him get away with that sexist claptrap in that document; it really is, that she would tolerate that as Minister of Labour.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Who said I was tolerating it?

Mr. Cassidy: Even the members of the cabinet are shying away, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Conway: He has the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener) to worry about, Bette, leave him alone.

Mr. Moffatt: She's going to Oshawa.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I get annoyed at the gratuitous comments across there.

Mr. Lewis: Informed, knowledgeable, profound, but rarely gratuitous.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Always gratuitous, never informed.

Mr. Breithaupt: Always worth the price you pay for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since this is the budget debate, all members will have an opportunity, hopefully, to participate.

Mr. Bullbrook: Can you guarantee that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's not a guarantee, but if you'll allow the member for Ottawa Centre to have the floor we'll get on with the business.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

One of the areas on which the Treasurer harps almost incessantly is the need to restrain the public sector. In his view the only real productivity is in the private sector, that is his ideology—although if he therefore intends to disband the Ontario Northland Railway, Ontario Hydro, the Liquor Control Board, and radio station CJRT, I wish he'd let the public know before the election and not afterwards.

Mr. Lewis: Don't give him any ideas.

Mr. Cassidy: We take a more balanced view. We believe that activity by the public

sector should be used where appropriate and where it can be most effective. We suspect that in many cases the public sector has better means of determining priorities than the private sector, regardless of what sector can carry those things out.

We also believe, as the Treasurer and his party do not, that governments and the public sector have an important role in redistributing income in a more equitable manner than that determined by the market. If the Treasurer disagrees with that statement, then would he please announce the government's intentions as regards the continuation of the GAINS plan for senior citizens and the disabled before we enter the election and not afterwards.

The Ontario Economic Council's recent publication on public decision-making puts this matter in the kind of perspective which we believe is more appropriate than the Treasurer's diatribes. They warn that the statement that government spending has risen to 40 per cent of the gross national product must be interpreted with considerable care, because the big increase in the government's share of the economy has been in transfer payments to redistribute income, which now accounts for an estimated 17 per cent of GNP or getting on for half of the government sector in toto.

To back this up, the Ontario Economic Council calculates that the total number of government employees has risen from 10 per cent of the work force back in the prehistoric times of 1961 to about 12 per cent today. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that is hardly a stupendous increase in government involvement in our daily lives.

The Treasurer had talked a lot about productivity in recent months and it is an area which we recognize is vital. But his position seems to be that we cannot afford to do much about the current levels of unemployment because we cannot jeopardize our long-term competitive position. We therefore must help industry now in order, or in hope of helping people later.

This approach is so sterile it is sickening. There are strong indications that Ontario's corporate palliatives will be irrelevant or even counter-productive. While the Treasurer can find words to deny it, the talk of Ontario's weakening competitive position lends itself far too easily to coming down hard on labour while subsidizing capital so that business can improve its productivity and reduce the need for workers.

However, the research that has been done indicates that; first, differences in productivity between nations relate to a number of factors, and sometimes to the way that those factors are combined and not just to one factor such as labour; second, that capital is employed far more inefficiently than labour in Canada.

A recent federal study for the Industry, Trade and Commerce department establishes that although Ontario is close to the US norm for labour productivity—I think that's important, because it indicates we've got a very good chance of making our way if there were more confidence in the future of Ontario's economy—although Ontario is very close to the US norm, the average Canadian labour productivity is about 18 per cent below that of the United States. That's bad, but the average productivity of capital in Canada is about 46 per cent below that of the United States, and that is disastrous.

The study concludes that "for all major industry groups in Canadian manufacturing except tobacco, clothing, machinery, transportation equipment and electrical products, the output per dollar of capital is much lower than in the US. This is very significant and suggests the need for measures to improve the performance of this factor input in Canadian manufacturing"—capital and management. That's where our biggest weakness lies right now, and it is an important point.

The Canadian tax climate has fostered a rich undergrowth of fast write-offs, of investment credits, of sales tax rebates, of capital cost allowance, et cetera. But what appears to have resulted is a capital bias which has actually damaged that productivity performance and drains scarce capital resources away from new entrepreneurs as well as from necessary social expenditure by government. I would say that the classic example is the petroleum industry, with capital productivity which is 48 per cent below its American counterpart. Governments have given this industry a licence to pick the consumer's pocket indiscriminately, the most recent incident being the Treasurer's decision to make the Treasury and not the oil companies pay for the increased cost of driving in the north. That's shameful.

The federal study concludes: "If the Canadian economy uses capital just as ineffectively as it does labour, it is doubtful whether competitiveness will be increased by the substitution of the former, [that is, capital] for the latter [that is, labour]. "And yet that is precisely the drift or the direction of the Treasurer's policies. The Industry, Trade and Commerce study also suggests that there is significant room for productivity improvement within small establishments without going to

the scale of US plants. The difference in plant sizes, it says, only explains a small part of the difference in cost per unit between the two countries; and I would suggest, with the changing pattern of manufacturing, that may even be more so in the future.

What does all this mean? It means that the capital efficiency and the management of Canadian industry will have to be seriously challenged if we wish to stay competitive. I suspect it means that government should encourage much more in-plant training, both for management, for supervisors and for workers, so that they can stay abreast of developments in the field and adapt quickly to the latest techniques. Just as in the automobile industry, it means that the province of Ontario should intervene actively with branch-plant subsidiaries in this province to ensure that their share of the parent company's range of products can be efficiently made in Canada and that they have access to new technology developed within the industry or by the parent at the same rate as plants that are closer to head office. The problem of the diffusing of technological expertise is a very serious problem within the Ontario economy which government can and should act to correct.

The 1972 figures indicated that Ontario's position is not quite so bad on productivity as the Canadian average, because we are that much more productive than the Canadian average. On average, in fact, we matched the Americans for productivity in 1972 and we are still not far off five years later. When the investment per worker five years ago was $41,000, compared with $27,000 in the United States, there are clear signs that we are using our capital stock inefficiently.

Two other points come out of the federal study. First, about 40 per cent of our work force is in plants of less than 100 workers, compared with 25 per cent for the Americans. There are obviously problems with plants this size but there may also be benefits from the flexibility of the work force, the closeness of management to staff and the substantially smaller size of administrative overheads which are characteristic of these small operations.

Second, the scope for productivity improvement is certainly not only through building large, world-scale specialized plants, as the Treasurer seems to indicate. The detailed figures on productivity by industry sub-sector indicate there are enormous differences in productivity between United States and Ontario firms precisely in the small and medium-size industrial sector and that these are areas where enormous improvements could probably be made if the government began to co-operate seriously with our industry in Ontario.

To take but two examples—because I could spend a whole speech in this area—it is hard to understand why Canadian vegetable oil mills are more productive than in the US; confectionery manufacturers in Ontario are less productive than in the US; but biscuit manufacturers and bakeries in this province have half the value added per production worker than in the US. It's easy to see from that single example that there must be many areas where by looking at the problem in detail we can achieve enormous productivity improvements within the Ontario economy.

Now I want to turn to small business. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business called the Treasurer's budget "small and medium-sized crumbs for small and medium-sized business." We agree, and we believe it's time for the province of Ontario to make a full legislative commitment to the small-business sector. The increasing concentration of economic power, allied with government programmes directed to big business, is killing the independent-business sector. This means everything from the corner drug store threatened by a chain, and the independent retailer being shut down by an oil company, to firms that are established suppliers in the manufacturing sector.

The Davis government has abrogated its responsibility to small business, and we're beginning to feel that the NDP is its only hope.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is called wishful thinking.

Hon. B. Stephenson: That would sound the death-knell for independent business.

Mr. Lewis: Small business.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: What is interesting is that in a world where people are beginning to talk about small being beautiful, all the Treasurer can say is that large is terrific. We disagree categorically with that kind of stand; we believe that there are many opportunities to be provided in the private sector, if, perhaps, one could even restore to industry some of the values of a few years ago, values which have been lost in the rush to the monopoly sector by this government.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, McKeough and Sons isn't that big, is it?

Mr. Cassidy: The government's incentive of increasing the compensation for sales tax collections is a sham. It's a $200 increase which still makes small merchants the next thing to unpaid tax collectors. The change in the capital tax is a step forward, but it should be complemented by the creation of one form for small business which would serve to file for unemployment insurance, for sales tax, for Canada pension and for all the other onerous dealings with government.

The Treasurer takes credit in this budget for creating special venture investments in corporations, ignoring the fact that the proposal first came from John White in the 1974 Ontario budget. I think that was three years ago, as a matter of fact; and it will be another year or two before they get operating. After three years of Tory inaction on this proposal, do we take it seriously now?

If venture investment corporations do get going, will they help small business? I question it. The Treasurer is so blind about bigness and about his own deficit that his legislation will insist that the venture investment corporations have outstanding capital of at least $250,000, and be up to three times that amount by the end of their fourth year. There is still absolutely no legislative encouragement for half a dozen friends to put some money into a pot and to launch a new small business without the fuss and delays that will be entailed in the venture investment corporations. I think it's worth contrasting this government's reticence about small business with the newly-formed Alberta Opportunity Corporation, which has a deliberate bias towards small companies and small communities. It has located its head office in a small town and has succeeded so well that the commercial lenders are now following its lead into the small-business field. Why can't we do that in Ontario as well?

Many small businesses need professional management advice but they can only get it in Ontario by paying $20 a day under a federal programme; and the service is little known. The NDP government in Manitoba has got such a service and it works well.

Providing advice like this could prevent thousands of business failures every year; many small businesses are vulnerable at the start, because of their owner's lack of business expertise. On the other hand, small business tends to be more efficient, more innovative and more flexible than large firms, besides being more economical in its use of energy. Small firms also create more jobs for dollar investment than big business, and this is important when unemployment is so high. The tax breaks for large industry, which the Treasurer is offering, do little for the small-business sector, which employs almost half of the province's work force. In our view it makes much more sense to give the small-business sector real incentives and encouragement to prosper and to create jobs.

[4:30]

Ontario is actually behind most western countries in the priority that it gives to small business. I've already spoken of the need to inform consumers of the Canadian content of goods sold within Ontario. To help small business and Ontario industry, Ontario should focus the purchasing power of both the provincial government and of the municipalities and of the many semi-public agencies, such as hospitals and school boards, which depend on public funds. It should insist that the Canadian content be identified on all tenders that they consider, and as part of a Buy Ontario policy which I am proposing, Ontario should insist that at the very least goods produced in this province should have preference where price and quality are comparable to imports.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Imports into Canada or Ontario?

Mr. Cassidy: Imports into Canada. Mr. Speaker, Ontario—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is not what you said, by the way.

Mr. Cassidy: Ontario should take steps to help group the common requirements of bodies such as hospital boards, in order that they help to develop an assured market for Ontario industry—and this time I mean Ontario industry. Because public demands are involved, this may be one area where joint public-private ventures could be justified.

Ontario should also ensure that small business gets a fair share of the provincial government's own purchases. This is something, among other things, which the US federal government has done for years. Many contract specifications in this province are drawn up today in such a way that small businesses are actually ruled out from tendering. Our policy would work the other way. Ontario, like other jurisdictions in North America, should require that a certain proportion of the purchasing that it does from big business be directed through subcontracts to small business. Ontario should also require larger firms to subcontract a certain proportion of the successful contract tenders into the small-business sector.

All of these are elements that enter into an industrial strategy for Ontario. I don't pretend to have covered every base, because the Treasurer has had six years and 600 staff on the job while opposition critics work with a staff of three or four. They're good staff, mind you, but it's three or four.

What I want to say on behalf of the New Democratic Party, however, is that we believe that now is not the time for defeatism and we believe that there are constructive approaches and new directions to be taken which respond to our problems, which build on our strengths and which are far more productive than hoping against hope that a few corporate decision-makers will bail out the Ontario economy.

Part of the NDP strategy is that Ontario needs a strategic development strategy that covers not just land use but also economic and social development. Years ago, we thought we might be getting it from the Conservative government, but that effort has been so thoroughly obliterated at the behest of this Treasurer that we know it will never be rehabilitated. If you follow the present population trends, Mr. Speaker, as this government now clearly intends to do, there will be no growth to speak of in northern Ontario or in the eastern part of the province. We will continue to have more and more people crowded into less and less space in the region around Metropolitan Toronto and the pressure for growth could easily take off again in the 1980s with another explosion in land and housing prices.

We believe equality of opportunity should spread into every region of the province and not be confined to people fortunate enough to live within a few miles' radius of Queen's Park. The plan we would propose would include a programme to preserve and maintain small communities across the province, as an alternative to forcing everyone to move into larger cities, for reasons of economy, diversity and social justice. Small enterprises, in particular, should be encouraged to locate in small communities and to build up the human and natural resources of their region.

Perhaps it's significant that the budget said virtually nothing about housing, despite the fact that 80 per cent of Ontario's families have too little income to pay for the average house being sold in Metropolitan Toronto. Part of our industrial strategy would be to ensure that housing was being provided at reasonable cost in every part of the province, in particular in order to serve families on low and modest incomes. But because such a strategy is lacking, the government is blindly marching ahead with increasing subsidies to developers for houses and apartments over which it will have no public influence, but whose subsidies will range as high as the cost of subsidizing a family in Ontario Housing.

Non-profit and co-operative housing groups have never been offered the generous treatment now being provided as a matter of course to the private building industry. This is an obvious case where the government's political biases have overcome any hope of a coherent strategy.

Next, resources: The New Democratic Party position on resources is well known. Our position is that resources development should be carried out with the maximum benefit for the community and for the regions in which those resources are located. That generally means the north, which is the region that now has the least economic benefit. As a beginning, Ontario should begin to review the 38 exemptions from domestic processing that have been so uncritically granted by the Ministry of Natural Resources.

We should negotiate with the mine owners to have that processing done in Canada, and preferably in this province. Ontario should be prepared to set up joint ventures to handle the creation and operation of processing facilities in co-operation with the private sector to ensure we begin as quickly as possible to reap benefits and jobs from the resources that have been mindlessly exported for so many years.

As a note, I might comment that the Northern Ontario Development Corporation specifically excludes certain kinds of beneficiating activities because it defines them as processing and not as manufacturing and, therefore, says they are ineligible for ODC assistance. That's the way the government is working right now.

Finally, energy is obviously a vital part of Ontario's industrial strategy. I want to speak about oil and conservation because these two were almost ignored in the budget, and they get less attention in the Legislature than Hydro. In his report a few days ago, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) said Ontario should give high priority to investments and incentives for conservation and efficiency in energy use. The NDP agrees. We looked in vain for any reflection of that strategy in the budget, apart from the remission of sales tax on insulation material.

We are concerned at the prohibitive capital requirements for the energy industry over the next decade. We believe alternatives should be sought and we regret their absence in this

budget. Among other things we should be concerned with are the retrofitting of houses and businesses and the development of techniques and technologies for alternative energy sources, such as sun and wind industry, which the Treasurer as Minister of Energy used to pooh-pooh when the member for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Burr) asked about it two or three years ago. We should be concerned also about the installation of more energy efficient technology in Ontario industry and the development of new energy sources.

Two areas that deserve particular attention are the establishment of a methane industry in Ontario, based on renewable forest resources, as outlined by my leader a few days ago, and the enormous deposits of lignite coal in northeastern Ontario at Onakawana. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the government promised to study the feasibility of this energy resource back in 1971.

Mr. Ferrier: That was an election year.

Mr. Cassidy: In the days of $2 a barrel of oil, they found that the project wouldn't fly or that they didn't want to fly with it. Perhaps it was only a politically motivated idea. Today, however, when our oil prices are moving towards the $13 world level and when Ontario is prepared to spend $100 million in a Syncrude project whose production will cost close to $18 a barrel, it makes very good sense to re-examine the Onakawana project. In 1973, the Onakawana task force which reported to the present Treasurer, said the deposit was an important potential asset.

In early 1974, consultants told the Ontario government: "The development of northern Ontario's vast lignite deposits is not only economically feasible but might make a significant contribution to the province's power supplies." They found there were enough reserves for a 1,000-megawatt generating station. The deposits happened to be within a stone's throw of the Ontario Northland Railway. They recommended that this should be seriously considered as an alternative to high-cost nuclear energy development. We accept that judgement, particularly with the rapid increase in energy prices since 1974. The power generated at Onakawana should, of course, be used to spur secondary industry development in the north.

Closer to home, there is increasing evidence that spending on conservation may be more efficient and may have a higher return than spending on new power generation facilities. It is also a good deal more labour intensive at a time of high unemployment. Given the present economic situation, plus the Treasurer's total unconcern for the need to create jobs, the money being provided to accelerate Ontario's hydro projects could conceivably include some funding directed to the area of conservation.

Third, I want to make a very specific and major proposal designed to get people working in a wide variety of occupations, to stimulate small business, to provide a particular stimulation to the eastern and northern parts of the province and to have important long-term results in energy conservation in the saving of capital and in the creation of new industries. There is real work to be done in this province in preparing our homes and businesses to use energy more efficiently through insulation, through the improvement of construction standards, through the installation of more adequate doors and windows and through the other measures that go under the general rubric of retrofitting. I don't particularly like that word, but the concept is both important and valuable.

I think many Ontario residents are prepared to co-operate with government in a programme to save energy and get Ontario workers back on the job by means of what I call an energy-saving programme.

The cost of retrofitting a house runs between $800 and $1,500, and the savings, typically, run anywhere between 10 per cent and 40 per cent of a household's fuel bill. It is, therefore, reasonable that homeowners share in an initiative by the Ontario government. I am, therefore, proposing on behalf of my party that Ontario launch a programme of energy-saving grants designed to make a substantial improvement in the energy efficiency of every Ontario household over the next 10 years. The grants should be worth up to one-third of the cost in southern Ontario and 50 per cent of the cost in the north and east. The maximum amount available would be $500 in the south and $750 in the north and east.

This is a programme which is important both for energy conservation reasons and for its effect on employment. It's a programme where it's possible to create meaningful jobs very quickly. Many of the techniques of retrofitting are straightforward and easily learned. Others call on construction labour, which is in more than ample supply. The materials necessary are in reasonable supply and this is also a field where small business can get involved very easily.

There's not enough time in this budget reply to elaborate on all of the areas of the economy and what should be done. I hope I

have given enough detail, however, to indicate the approach that we in the New Democratic Party believe should be taken and to indicate, as well, how firmly we are opposed to this constant recycling of old shibboleths by the Treasurer.

Mr. Lewis: It's fundamentalist dogma.

Mr. Cassidy: Our analysis shows the government position on these matters is almost entirely a matter of words.

Mr. Lewis: He would do well in South Carolina.

Mr. Breithaupt: Are there new shibboleths?

Mr. Cassidy: I thought of calling for new shibboleths. It's about time we had a few. The Treasurer is excessively fond of saying that something must be done about the problems that confront us over the next 10 years—but then he falls back on naive hope in the corporate sector.

One final example: Just as the most uncritical supporter of the recent federal budget was Ontario's provincial Treasurer, so too is the Ontario government likely to remain the last defender of the Anti-Inflation Board. We have opposed Ontario's involvement in the AIB since its inception, but the pressure to scrap controls now comes not only from my party and from the labour movement, but from spokesmen for business.

What Ed Broadbent predicted 18 months ago has come to pass. The AIB has been such shock to confidence and has created such distortions in the economy that both Ontario and Canada have fallen seriously short of what they could have achieved economically if the AIB had not been created. Both the federal and the provincial economic councils keep warning that economic policy makers should beware of concentrating too obsessively on one measure of economic performance, such as the control of inflation, over our other goals, such as an adequate rate of growth and equitable distribution of incomes and the creation of jobs.

Mr. Lewis: Is the Treasurer doctrinaire?

Mr. Cassidy: But so determined is our Treasurer to wrestle inflation to the ground and to balance his budget for ideological reasons that he is absolutely blinded to the consequences to Ontario and to its workers of his single-minded obsession. We believe both goals are important: Get the economy moving and keep price increases in check.

I recall with great regret just how many times my leader and the NDP called, in this House, on the government to establish a mechanism to keep prices under review, but were rebuffed in the early 1970s because the government feared their proposal would unduly intrude on business.

Mr. Lewis: Right. The old rigidity.

Mr. Cassidy: I marvel at the bias that allows the Treasurer to argue the AIB controls on profits should be withdrawn now while controls on wages should continue to apply. How much more one-sided can he get?

The measures I have outlined will contribute to improving Ontario's productivity and competitiveness over the next few years and would also contribute, both directly and indirectly, towards improving our price performance. They should also help to protect the economy against overheating when it is moving near to full capacity. These proposals are put forward in a constructive spirit, because we believe it is important for the public and private sectors to work together cooperatively and we are tired of the government's inaction and its apparent inability to grasp the challenges that lie in store for Ontario's economy over the next 10 years.

[4:45]

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is such a fundamentalist. He makes Edmund Burke sound a radical.

Mr. Cassidy: And Ronald Reagan.

In the short term, the actions of the Treasurer are just as misguided as is his inaction over the long term. A week before the budget was delivered, the Treasurer said he was not going to tinker with the basic setting of the income tax in Ontario—tinker. Instead he has chosen to play with every other part of the tax system in a way that probably appeals to certain small groups who are rock-ribbed Tories, but that certainly doesn't appeal to most people in Ontario because they pay the shot and they don't get the benefits.

Mr. Lewis: Turned the budget into a Tinker Toy.

Mr. Cassidy: Ontario is taking only 35,000 low-income people off its tax rolls, while tiny Manitoba just last week found it possible to take 75,000 low-income people off of its rolls.

Much of the $32-million reduction in Ontario's personal income tax revenues comes from paralleling the federal dividend tax benefit, whose major beneficiaries will be people earning more than $25,000.

While the tax on cigarettes and car licences go up and are paid by the little guy. Ontario is matching the federal inventory write-off to give Ontario corporations, mainly big business, a tax cut of $42 million.

Mr. Reid: Who provides the jobs?

Mr. Cassidy: If you are a dead quarter-millionaire, Mr. Speaker, then you are one of the prime people in need whom the Treasurer helps in this budget by raising the exemptless limit for succession duties. In just two years, in fact, the Treasurer has raised the exemptions on succession duty by 100 per cent, from $150,000 to $300,000, apparently on the basis of ability to pay. Over the same period of time, his government is raising general welfare and family benefits by eight per cent, or by half the increase in the cost of living, apparently on the assumption that poor people are much better able to cope with inflation than people who are very wealthy. It is better to be rich and dead than poor and alive if you live in Tory Ontario.

Mr. Deans: That is correct.

An hon. member: Right on.

Mr. Cassidy: In our opinion, the succession duty is a tax that is fair and just. There is no excuse for the government's continued abandonment of this field, just as there is no excuse for the continuous way that it has pushed the exemption levels up. In fact it is Ontario's retreat that is forcing other provinces to vacate this lucrative tax field. Ontario could be collecting an extra $100 million in succession duties this year if it wasn't so committed to giving further privileges to people with wealth when they die.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's called downward indexing.

Mr. Cassidy: In passing, I am sorry the Premier isn't here, as a matter of fact, because I understand that he spoke to an appreciative farm audience last week and told them the NDP didn't care about the farmers because we had opposed the increase in succession duty exemptions to $300,000. He was also chortling that tiny Manitoba had increased its succession duty limit and why was the NDP opposing it here in Ontario.

If the Premier wasn't so anxious to curry favour with farmers by distorting the facts, he would have acknowledged that farmers have been effectively exempt from succession duties since 1973, that this Ontario measure was supported by the provincial NDP and that the new exemption from succession duty in Manitoba has been increased from $50,000 to a realistic $75,000, or one-quarter of the exaggerated level that is being permitted in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: How about some policies for the living now?

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

The final tax concession that the budget announces is the fast two-year write-off for machinery and equipment worth about $80 million. When you look closer, however, Mr. Speaker, that is simply a continuation of a tax concession which was already in existence and is not a new tax cut at all. As I said before, this is yet another misrepresentation and it is no response for an economy that has too much industrial capacity to spare and too little confidence to grow.

We would withdraw the inventory write-off. We consider the succession duty cuts are inappropriate at this time of economic stringency and we believe the subsidy to capital contained in the fast write-offs is ineffective and should also be withdrawn.

As for the machinery sales tax rebate, I have already made our case. We believe this $160-million annual cost to the Treasury can be used in better ways in order to stimulate the Ontario economy.

My colleagues will have more to say about the individual tax increases proposed by the Treasurer, although I want to personally welcome the increase in tobacco taxes as what I hope will become an essential part of a public campaign against the worst public health hazard we have in Ontario. Tax action alone will not stop people smoking, however, and, in my opinion, government should follow this tax increase up with prevention campaigns, with stop-smoking clinics and with provincial legislation to stop smoking in public places and guarantee non-smokers the right to clean air. That kind of action is simply absent as far as this government has been concerned.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: The House leader for the NDP (Mr. Deans) wants an exemption for certain cigars, which we grant him for at least six months until he quits.

Mr. Breithaupt: I hope he doesn't want the spitoons brought in here.

Mr. Cassidy: While the tax cuts are overwhelmingly directed to business, and while some of them in fact are recycling of tax cuts granted a year ago, the tax increases

are both regressive and mainly come from the consumer. There isn't much philosophy to them, except for an effort to soak the little guy. It all amounts to fiscal tinkering. There isn't even the increase in exemption for sales tax from 21 cents to 25 cents, which we expected, which we would like to have seen and which not only would have kept people working in the chocolate bar industry but also would have helped people in small retail businesses and taken some account of the effects of inflation on the price of small purchases over the last five years.

Everyone in Ontario, everyone in this Legislature, knows northerners such as the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) who sends his regrets at not being here, and the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) pay more than a dollar a gallon for their gas, while my Toronto colleagues and I pay as little as 81 cents a gallon when we fill up our car. It is, therefore, welcome that the government, at long last, recognizes it costs far more to operate a car in the north than in the rest of Ontario. It is typical of this Treasurer, however, that after he mouths slogans about making the private sector responsible, he bails out the oil companies by giving northerners the equivalent of a nickel a gallon subsidy on their gas out of the public Treasury. In our opinion this amount does not compensate the additional operating costs in the north and it is the oil companies who should pay by providing gasoline to motorists in the north at the same price as in the south.

Mr. Wildman: That doesn't help the dealers at all.

Mr. Reid: Stealing Liberal policy again from the last election.

Mr. Cassidy: As for the tax on pop cans, we welcome the government's environmental initiative, but we are naturally anxious to know what the job impact of this proposal will be at a time of seven per cent unemployment. Because this tax comes from a Conservative government, I strongly suspect no alternative has been given or even considered for the 1,000 can workers whose jobs may be affected. We believe government should take every care possible to ensure new jobs are found when it is cutting back in a sector of industry for environmental reasons, whether it's in pop cans or any other environmental campaign.

Mr. Ferrier: The revenue grab.

Mr. Cassidy: Four years ago in this House I urged the imposition of a tough land speculation tax at a 50 per cent rate to halt the hectic spiral of property dealing, which was driving up housing prices and also affecting the competitive position of Ontario's industries. The measures that followed were conceived by Tories and so were designed to be ineffective in action. They were riddled with loopholes and they were irrelevant to the real problem.

Now that our resources and secondary manufacturing are firmly in the hands of foreign owners, the government apparently feels it is time to remove any impediments to increased foreign control of property in our urban centres. We will oppose that change, but in sorrow at how inadequate the original bill was for the problem.

We regret the reduction in the land speculation tax, but in particular because that tax has been so ineffective from its very inception.

I want to bring my remarks together now in order to comment on the Treasurer's actions and on what we would do to get the economy of Ontario moving. Just two weeks ago, the Treasurer said he was not going to encourage what he called "forced levels of economic expansion" by means of a personal income tax cut. How an increase from our current level of activity could be forced growth is beyond me. But what is significant is that the Treasurer and the government of Ontario are virtually alone in their present stance.

What we in the NDP advocate in terms of job creation and tax cuts is solidly backed by a wide variety of expert opinion, while the experts are almost equally unanimous in their judgement that further tax concessions to business will have no stimulative effect. That has certainly been the experience of the past year. The rate of machinery investment, for example, went up by 2.4 per cent; we created only 29,000 jobs. We're not doing the job were the Treasurer's answers.

We simply cannot stimulate the economy from the top. If we put money into the consumers' pockets, however, if we start from the bottom, however, we will inject demand into the spending stream; we will create jobs; we will restore investment and restore confidence to the business sector.

Mr. Deans: Did you hear that, Darcy?

Mr. Cassidy: Let me cite some of the voices that have been calling for a tax cut in order to get the economy of Ontario, or the economy of Canada, moving. Chief among them is the Ontario Economic Council, whose report came out just before the budget. They

are supported by the Economic Council of Canada, by the C. D. Howe Research Institute, by economists Abraham Rotstein and Dian Cohen, by the Canadian Labour Congress, and even by the economists for the Canadian Manufacturers Association.

The support is so widespread, in fact, that it even extends to Lincoln Alexander, the Conservative opposition in Ottawa and to the official Conservative finance critic in Ottawa, Sinclair Stevens, who this month in his reply to the federal budget called for a substantial personal income tax cut, with the greatest benefit going to people earning less than $8,000 a year.

Mr. Breithaupt: Surely he'd like some for himself, as well?

Mr. Cassidy: Speaking for a party which has a strong tradition of saying the same things at both levels—at the federal and at the provincial level—I really wonder how the messages can be so different between the Conservative opposition in Ottawa and the provincial Conservative government.

Mr. Reid: That's you, monolithic.

Mr. Breithaupt: You are against everything, so it is easy.

Mr. Lewis: Your sister government in Zaire.

Mr. Wildman: Rhodesia.

Mr. Nixon: Both levels of the NDP say what Joe Morris tells them.

Mr. Cassidy: We in the NDP acknowledge that there are significant restraints to the amount that Ontario can afford to put into stimulating the economy this year. What we deplore in particular is that there is no effort at all being made.

Ontario has so misspent its good years for the political benefit of the Tories that when action is really needed, which is now, the cupboard is virtually bare. Since we anticipate that the Treasurer's budgetary deficit will probably be $400 million higher than he forecast—that is, it will exceed $1.4 billion—we feel compelled or constrained to propose only those fiscal measures which will not further increase the deficit.

I would that we could do more, and I regret that we cannot do more.

There are three elements in the fiscal stimulus which we believe should be applied to get Ontario's economy moving and to get its people back to work The first is direct job creation through the energy-saving programme which I have already outlined, a programme to insulate Ontario's houses beginning now and completing the job over the next 10 years. We estimate that a $50 million programme in grants, along the lines that I have described, would generate $150 million in new spending in the economy; would provide for more than 100,000 homes to be made fuel-efficient; would generate important long-term savings for Ontario consumers and the Ontario economy; would begin to reduce Ontario's needs for capital in the energy sector; and could provide up to 10,000 jobs between now and the winter—and those are full-time jobs, not the kind of summer work the Treasurer is providing.

Secondly, we are calling for an Ontario youth careers programme that would provide full-time work for about 8,000 young workers this year. I've already described how that programme would work. I wish it could be more, but this is certainly a more significant effort than the 250 full-time jobs for youth that are promised by the Treasurer.

We estimate that the cost of providing 8,000 jobs as a part of our package of stimulating the economy would be about $40 million this year.

Third, the New Democratic Party believes that there should be a cut in personal income taxes to stimulate the economy and that it should be as substantial as resources permit. I've already outlined a number of areas where we believe resources are available because of misapplied tax incentives in other parts of the economy.

This tax cut should be directed to families in low and modest incomes to ensure that it is spent and not saved. Without increasing the deficit a nickel, it should be possible to draw money from the Treasurer's dubious incentives to business and to provide for tax cuts that would be greatest for people on the lowest incomes.

Such a tax cut would do four things: It would increase real growth in the Ontario economy this year, and it would do so substantially; it would increase employment and reduce unemployment; it would have a positive effect on the rate of productivity growth in Ontario; and it would serve to restore confidence in an economy in which the Conservative government of Ontario seems to have lost faith.

[5:00]

Mr. Deans: The Treasurer just doesn't understand.

Mr. Cassidy: To conclude, we in the New Democratic Party find this to be a profoundly disappointing budget. As the unemployment rate climbs towards eight per cent, the evidence rises every day that the Treasurer and the government are mismanaging Ontario's economy. The Treasurer's budget is filled with misrepresentations from beginning to end and its distortion of figures for political purposes is fundamentally dishonest. The callous decision to accept a permanent army of more than 200,000 unemployed by redefining the full employment target in Ontario reflects both on the government's mismanagement of the economy and on the Treasurer's warped sense of social priorities.

Mr. Makarchuk: Now you've got throw-away people.

Mr. Cassidy: In particular, his condescending attitude toward so-called secondary members of the work force is unjustified and will be resented by every woman worker in Ontario. As the member for Brantford says, it's a throw-away society, and now this government is going to throw away people.

Effective April 19, 1977, the word "progressive" is no longer applicable to the Conservative Party of Ontario. The Treasurer is failing to provide the leadership needed to bring Ontario out of its economic doldrums. His budget is totally devoid of any coherent plan for the future structure of Ontario industry. He was trying to divert attention from our present difficult situation by presenting a plan to achieve a balanced budget which can only be described as a fantasy.

In this speech I have tried to outline how my party would tackle Ontario's difficult economic situation over the next five to 10 years and for this year. Our most urgent priority now must be to get the Ontario economy moving and to put Ontario workers back to work. The corporate concessions that are offered as a solution by the Treasurer demonstrate that it is he and not the New Democratic Party who is the real prisoner of ideology in this Legislature.

We need to take those corporate tax cuts and put them into programmes to get our young people working, to provide direct job stimulation in a useful and responsible way, to begin to prepare for a future of scarce energy and to put money in people's pockets where it will be spent both to stimulate the economy and to restore confidence in Ontario's future. That is the programme for 1977 of the Ontario New Democratic Party.

Mr. Deans: He should resign.

Mr. Cassidy: On behalf of my party, I'm moving an amendment. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this is couched in technical terms so that it will be understood by the economists in the Treasury.

Mr. Lewis: In soft and gentle terms compared to what we would have wished.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Cassidy moves—

Mr. Breithaupt: Dispense.

Mr. Renwick: No, read it.

Mr. Speaker: I think we should read it. It's fairly short.

Mr. Bullbrook: I think it is out of order too.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Cassidy moves, seconded by Mr. Lewis, that all the words after "that" in the main motion be struck and the following added:

"This House deplores the mismanagement by the government of Ontario's economy, condemns the misrepresentation by the Treasurer of the government's fiscal situation and Ontario's economic prospects, rejects a policy which accepts a permanent army of 200,000 unemployed, regrets the failure of the Treasurer to provide any long-term direction for Ontario's industrial development and future prosperity, condemns the slavish addiction to ideology which has led the Treasurer to offer corporate tax handouts as his only remedy for our short-term economic stagnation and, above all, calls for a reordering of the expenditure programme to create jobs in order to put the province back on the road to economic strength and security."

Mr. Peterson moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Cassidy: As a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I had been led to understand that the Conservative speechwriters were writing heckles for this particular speech, and I want to express my regret they didn't come in with them.

Mr. Speaker: That's not really a point of personal privilege or order.

Mr. Cassidy: Not a word about Manitoba.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen

the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in her chambers.

Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Her Honour has assented:

Bill 10, An Act to amend The Election Finances Reform Act, 1975.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Trustees of the Toronto General Burying Grounds.

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting Canada Trustco Mortgage Company.

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Webwood Investments Limited.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of East York.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting Lombardo Furniture and Appliances Limited.

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting Kevalaine Corporation Limited.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation for the Diocese of Alexandria, in Ontario, Canada.

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the Village of Erie Beach.

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting Frank Postl Enterprises Limited.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm so glad that the cameras have been brought in while I move the adjournment of the House.

On motion by Hon. Mr. McKeough the House adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 846.)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

28. Mr. Mackenzie—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Minister of Labour table the number of active files on the desk of each claims review officer at the Workmen's Compensation Board and the number of overtime hours that each claims review officer has worked over the last six months to March 31, 1977? Tabled April 7, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson):

Since there is no such title as claims review officer, this answer contains information regarding both the claims review specialist in the claims review branch and the adjudicators in the claims adjudication branch. Both branches are part of the claims services division.

The review specialists review adverse decisions recommended by the claims adjudication branch before the employee and the employer are notified of the decision, therefore, they see only a small percentage of all decisions made. Since January 1, 1977, each review specialist has handled an average of 36 claims per week, which is considered to be an acceptable workload. The overtime is practically non-existent with only four hours since January 1, 1977, for the entire group.

In a report to the board dated April 5, 1977, the executive director of the claims services division advised that the total caseload of active claims in the claims adjudication branch was on the increase. As of January 1, 1977, the number of active lost-time claims for each claims adjudicator varied from 248 to 614 depending on the level of claims complexity and the experience of the claims adjudicator. During the six month period ending March 31, 1977, each claims adjudicator worked an average of five to six hours overtime per week.

The executive director of the claims services division recommended a substantial increase in the number of adjudicators to provide greatly reduced caseloads, which will result in better and more prompt handling of claims for the injured person with a minimum of overtime. A modification in the organization of the claims adjudication branch was also recommended to provide improved supervision, guidance and control of the claims adjudication function.

The board approved the recommendations on April 19, 1977, and the first new group of claims adjudicator trainees will commence training on May 17, 1977.

29. Mr. Moffatt—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Minister of Revenue advise what are the regulations regarding late filing of returns of retail sales tax collected by vendors? How much in penalties has been collected during each of the last three years? Are all retail sales tax collectors subject to the same regulations or are there different regulations depending on the amounts collected? Tabled April 12, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener):

Section 27 of The Retail Sales Tax Act provides for the following penalties for late filing of returns of Retail Sales Tax collected by vendors: 1. Five per cent of the tax that was collectable for the period covered by the return, if the amount of the tax was less than $10,000; or, 2. Five hundred dollars, if the amount of the tax was $10,000 or more.

The following are the amounts of penalties assessed during each of the last three fiscal years: 1974/75—$289,937; 1975/76—$374,212; 1976/77—$554,591.

All sales tax vendors are subject to the same penalty provisions.

30. Mr. Mancini—Inquiry of the ministry: Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations indicate to the House the criteria by which liquor inspectors are hired? In particular, could the minister table the application forms, letters of reference and any correspondence concerning the hiring of Mr. Carl Vargas, as liquor inspector, serving the eastern half of Essex county? Also, could the minister table the names and qualifications of all other applicants applying for that particular job? Also, could the minister furnish in writing, the reasons why Mr. Jack Davenport was removed from the Leamington area as liquor inspector, and Mr. Vargas was sent in? Tabled April 12, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman):

The Liquor Licence Board of Ontario initially advertises vacancies for inspectors internally, and if no suitable applicant is found recruiting is carried out in the area where the vacancy exists.

Applicants for a position are advised of the following: Duties: to conduct regular inspections of licensed premises, issuing work orders when deficiencies are noted; follow up on work orders for compliance; to conduct follow-up interviews with licence inquirers or applicants and to provide advice and guidance on requirements and necessary documentation; to arrange and schedule regular inspections ensuring all premises are inspected at the prescribed times; to act as an Inspector under The Hotel Fire Safety Act. Qualifications: Ability to gain a thorough knowledge of The Liquor Licence Act; knowledge of proper reporting techniques and able to communicate effectively, verbally and in writing; ability to work nights and week-ends as part of monthly work; high degree of diplomacy and tact.

Nine applicants were considered for the position and four interviewed. Mr. Carl Vargas submitted an application by mail and was interviewed. He was employed effective April 5, 1976. A copy of the application forms [on file with Clerk of the House] and letters of appointment are attached. There were no letters of recommendation requested as a result of favourable police and credit reports. We are advised that it would not be appropriate to submit names of individuals who were considered since the application is made in confidence and could jeopardize their current employments.

At the time of the hiring of this inspector, there were some 286 licensed establishments being inspected by four inspectors. A desirable workload at that time was considered 50 establishments per inspector and the areas of all inspectors in that geographical area were adjusted to reduce and redistribute workload.

It is an administrative policy of the board to change inspector's calls from time to time. Both Mr. Davenport and Mr. Vargas are highly regarded inspectors and their performance is more than acceptable to the board. It should be pointed out that the Liquor Licence Board does have an approved complement and must operate within these levels.

Mr. Carl E. Vargas,
1474 Dougall Avenue,
Windsor, Ontario. N8X 1R8

4666
March 8, 1976.

Dear Sir:

Further to your application as an inspector with the Liquor Licence Board, please be advised I have been instructed to inform you that you have been appointed to the Liquor Licence Board Inspection staff as a licence inspector effective Monday, April 5, 1976, at a starting salary of $11,485 per year.

You will be paid mileage for the use of your car on board business at rates set out in the back of the travelling expense form which you will use to claim for mileage and other expenses incurred while on duty for the board.

Sick leave credit at the rate of one and a quarter days per month may be accumulated and vacation after one year's service will be fifteen days. No vacation time will be credited to you until after you have been with the board a period of six months. All appointments to the Liquor Licence Board staff are probationary for at least the first six months. After completing this period of time, and the employee is satisfactory, he or she will be appointed by order in council a permanent public servant.

The Liquor Licence Board and Liquor Control Board have an excellent credit union, health insurance plan and other types of life and accident insurance. All group benefits will be explained to you during your training period.

Please arrange to be in my office Monday, April 5, at 8:30 a.m., for an interview and further instruction, and be prepared to remain for two or three weeks. Accommodations have been arranged for you at the Harbour Castle Hotel, 1 Harbour Square, for Sunday, April 4.

Yours truly,
R. G. Lamb,
Director of Inspection.

RGL/sl

31. Mr. Ferrier—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications table the figures of the savings to be realized to the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission by the closing of the South Porcupine railway station? Tabled April 12, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow):

The Ontario Northland Railway estimates a saving of $44,000 during the first fiscal year, and $24,000 each year thereafter.

32. Mr. Ferrier—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications provide a list of the number of management personnel and permanent staff in all the departments of the operations of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission? Tabled April 12, 1977.

Answer by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow):

The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission employs 201 management personnel and 1,621 permanent staff.

Monday, April 25, 1977

Home renewal programme, statement by Mr. Rhodes 831

Lake pollution, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Bain 831

OECA publication, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Lewis 833

Lake pollution, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. S. Smith 833

Bingo regulations, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. S. Smith 834

Aid for Hamilton, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 834

Quebec language legislation, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Roy, Mr. MacDonald 836

Sales tax exemption, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Edighoffer 838

Multilingual translations of Workmen's Compensation Act, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Ferrier, Mr. di Santo, Mr. Deans 838

Children in unlicensed homes, questions of Mr. Norton: Mrs. Campbell 839

Sales tax exemption, correction by Mrs. Scrivener 839

North Pickering project, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Godfrey 839

Bingo regulations, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Kerrio 840

Nuclear power development, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Moffatt 840

Jobs in agriculture, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell, Mr. Bain, Mr. McKessock, Mr. Wildman 841

Quebec milk, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Samis 842

Richmond Hill nursing homes, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Stong 842

Peel teachers' dispute, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Sweeney 842

Brant County teachers' dispute, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Makarchuk 843

Citizen complaints against police, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Singer, Mr. Roy 843

Occupational health, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis 844

Entertainment tax, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mrs. Campbell 845

Ontario Malleable Iron, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Breaugh 845

Petitions re Durham region costs, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Godfrey 845

Regional Municipality of Durham Amendment Act, Mr. Breaugh, first reading 845

Consumer Protection Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 846

Tabling answers to written questions Nos. 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32, Mr. Welch 846

Toronto General Burying Grounds Act, Mr. Drea, second and third readings 846

Canada Trustco Mortgage Company Act, Mr. Peterson, second and third readings 846

Borough of York Act, Mr. MacDonald, second and third readings 846

Webwood Investments Limited Act, Mr. Stong, second and third readings 846

Borough of East York Act, Mr. Leluk, second and third readings 846

Lombardo Furniture and Appliances Limited Act, Mr. Burr, second and third readings 846

Kevalaine Corporation Limited Act, Mr. Grossman, second and third readings 846

Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited Act, Mr. Morrow, second and third readings .. 846

Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation (Diocese of Alexandria) Act, Mr. Villeneuve, second and third readings 847

Village of Erie Beach Act, Mr. Spence, second and third readings 847

Frank Postl Enterprises Limited Act, Mr. Johnston, second and third readings 847

Budget debate, continued, Mr. Cassidy 847

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Peterson, agreed to 869

Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 869

Motion to adjourn, Mr. McKeough, agreed to 870

Appendix, answers to written questions 871

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)

Ontario

No. 22

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 26, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

MANPOWER CONTROL

Hon. Mr. Auld: In the budget address last week, the Treasurer announced that I would make a statement outlining the government's new manpower policy. Today, Mr. Speaker, I have tabled a paper on manpower control in Ontario. The paper describes the new manpower control policy and outlines the ways that it can contribute to significant improvement in human resource management and manpower control in the civil service.

This paper also sets out details of the present manpower control system and outlines its method of operation during the period of expenditure constraint, commencing with the 1975 budget.

It also covers the opportunities for improvements to the present system, keeping in mind the requirements of ministries, Management Board and the Legislature.

Then, the new manpower control policy is described. The policy consists of three elements—annual salary and wage dollar control, classified staffing control, and staffing information system. The paper explains each of these elements and describes how they contribute to the requirements of the Legislature, Management Board and the ministries.

The implementation of the new manpower control system will be gradual and will take place on a ministry-by-ministry basis throughout the 1977-78 fiscal year.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Later today, Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing an amendment to The Environmental Assessment Act which permits a broad inquiry into various developments in northern Ontario, including the Reed proposal for the harvesting and use of timber resources. The amendment will allow the government to appoint Mr. Justice Patrick Hartt to conduct an inquiry into major developments north or generally north of the 50th parallel north latitude. By the broad definition of the environment in the Act, the amendment will authorize the inquiry to consider both the natural and human environments including the cultural, social and economic aspects of a proposed development.

As soon as this amendment is passed by the Legislature, a recommendation for an order in council will be presented to the Ontario cabinet appointing Mr. Justice Patrick Hartt to conduct the inquiry.

Mr. Lewis: When will we have it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Under the terms of the order in council, Mr. Justice Hartt will have the discretion to decide which major enterprises located north of the 50th parallel will be inquired into; the government will also have the discretion to refer to Mr. Justice Hartt developments located in the north that it feels should be considered. The order in council will refer the Reed proposal to the inquiry.

The terms of the amendment and of the order in council are acceptable to Mr. Justice Patrick Hartt and the representatives of the native people concerned. We are looking for a number of positive benefits from this inquiry: a broader range of information on the full environmental implications of the Reed Limited proposal to guide the Environmental Assessment Board and the government in their future considerations of this project; an extensive public forum in which many of the issues in this and other proposed developments can be identified and to some extent resolved; the recommendation of new approaches to planning and assessing resource-based development in the sensitive environment of northern Ontario. I also expect some indication of the extent to which The Environmental Assessment Act should be applied to various types of development in the north.

This new approach to evaluating northern development is a much broader application of the principles of environmental assessment. We are depending on the Hartt inquiry to break new trails and guide us further towards a better future for northern Ontario.

The conduct of the inquiry is in Mr. Justice Hartt's hands. He is authorized to call and

examine witnesses, produce and review any relevant documents and conduct any meeting or public hearings required in any location he chooses for the inquiry. In public reports he will provide me with information and advice on the issues referred to him. His reports will, I am sure, provide valuable information and guidance to the government and the Environmental Assessment Board in his subsequent hearings and decisions on any proposals studied in the inquiry.

Mr. Reid: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order?

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. Reid: Actually, I have three, Mr. Speaker. I'll begin with the one relative to the statement just made. Does the minister have any relevant documents to table with the Legislature in regard to his statement today as to the terms of reference? Will they be part of the amendment or is the minister going to table those as the new rules of the Legislature require?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am introducing a bill, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member realizes; it's not just a statement. The compendium will be attached to the bill, and it was my intent to table the terms of reference before second reading.

Mr. Reid: A further point of order, Mr. Speaker: On the introduction of the bill setting up the Ministry of Northern Affairs, there was no relevant material tabled at that time—

Mr. Lewis: But there isn't any.

Mr. MacDonald: Table the minister.

Mr. Reid: —I presume it's because there is none and that there wasn't really any background studies except the horizontal rise of the former Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier). I wonder if there is any material to be tabled.

Mr. Lewis: It is a job security programme. You get activated, don't you, Leo?

Mr. Speaker: That's not a point of order. If there was material to be presented, it must have been presented. If there was no material, then it is impossible to present nothing.

Mr. Reid: There is no material; that was my point. I just wanted to know.

Mr. Lewis: A job-creation programme for one minister.

Mr. Reid: I have a further point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A further point?

Mr. Reid: I have in my hand a report sent out by a member of the Legislature, an NDP member, under the guise of being a constituency report, which contains three questions that are of an extreme political nature. One of them I can't fathom any intelligent person replying to in the affirmative: "Would you like to learn more about the Ontario New Democratic Party?" I think everybody knows too much, or enough, about them already. But I want to bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is a crass political document and that public funds are being used to proselytize a particular party and ideology. I would hope that you would look into it. I'll send it to you.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the member does not have a point of order, but I'll check into it and, if so, I'll take the necessary action.

Mr. Reid: A point of privilege then, if you like.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be nothing out of order here as far as the operation of the House is concerned. However, we will study the document and report if necessary.

Mr. Nixon: It's just a waste of public funds —misappropriation.

An hon. member: Whose report is it?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: No, it's over with.

Mr. Lewis: —in my riding report—

Mr. Nixon: He said there wasn't a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: —I invited people to say if they'd like to help the Conservative and Liberal Parties and got seven responses out of 700 replies.

Mr. Reid: It is still public funds.

Mr. Lewis: But in a good cause, you will admit.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is uncertain.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps I should ask a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the meeting this morning of the chiefs in northern Ontario who asked to have the English-Wabigoon River system finally closed and indicated that if the government couldn't somehow, sometime, render a decision on this, they would have to step up their campaign, including lobbying through southern cities and again closing the road on the reserve, is it possible for the Premier to indicate what the government will do and when ?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it's not possible for me to indicate anything today. I wasn't aware that the chiefs were meeting this morning, but I had heard that this possibility might exist. It's a matter that is presently being discussed by cabinet. As soon as I have some information to share with the House and the public I shall do so, but I haven't anything that I can usefully say to the House today.

Mr. Lewis: If I may ask the Premier, by way of a supplementary, since this matter has been under discussion now for a couple of years and has passed back and forth, federally and provincially, for several months while the native peoples have waited for a reply, and since the government commissioned a study through the former Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) to send a study team on mercury poisoning to Iraq and Japan, and since that study paper said about mercury-contaminated fish and its effect on human health, in recommendation No. 2: "It is recognized that the most effective method of achieving recommendation 1"—that is, not to use fish for human or animal food—"is to close the waterway to all forms of fishing. In particular, this would protect the fishing guides who are the population most at risk," why is there the endless resistance to the arguments when his government has itself documented the position in June of 1976?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think it's a question of endless resistance to some of the arguments. I think it's a case of the government endeavouring to come up with a workable solution that is in the interests of the native people themselves. I'm aware of this report and other discussions. As I said to the hon. member, it is a matter that is presently before cabinet and when we have some further information to share, either I shall, or the minister will, be prepared to do so.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask which minister would report on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Probably the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: Can the Premier indicate whether the problem is an agreement betwen the province and the federal government as to the closing down, and exactly who has the authority to close the river? Is it the federal government, the provincial government or both of them in combination?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm going by memory. I think, legally or technically, it is the federal government which must effect the closing. I think I'm right in that.

Mr. Foulds: I have a supplementary: Can the Premier share with us at this time what he and his cabinet would consider the factors that need to be taken into account in their "workable solution"?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I endeavour to share as much as I can with the members opposite, but I have to say to the hon. member on this occasion that I really can't prejudge for him some of the matters that will be discussed and I really just can't help him with that particular question.

Mr. Lewis: One quick, last supplementary: Could I ask the Premier, in case he hasn't seen it—and it's possible he hasn't, because it's very recent—to take a look at the Study on the Detection of the Effects of Methyl Mercury on Man, done by Clarkson, Marsh and Myers of the Environmental Health Sciences Centre at the University of Rochester and supplemented by Dr. Prichard at the University of Toronto, with several scientists in Iraq, who point out that present clinical methods for detection of mercury effects are minimal, and end up by saying: "In short, were we to rely on current clinical methods, a major outbreak of poisoning could occur without any prior warning"? Since it is, in a sense, new scientific evidence of the dilemma up there, could it be considered among the cabinet documents?

[2:15]

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure that some members of cabinet would be quite prepared to familiarize themselves with that particular information. I can't say that all of us in cabinet will become completely knowledgeable with respect to it, but certainly we would be quite prepared to have the group assess that particular document.

REED PAPER

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of the Environment, referring to his statement. If Justice Patrick Hartt in his inquiry were to find, over the course of the next two years and prior to the actual environmental studies material relating to Reed being available, that there were various small developments —economic and social—of benefit to that part of the north, independent of any particular project, would the minister be prepared to accept that as a basis on which to proceed—providing jobs and all the other things this Legislature wants—without waiting for a final document four or five years down the road?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith: That is a different tune, isn't it?

Mr. Reid: That is what you call a flip-flop.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. minister is to answer.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It may be assuming that The Environmental Assessment Act—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —now applies to the private sector.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. minister is trying to answer the question here.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is a weak reed to lean upon.

Mr. Lewis: You have moved full circle on this one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition—order, please.

An hon. member: Ask the Premier to stop—

Mr. Roy: Show your independence.

Mr. Bullbrook: Send them both out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will continue.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: In the event—and I would expect that this would be so—that The Environmental Assessment Act itself applies to the private sector, that Act and the provisions of that Act would still apply to any project that may be developed in the north or any part of the province. But, certainly, if the Hartt inquiry indicated that the type of project to which the Leader of the Opposition refers was appropriate in the north, I would expect that it would have a great deal of effect on the Ministry of the Environment and the minister himself, as far as approvals were concerned.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: We can proceed where it is appropriate to proceed, without waiting five years down the road on the one particular project which triggered all this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, indeed.

Mr. Reid: Well, you have got it both ways now.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: If the terms of the order in council, as the minister says on page two of his statement, are acceptable to Mr. Justice Patrick Hartt, presumably they have been drawn up and are in printed form. Could the minister make those terms available at the present time to the Legislature, even though the legislation has not passed?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As I indicated, I would like to take this to cabinet tomorrow. Before we discuss this bill on second reading, the terms of reference will be made available to the members of the House.

RESTITUTION BY COURTS

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question for the Attorney General: Is the Attorney General satisfied that he has done everything in his power to persuade Crown attorneys—and the court system generally—to make more use of restitution as part of the sentencing procedure, particularly in cases of vandalism where people are apprehended? And can he say whether or not he has asked the federal government to move in that direction, in keeping with the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes. As I recall, approximately a year ago I sent a memorandum to all the Crown attorneys in the province of Ontario requesting that they not only make greater use of these restitution sections of The Criminal Code but also assist victims of crime in presenting the necessary documentation to the Court when they appear in court in order that the proper order in the correct amount might be made.

I might say that there is some legal, constitutional cloud over this issue. I think it was resolved by the Ontario Court of Appeal a few months ago, when these sections of The Criminal Code were challenged on the basis that they were dealing more with matters of property and civil rights—provincial matters, as opposed to criminal law. The Court of Appeal ruled in favour of the restitution provisions.

As a matter of interest and a matter of information only, the Manitoba Court of Appeal has ruled differently, and the matter will probably be finally resolved in the Supreme Court of Canada in the not too distant future. But in the meantime we are encouraging our Crown attorneys to make as much use of these provisions as is possible.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Could the Attorney General give us some indication of the results of the letter which he sent a year ago to the Crown attorneys, and whether there has been an improvement in that regard? Specifically, when he's on his feet reporting on these results, could he tell us whether he's taken any special initiatives with regard to recent vandalism in the western part of Hamilton where apparently, it is alleged, those who were involved are quite willing to make restitution but are hoping the court will arrange a method whereby this can be done?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Dealing with the latter part of the supplementary question first, I don't know the particulars of the matter in the west end of Hamilton to which the leader of the Liberal Party is referring. If he were to provide me with the particulars I would be happy to discuss it with the local Crown attorney in order to assist in what I think is a very important endeavour.

I do not have any statistics at the present time with relation to the success or otherwise of my instructions to the Crown attorneys. We are attempting to gather that. Recently we instituted in the province a system of regional Crown attorneys in order to facilitate information such as this coming from various parts of the province to 18 King Street East, and I would hope we will have some useful information in the near future.

Mr. Stong: Supplementary: In the light of the conflict between the Ontario Court of Appeal and the Manitoba Court of Appeal dealing with restitution in property and civil rights, would the Attorney General consider amending The Ontario Evidence Act, section 9 of The Provincial Courts Act, RSO 1970, and section 14 of The County Courts Act, RSO 1970, to eliminate any doubt that those courts have power over property and civil rights in the question of making restitution and proper reparation in criminal proceedings?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I'm not so sure that that would have the effect of resolving the issue, but we would be quite happy to look at those sections with that in mind. I want to assure the members of the House that notwithstanding the legal cloud that is still over this matter in relation to the conflicting decisions in Manitoba and Ontario, in Ontario we are proceeding on the basis of the decision of our own Court of Appeal. The resolution of the matter by the Supreme Court of Canada in no way is hindering us in that purpose.

Mr. S. Smith: I thank the minister for his answer.

INSULIN PRICES

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question for the Minister of Health: Has he completed his investigation of the large price increase with regard to the product insulin? Is he satisfied with regard to the pricing of that product at the moment? Does he plan any measures to ensure that diabetics are not left at the mercy of increasing price rises of the kind that have happened this year, particularly here in Ontario since last July?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Can the minister indicate to this House when he's likely to have some answer? When he's looking at the matter, has he any plans for dealing with Connaught Laboratories? For instance, is the Ontario government thinking of any way in which the laboratories could be re-acquired, either by the government or by the University of Toronto, or is the minister satisfied with the present operation under the CDC?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: To answer the second part first, I do not believe it's in any way necessary to consider bringing Connaught Labs back under government jurisdiction, whether it be through the university or as a Crown corporation of a provincial government or in any other kind of business setup, other than what they are now under the CDC. Over a month ago I expressed in a letter to my federal counterpart, Mr. Lalonde, concerns about the problems that the CDC

is having with its finances. I think there are things that the federal government could be doing, and I would hope that when the Ministers of Health meet in Ottawa—I think it's on June 21—this is something we could discuss either at the meeting or privately with Mr. Lalonde.

Mr. S. Smith: A brief supplementary, if I might: Would the minister care to comment on the 23 per cent increase which followed an 11 per cent increase and indicate whether he feels that is acceptable and satisfactory in the light of what he has learned so far?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The very first question was had I completed the review of the price increases, and the answer to that was no. So no, I wouldn't care to comment at this time.

Mr. Moffatt: When the minister is involved in his conversation with regard to Connaught Labs, I wonder if he would make part of that conversation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question had to do with a price increase—

Mr. Moffatt: That's correct, Mr. Speaker. With regard to Connaught Labs, would it be possible for the minister to investigate whether the transfer of the patents for insulin, which were left to the University of Toronto, were included in that? Also if in fact it is legal for a profit to be made from the sale of insulin by Connaught Labs?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'll ask that question.

Mr. Moffatt: Good.

Mr. Speaker: No questions over here? The hon. member for Downsview.

Well, all right, for York South, then.

Mr. Nixon: We don't take that sitting down.

Mr. Roy: You're acting as though you are still leader.

Mr. MacDonald: I am delighted to learn that the Liberal Party is awake today.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Now we'll have the question.

AID TO THE THIRD WORLD

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the Premier: In view of his commitment to the delegation from the Ontario Council for International Co-operation on April 5 that he would shortly indicate whether or not the government had got cabinet approval after his presentation to cabinet of some form of financial assistance on international projects of food aid and development if they have been approved by CIDA, is the Premier in a position to report to the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated to the House—I guess two weeks ago, a week ago, whenever it was—the group was in with a somewhat altered proposal. They had either five or six points; we agreed with, I think, two of them, and I said that as soon as possible and I hoped in about three weeks—I think it will be another week or 10 days, quite honestly; we have not had a chance to deal with it; there have been one or two other matters of priority that we wish to get before this House that I am sure the members are aware of—but as soon as we have an opportunity to deal with it, not only will I inform those—

Mr. Cassidy: Leave all the awkward decisions until after the fateful day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Say, I understand you had a new suit yesterday.

Mr. Reid: It was a rental.

Mr. Breithaupt: He only had it until 5 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, interjections will be ignored.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Really very impressive.

But as soon as we have, certainly I will inform the hon. member.

Mr. Good: A supplementary to the Premier: In view of the fact that the Premier's former refusal to grant this consideration was based on jurisdictional, administrative, and legalistic arguments, would the Premier, when reconsidering it, consider the moral and philosophical grounds on this and consider it in the fact that maybe Ontario just does have an obligation to contribute to the development of the Third World countries?

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect to the hon. member—and I thought I had explained it to him when he asked the question—it's not just a question of a legal or administrative argument. Part of it—

Mr. Good: Well, it was.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, with great respect, I was there at the meeting, the hon. member wasn't; and I know what I said. I happen to know some of these people fairly well, and I have a lobby within my own family as it relates to this particular issue, so I'm as

familiar with it as the hon. member is. Maybe more so.

Mr. Eakins: Don't bet on it, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I would say to the hon. member that it was partly a philosophical concern with respect to the perception of, and the question of, whether a provincial jurisdiction should be directly involved in terms of international agreements or aid.

Mr. MacDonald: You are now. Phoney argument.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On an ongoing sort of basis I made it very clear to the people who were there that in philosophical terms as to what the government of Canada was doing, the functioning of CIDA, our support for the CIDA programme, that they had a supporter as far as I was concerned; and I think I speak for all of my colleagues. The real discussion centred on whether the provinces, as provincial jurisdictions, in philosophical terms should be really doing–

[2:30]

Mr. MacDonald: You are involved now.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: –that which, I say with respect, the federal government of this country should be doing. It was as simple as that.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: Can I ask one quick supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: It will be the final supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the Premier said he would be making a statement on this in 10 days, will he be making a statement in the House in 10 days or some place else?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the hon. member for Ottawa East that there are those who have tried to get the answer to the question he just asked in a far more subtle fashion–far more subtle, far more subtle.

Mr. Breithaupt: But none more effectively.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now that I've told him there are more subtle ways to ask the question, he may think of one between now and the end of the question period.

Mr. Roy: Are we having an election shortly?

Mr. Speaker: No, no. That was the last one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you going to run?

RESTITUTION BY COURTS

Mr. McKessock: A question for the Attorney General. In view of the Verdun Rae case pertaining to the question of restitution in criminal proceedings, when does the Attorney General intend to introduce an amendment to the Ontario Evidence Act, whereby previous convictions for criminal or provincial offences would be admissible in subsequent civil proceedings as proof of the fact giving rise to the conviction?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The Ontario Law Reform Commission very carefully studied this whole problem and, as a matter of fact, dealt with it in relation to their study on matters of evidence generally. I tabled the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission some weeks ago–I don't recall the actual date now, and it may be that the hon. member hasn't had an opportunity of perusing that report–but it deals with this question in some detail and recommends against such an amendment to the Ontario Evidence Act.

We're considering very carefully all of the recommendations made by the Ontario Law Reform Commission, as they obviously have great importance with respect to the administration of justice as a whole–not just in this area but in the whole broad area of the administration of justice–and we intend to react to these proposals when that review has been completed.

In this particular area, I personally am of the view that there are amendments that should be brought forward to avoid the situation that was faced in the case of the farmer who lost the cattle that the hon. member is referring to; that is, to avoid unnecessary duplication of proceedings, namely findings in a criminal court that have to be retried in a civil court. I would agree, notwithstanding the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, that there has to be some way where we can avoid that. But until a complete review has been done of the Law Reform Commission's recommendations, which are very extensive, I don't think I can say anything further at the present time.

Mr. Roy: Can I ask a supplementary quickly on that? In view of the questions and the answers that the Attorney General has given earlier on this question of restitution,

would he not agree that the real way of avoiding any duplication of action, of course, is to have a better restitution method at the criminal hearing, which would avoid the civil proceedings? Is there any way the Attorney General can get together with his federal colleagues to resolve this issue of property civil rights, rather than just wait for some court decision?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't think the member for Ottawa East perhaps heard my last answer, because I said we didn't have to await any disposition because the law of Ontario for the present time has been clearly determined by our own Court of Appeal and we are going on the basis that that is the law of Ontario. Until we get a contrary verdict from the Supreme Court of Canada, we assume that the law does allow us to urge the courts to utilize these restitution orders wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Solicitor General has an answer to a question asked previously.

FIRE PREVENTION

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: On Friday last, the member for Port Arthur asked a question regarding fire prevention in northern Ontario. The Fire Marshal's office has arranged a contract for the services of two former members of the fire advisory service of the Fire Marshal's office to review the claims for fire equipment in the unorganized territories which have been submitted to the Ministry of Northern Affairs.

These two former employees are: Mr. George Alexander, the former head of the fire service advisers section of the Fire Marshal's office, and Chief Joe Miller of Mississauga, who is also a former member of that section; they are assisting the Fire Marshal in this survey and are paid through the Isolated Communities Assistance Fund programme. These two men are reviewing the applications from fire services in order that the Fire Marshal can in turn make recommendations to the Ministry of Northern Affairs as to whether or not the equipment requested is realistic. In addition, they do some training and educational work. It is our plan to eventually replace them with permanent staff members.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: I don't believe the minister answered the fundamental part of the question; that is, what is their total time allotment? Are they full time for a full year, as he implied in Thunder Bay? Or are they just part time for part of the year?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I ended up my answer to that question on Friday last by saying that we were using all the time they had available. I don't think they are available full time, and I don't think they have given us any commitment as to how long they are ready to serve us. The answer, as far as I know, is no, they are not full time; and no, they are there for an indeterminate period.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Does the minister think, in all honesty, that that is enough of a commitment to fire prevention and education throughout northern Ontario—two measly part-time people?

Mr. Breithaupt: It's not the people who are measly, it is the programme.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: The commitment is there, and that is why I went on with this last sentence: "It is our plan to eventually replace them with permanent staff members."

Just to enlarge on the programme a little further. As the member will know, it has arisen rather quickly, in the hope of helping some of these isolated communities. Suddenly, one of the best ways to help them was with the request for fire equipment. These requests had to be analysed as to whether they were practical and whether they could be carried out; and so we recruited these two people in a hurry to do this job. We see this as eventually being a continuing programme, and they will be replaced with permanent people. That is our commitment; but so that we could move quickly, we got these temporary people with experience.

WOMEN IN LABOUR FORCE

Ms. Gigantes: A question of the Treasurer: I wonder if he has managed yet to come up with the rationale for counting all women as part of the secondary labour force in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I undertook to get an answer to that question. I haven't, and I will.

Mr. Lewis: It takes some time to find the answer to your own balderdash.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Can the Treasurer say on what basis his budget paper contends that the traditional rate of unemployment among women is higher than for men?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the hon. member debated that at some length yesterday. I don't think we want to particularly get into debate here. I'll answer the question in due course.

WINTARIO FUNDS

Mr. Kerrio: I have a question of the Minister of Culture and Recreation. Could the minister tell me how many cases of fraud involving Wintario funds have been uncovered? How many cases are before the courts? How much Wintario money has been recovered?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As the hon. member will recall, he asked me a question along these lines last week and I indicated that there were some charges laid. That matter is now before the courts. I know of no other charges. And, of course, whether or not these charges are substantiated and any money recovered is a matter to be determined after the courts have examined all the evidence.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary: That doesn't quite answer my question, because we made some calls and we didn't get answers. Could the minister tell me how much of present Wintario administration costs are used for investigating; and if professional auditors will be employed to ensure proper use of the uncommitted Wintario funds?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, as I explained last week, too, when this question of fraud was raised, or the allegations of fraud, we do have procedures with respect to post-commitment audits. Indeed they are qualified people who are doing this. I wouldn't be able, off the top of my head, to attach some percentage of administration cost to that operation but I would be glad to get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Roy: No? Aren't you the minister?

Mr. Good: Just give us a flat figure.

DOWNSVIEW AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. di Santo: I have a question of the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Good: It may be his last question.

Mr. di Santo: Can the minister report to the House on the negotiations on Downsview Airport and on the meetings that have taken place since last month? In particular, can he tell us whether the release of the site has been finalized?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I cannot report to the House because I have not taken part in these negotiations. I have only been contacted through the mails by the Minister of National Defence, advising me that he was going to be making the announcement concerning the Downsview lands being available. The discussions at this time are strictly between staff. I have not had any meetings with either Mayor Lastman, Mr. Danson, Mr. Ouellet or Mr. Godfrey concerning the Downsview properties. Staff have been meeting and we are awaiting reports back from those staff meetings.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary: Since there is some concern among the residents of that area, can the minister at least in his dealings with the federal government apply some pressure so the federal government will consider the release of the whole area, and too, that the site will be released to the municipality of North York so that it could be used for housing, thus avoiding any form of land speculation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am already on record as saying I feel the area should be planned by the community of North York, and that that is how I would like to see it go. I have advised Mr. Danson that I felt he should be dealing with North York and that it should be for housing. The hon. member I think is well aware that when it comes to the point of developing that land, putting plans of subdivision on it, of course the municipality will be very much involved and, as a result, the residents of the municipality will have an opportunity to make their feelings known.

PUBLIC HEALTH NURSES

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. MacDonald: His supporters are really awake.

Mr. Lewis: They are clapping in the dark to keep their spirits up.

Mr. O'Neil: With respect to the industrial inquiry commission looking into the dispute between the Ontario Nurses Association and certain public health units, can the minister tell us whether she has yet received Mr. Sherrif's findings, and if not, when they are expected?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: We're surprised to get an answer.

An hon. member: Tired blood over there.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received the findings as yet. I anticipate that I will have them before the end of April.

Mr. Good: Withdraw your applause.

Mr. O'Neil: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us why the industrial inquiry commission was appointed to look into only three areas of the province while there are unresolved differences in many more areas? Does she propose to set up further inquiries so that the disputes in the other areas can be resolved?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I can't say that I am going to appoint other industrial inquiry commissions. The purpose of setting up this one was to examine as carefully as possible all of the details involved in three fairly typical disputes in widely-spread areas of the province. They seem to represent certain geographical areas. They seem to be reasonably appropriate for this kind of investigation. I will await with great interest the report of the industrial inquiry commissioner.

RACISM IN SCHOOLS

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Education. On Wednesday last, his remarks at the opening of the Ontario Association for Curriculum Development's conference on multiculturalism in education stressed, and I quote, "that the schools must fight racism." In other words, he is joining the hon. Attorney General in that assertion.

[2:45]

Could the minister please inform the House and the schools what he proposes to do in terms of funding the development and implementation of these programmes, or is he committing the schools to fight racism without any commitment from the government?

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend assumes that everything that is promised or suggested can be done is going to take money.

Mr. S. Smith: Or is delivered.

Mr. Reid: He knows better than that, he has been here long enough.

Interjections.

An hon. member: We don't believe you either.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There are a lot of things that the school system can do that are not going to take money.

Mr. S. Smith: The teaching of English and French.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't know whether members realize but we spend more of our gross national product on education in this country than any other country in the world. We spend a lot of money on education in Canada and in the province of Ontario. There are a lot of things that the education system can do to fight racism.

Mr. Reid: You waste a lot too.

Mr. Good: That's the rub.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are going to help the school boards to identify those things and to help them to put them in place in the school system. But we're not necessarily going to provide a lot of money, because it isn't going to take a lot of money to help that attitude become prevalent in the school system of this province.

Interjections.

Mr. Grande: Supplementary: When is the minister going to turn over to the boards of education the $10 million that the federal government gave the province for the use of increasing English by second-language classes and implementing programmes to fight racism? Why is he holding back and why does this government seem to be against the schools at all times?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are as phoney as a $9 bill.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There has to be some kind of a limit.

Mr. Grande: More importantly, what does this government have against the children in this province who need special educational help?

An hon. member: Shame, shame.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would have expected better from my friend, because he did work for the Toronto Board of Educa-

tion at one time and I think he knows a little about the English as a Second Language Programme and about the money that is obtained from the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Very little.

Mr. Foulds: He knows a lot more about it than the minister does.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The only money this government gets from the federal government goes into English as a second language teaching to adults in this province, it's all spent on that particular purpose. We don't get any money for teaching English as a second language from the federal government to pass on to the school boards. They haven't seen fit to give us any money in that particular area, and I think my friend knows that.

We certainly are doing all kinds of things to make it possible to help teachers in this very important and vital area of fighting racism in our schools. If my friend read my total remarks to that national conference on multiculturalism he might be better informed as to what we're doing than he seems to indicate.

NORTHSTAR YACHTS LIMITED

Mr. Riddell: A question of the Minister of Labour: One of the businesses in the Huron industrial park owned by the Ontario government, known as the Northstar Yachts Limited, went into receivership last January. The workers have told me they are not getting any back wages, severance pay, holiday pay or OHIP premium payments on which the company defaulted. Could the minister look into the matter to see if they are not entitled to some of these back wages or holiday pay?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will.

INCO EMISSIONS

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Is the minister aware of a statement by the chairman of the board of International Nickel Company, that Inco would not be meeting the emission standards of 750 tons per day of sulphur dioxide by the end of 1978, as required in a ministerial order? What is his response to the chairman's statement?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, that statement has been made to officials of my ministry as well. They are in compliance at the present time with the control order as far as emissions are concerned. If the company is not able to meet the emission standards that are set down, I guess it would be for the beginning of 1969, then we'll have to deal with them at that time—1979, I'm sorry.

Mr. Germa: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister agree or disagree with the chairman's statement that it is preferable to breathe SO_2 rather than walk around up to our ankles in sulphuric acid? Is that the only option available to the city of Sudbury?

Mr. Lewis: Is that the choice? That's a nice choice.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, I don't agree with that statement.

Mr. Lewis: Sensitive people.

Mr. Bain: Supplementary: Will the minister assure the House, in the strictures that have been placed on the companies in Sudbury, that these guidelines, when enforced, will ensure that sulphur dioxide does not pollute the many lakes in the area, consequently reducing the fish and being very harmful to tourism in the whole area, including such famous lakes as Lake Temagami?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, since the company has been under the existing control order the SO_2 emissions have been substantially reduced by Inco. Certainly in the last two or three years the improvement has been substantial. The control order, of course, calls for improvement every year. The final requirement of 750 is a substantial reduction for 1978, for example. There's no question, with the progress they've made and with the technology, that they may have difficulties, but we'll have to deal with that when we come to it.

As the hon. member implies, the market as far as sulphuric acid goes is not our concern. The level of emission is our concern.

AGGREGATE RESOURCES

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Does the minister concur with the policy proposals as outlined in the report, A Policy for Mineral Aggregate Resource Management in Ontario, and can the minister give the House some indication as to what his intent will be in respect to this report?

Hon. F. S. Miller: If I have my titles correct, Mr. Speaker, that's the working party

report comprised of people from a number of walks of life, naturalists, members of the communities, members of the aggregate industry, members, I believe, of the construction industry and also of the universities.

Mr. Roy: And a couple of Conservatives.

Hon. F. S. Miller: So it was a fairly broad-based committee, as I recall, and I believe it was tabled by the former minister sometime before I assumed the portfolio. We had hoped that there would be responses by sometime in March; I think March 15. A number of groups of people, municipalities and associations, asked that that be postponed until May 15 so they would have time to examine the report fully and to respond.

We have agreed to do so. Therefore, the ministry has neither accepted nor rejected the statements in that report. It will do so only after it's had an opportunity to look at the reactions of the people concerned.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: Would it be the intention of the minister to bring in legislation sometime after May 15, presuming, of course, that we get the election out of the way in the meantime?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, either way we'd be able to.

Mr. Bullbrook: He's worried.

LAND SPECULATION TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. This is in reference to the sale of property by Lynden Hill Farms to Lehendorff Investments. Was any tax paid, or is there any tax claim against Lynden Hill Farms under The Land Speculation Tax Act in that particular transfer?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I seem to recollect sending a letter on this very matter to the member.

Mr. Shore: He can't read.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I think I told him at that time that this particular firm was exempt from the tax.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The answer the minister gave me stated that the lien clearance was given, and the lien clearance does not imply whether tax was paid or not paid. It just says that the company was exempt from paying tax. My question to the minister is: Did Lynden Hill Farms pay any tax in that particular transaction?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, not that I know of.

Mr. Makarchuk: Final supplementary: In view of the fact that no tax was paid, is the minister prepared to submit this matter to the public accounts committee for investigation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: With no innuendoes, of course.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: The question is why?

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: If the Speaker is going to accept that as an answer, then I'll ask the minister another question. Since this matter was put on the order paper requesting information, will the minister undertake to table the documents that supported the decision of her predecessor to exempt the Lynden Hill Farms property from the payment of the tax?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, that question was placed on the order paper and was answered quite fully.

Mr. Nixon: Since then you allowed two—

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary from the hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the minister if she will table all of the documents leading up to the decision that her predecessor took in exempting the Lynden Hill Farms.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I will consider it, Mr. Speaker.

ATIKOKAN HYDRO PLANT

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy in regard to the proposed Hydro plant at Marmion Lake, north of Atikokan. Has the minister received the final submission from Ontario Hydro in regard to the studies it has done in regard to the proposed plant for Atikokan and has the cabinet considered that submission yet?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: No.

Mr. Reid: To both questions?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: To both questions.

Mr. Reid: Can I ask one short supplementary? When is the minister expecting to receive the report and can he give us an indication when a decision might be made, hopefully in the—

Mr. Good: In due time—in due course.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I really couldn't give a definite answer to that. Hopefully soon, and I appreciate the interest of the member in that particular project. May I say that I share his interest in seeing that generating station proceeded with as expeditiously as possible.

HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mr. Breaugh: I have a question for the Minister of Housing: Given the comments reported in the Star yesterday from several major development firms in the Toronto area about his assisted rental programme, essentially saying that it is a nice idea but it is not enough and that even if it were enough and they wanted to do it, it would take at least 30 months to get a project to fruition, is he still sticking with his original projection of an additional 3,000 units within a year in Metro?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it was just one particular developer quoted in that article who claimed 30 months. He is one who does most of his developing, as he says in the article, in the core of Toronto. We are looking at development that will take place in areas other than the downtown core. So I don't expect to have unanimous support of that particular programme from all of the developers but I think there are sufficient numbers who will take part.

Mr. Breaugh: Is the minister contemplating any exercising of his powers as Minister of Housing to either move around the normal planning process or expedite the planning process? And would he elaborate on how he intends to do that with these projects?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I certainly have no intention of moving around the planning process. I think that the planning process is there and that we can discuss the matter of the need for rental housing, which I think is being accepted more and more by municipalities, and I would rather do it with discussion rather than with the big stick that I think the hon. member might be in favour of using.

SERVICES TO THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. Following his recent announcement with regard to treatment at home and so forth, and hiring additional people for employment, is one of his plans that he would have people to treat quadriplegics or these who were confined to wheelchairs in the home—maybe male nurses coming in a day at a time or a few hours a day, or others who may come in and help these people stay in their homes?

Hon. Mr. Norton: If the reference is to the announcement with regard to the employment of young people in providing service in the homes to the elderly and the disabled, the answer would be "no." It's not intended that programme be geared to providing that kind of highly professional help.

The programme is contemplated to provide assistance to those persons who are living in their own homes at the present time and through the provision of such assistance can continue to remain independent in their private dwellings for a longer period of time. It is expected that the kinds of duties that would be performed by these people might range from housekeeping assistance to assistance in maintaining their residence outside and inside, assistance with such necessary duties as shopping, if the person has difficulty getting out in order to do that, and that type of thing. In terms of employment, it is directed towards the young people who are currently on the unemployment rolls in the province.

[3:00]

The provision of more highly professional services is something which we have under consideration, and I have made some general policy statements about that with regard to directions in which we would like to move. I would point out that, under our general welfare assistance programme at the present time, the option is there for municipalities to hire persons to provide that kind of service, either as homemakers or visiting nurses, and we pay an 80 per cent subsidy in the provision of that service.

Mr. Riddell: You pay 40 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Unfortunately, there are many municipalities in the province that have not seen fit to take advantage of that already existing programme under the general welfare assistance programme.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: In providing this youth employment, is the minister going to take into account, in arriving at the numbers to be employed in a municipality, either the percentage of the aged in the community or the fact that some municipali-

ties have a fairly high index of enemployment?

Hon. Mr. Norton: We have corresponded with the municipalities across the province already. I would expect they are in receipt of the initial letter. In that, we have indicated an initial allocation of positions based on population, but not at this point taking into consideration the special local factors that the member cites, such as the percentage of elderly in the population. But we have, in reserve, some additional positions. Not all of the complement is taken up at this point.

We have invited responses from municipalities within 15 days to indicate their interest in the programme and how they view their needs. It's at that point that we would be able to take into consideration the special needs of the municipality. We don't for example, have readily available that kind of information with regard to every municipality across the province. We have invited them to respond to us and, where additional people might be merited across the province, we will try to meet those needs within the limits that we are faced with.

Mr. G. I. Miller: May I have a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: It will be the final supplementary.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Will this programme be available to the private sector, such as the plumbing trade, agriculture trades and industry?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, this programme is designed primarily to meet the needs of the elderly and the disabled who are in need of assistance in order to be maintained in their homes. I can't speak in detail on this, but I believe there is another programme that will be directed to the provision of some jobs, or the stimulation of employment, in the areas that the hon. member has suggested.

BENEFITS RATES

Ms. Sandeman: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Could the minister please explain why the recommendations made to her in February by the Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped about increases in family benefits to the disabled were ignored in the announcement of increases in the family benefits made last week?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: We'll allow a supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: If the minister can't explain it now, will she undertake to explain it in the House as soon as possible? It's a very serious omission.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'll take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Stong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: I think we'd better get on with it. We've gone back now and we're just about out of time.

An hon. member: The original questioner should be allowed one supplementary.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have about five minutes. We'll allow a final supplementary from the original questioner.

Ms. Sandeman: I just wished to ask the minister whether she had discussed these excellent recommendations with the Minister of Community and Social Services?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Those recommendations have been circulated to all of the ministries involved and when I have the responses we will be considering it in total.

YORK REGIONAL COUNCIL

Mr. Stong: Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Premier a question; he promised an answer for Monday, but I understand his mind has been preoccupied. Perhaps I can direct the question to the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Your fate rests in the Premier's hands.

Mr. Stong: Would the Treasurer indicate when he proposes to amend The Regional Municipality of York Act to provide the town of Markham with the extra seat on that regional council which is much needed in that area in terms of the population expansion?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the fullness of time, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are over-represented now.

Mr. O'Neil: Better make it before Thursday.

Mr. S. Smith: The old arrogance.

VOLUNTARY FIRE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Wildman: I have a question for the Solicitor General: Can the Solicitor General tell us if the Fire Marshal's office has resolved the questions regarding legal liability protection and workmen's compensation for voluntary fire departments that have been set up and will receive equipment under the Isolated Communities Assistance Fund? And if so, why was Mr. Huntington of the North Bay office so discouraging to the Aweres township applicants when he met with them to discuss their application recently?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about that last question. If the member can enlarge upon it, I will try to get some further information. But I think any of these community groups or whoever may be looking after volunteer fire departments can, as I understand it, obtain workmen's compensation if they wish to pay the premium and apply for it.

If he wants further information on that last question, I will try to get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary: I understand that if they are trained by the Fire Marshal's office they can get workmen's compensation. But what about the question of legal liability if there is injury or whatever resulting from travelling to a fire or during the process of fighting a fire?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I don't grasp the impact of that question. Is the member concerned with liability to some person that may be struck on the highway as they are rushing—

Mr. Wildman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Well, I suppose that's the regular law of the land, as far as the court is concerned. If a fire reel or any other piece of emergency equipment strikes somebody in going to a fire or going to an emergency call, they are subject to the same law of the land as any of the rest of us are.

SALES TAX ON INSULATION MATERIALS

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Revenue: Will the minister reconsider the government's budget policy on energy conservation and extend sales tax exemption to include storm windows and doors? The federal sales tax exemption includes storm windows and doors as insulating materials.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I am aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but we will not consider it at this time.

HYDRO BLACKOUTS

Mr. Foulds: I ask a question of the Minister of Energy with some reluctance: Could the minister indicate whether the statements made by the public relations officer of Ontario Hydro in early March about the possibility of rotating blackouts in northwestern Ontario is still the view of Ontario Hydro and his ministry? And what steps is his ministry taking to overcome those blackouts of power because of the low water levels in the region?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I have to check the source of that particular statement by Ontario Hydro, but I can assure the member that I think that we can feel confident in this province that we won't suffer blackouts in any part of Ontario.

Mr. Conway: Not even on June 9.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Could he get a more definitive answer for me, taking into account that the tie lines between Manitoba and northwestern Ontario and eastern Ontario and northwestern Ontario now are operating at full capacity and there is no further generating capacity within the northwest?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You know why.

CANADIAN HISTORY

Mr. Sweeney: A question for the Minister of Education: Given the disagreements that we have had in this House about the quality of the teaching of Canadian history in the secondary schools, how does the minister intend to respond to John Palmer, the head of the history department of Orillia Secondary School, Roger Graham, a history professor at Queen's University, and Eugene Forsey of the Canadian Senate, who have all declared in writing to him that the new guidelines for Canadian history for grades nine and 10 are totally inadequate as history, and are in fact no more than sociology?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The socialists will be happy to hear that. That's a putdown.

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, I haven't seen that letter; I would like to see the letter and the substance of it. I recall a few weeks ago that the leader of the Liberal Party talked in this House about some statements made by Ian Macdonald concerning the teaching of history, which I later learned were never made by Ian Macdonald.

I would be very happy to look at the letters that the member has. I would also be happy to table for him the names of the practising history teachers in this province who wrote that document. I guess it's quite possible that historians and history teachers will differ over what should be taught in the schools; but the intermediate history document that the member is talking about was written by a writing team made up of practising history teachers in this province and people from the Ministry of Education, all experts in the teaching of history, and people who should be able to be relied upon to develop a guideline for history in this province.

I say that, but I also say that I would like to see the detailed letters, because the leader of the Liberal Party indicated that Ian Macdonald made some statements some while ago, which Mr. Macdonald never made.

Mr. Conway: None of your innuendoes.

Mr. Nixon: Did they really forget to mention both world wars?

Mr. Breithaupt: Whatever happened to the two world wars?

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: It's a personal attack on Eugene Forsey. He's speaking at the Empire Club on Thursday.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question period has expired.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Makarchuk: I wish to advise you, Mr. Speaker, under standing order 27 that I am dissatisfied with the answer I have received to my question to the Minister of Revenue, and intend to debate it at the adjournment of the House this evening.

PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday three petitions were tabled by Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Breaugh and Mr. Godfrey. I stated that I would examine them and report to the House today as to whether or not these petitions are in order.

I direct the attention of the House to standing order 84, which reads as follows: "No petition can be received which prays for any expenditure, grant or charge on the public revenue, whether payable out of the consolidated revenue fund or out of moneys to be provided by the House."

I must then direct the attention of the House to the last sentence of paragraph one of the three petitions, which reads as follows: "As an immediate solution, we require that increased funding from the province be made available in the amount requested by the region in December, 1975 of the Treasurer of Ontario."

The House will see that these petitions are in direct contravention of standing order 84 and, therefore, cannot be received. I am directing the petitions be returned to the members.

Perhaps I might suggest, however, that the petitioners might make their representation to the Treasurer in some other way.

Any further petitions?

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. Breaugh: Respecting your ruling, I don't read anywhere that it's asking anybody to give money. It simply makes a statement of fact, that we require—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is debating. I think if he reads what I said and refers to standing order 84, he'll understand the answer very clearly because it is a very clear statement of the rule. As I say, I don't want to debate the issue because it's not my position to debate it. But it said that—we require that increased funding be provided by the province—in so many words.

Mr. Bullbrook: This is a point of order, I want you to know that at the beginning.

Mr. Singer: One of the very few.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yesterday you permitted, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: To wear a suit.

Mr. Bullbrook: —seconded by the Leader of the Opposition to move before you in this House a motion that reads—"this House condemns the misrepresentation by the Treas-

urer of the government's fiscal situation and Ontario's economic prospects."

[3:15]

I took issue with that yesterday and I take issue with it today. That is entirely out of order. That assertion condemning a misrepresentation by another member of this House is entirely out of order. It's against our standing orders. It should be expurgated from that motion.

If you are going to permit that type of thing, it will just expand and we will lose all sense of the orders of this House. I ask for a ruling from you. I believe under the rules of order and under May's interpretation you can expurgate that particular section.

We might wish to conclude in our own mind that there was a misinterpretation by the Treasurer of Ontario of the budgetary and economic situation in Ontario—

Mr. Cassidy: There certainly was.

Mr. Bullbrook: —but we cannot, viva voce or by motion, accuse him of misrepresentation.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I appreciate the fact that the member for Sarnia has raised this matter, but it had been my intention at some time during the afternoon also to raise this question.

I understand there may have been a note of irony in the voice and the face of the leader of the official opposition when he said, just as the amendment was being seconded in his name, that the terms of the amendment were, to quote him, "soft and gentle terms, compared to what we would have wished." However, I am sure all members of the House would agree the amendment to the main budget motion is by tradition a very serious matter, as the member for Sarnia has pointed out, and we on this side would wish to view this just in that way.

So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you would advise the House as soon as you could as to whether it is accepted parliamentary language to say that the Treasurer of this province has misrepresented the government's fiscal situation and Ontario's economic prospects.

Mr. Cassidy: That's what happened.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is my view that it is not, and quite apart from the arguments made in his text by the member, that this is quite unparliamentary language.

Mr. Renwick: If I may speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly defer to you if you were to decide this was not a point of order and bring this matter to an immediate conclusion. If you were to decide it is a point of order, I would like to have an opportunity to speak to it. Could I therefore ask, in the interest of expediting the business of the House, that you make the initial decision as to whether or not the member for Sarnia had a point of order?

Mr. Bullbrook: It's one of the few points of order that have ever been made that is a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I will make that ruling right now, because I was concerned. When I was handed the motion yesterday, I am afraid I didn't get the full impact or import of the motion. I was certainly concerned about the expression when that amendment was used yesterday, and I discussed it—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Singer: You invited him to go, and now he's gone further than you wanted.

Mr. Renwick: I want you to understand that I would like to have the opportunity of speaking to the point of order, before you make a ruling on the matter before you. That is, if you are about to decide that there was a point of order, I would ask that I be given an opportunity to speak to it.

Mr. Singer: Why did you interrupt the Speaker? You know the Speaker has precedence even over you.

Mr. MacDonald: Is it a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: I was going to rule that it was a legitimate point of order.

Mr. Breithaupt: There is no question about that.

Mr. Renwick: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of being in the House all afternoon yesterday when my colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre, was speaking on the budget for this party. When he moved the amendment, which is permitted—and I agree with the member for Sarnia and the House leader for the government that it is a serious matter, because it is the amendment of this party to the motion by the Treasurer for the adoption of his budget—I listened carefully, and I had had, of course, on opportunity of considering the wording of the amendment before it was put in this House.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when a member stands on an important matter of a point of order, and there are rules of the House which refer to that matter, it is important that we deal with the rules. I draw the attention of the House to rule 39, which states, "Whenever the Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the rules and privileges of Parliament, he shall apprise the House thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and may quote the rule or authority applicable to the case."

Mr. Breithaupt: Would you like him to wait until December?

Mr. Renwick: Some members may note a certain ambiguity in the rule of the assembly which would indicate that there is some conflict about the point in time when the Speaker is to apprise the House of whether the motion is or is not in order for the reasons given.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in considering your ruling, that the operative part of those words is as follows: "Whenever the Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the rules and privileges of Parliament, he shall apprise the House thereof immediately . . .". I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that whatever your personal opinion may be of the matter, the rules of the House require that you should have apprised the House immediately the amendment was offered to you and at the time when you, sir, repeated it in this House yesterday afternoon.

But be that as it may, and in the interest of clarifying the substance of what we are speaking about, when my colleague, the member for Sarnia, came to us yesterday to note that the motion might have been out of order, for a moment I noted in my own mind that perhaps it was because his colleagues in the Liberal Party wanted to find some reason for voting against the motion.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's out of order. That's imputation.

Mr. Renwick: But I knew, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, come on.

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order now, Mr. Speaker. You cannot—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Renwick: But I knew, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't—

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, you cannot impute motives.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. S. Smith: You cannot impute motives.

Mr. Renwick: But, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, I did not—

Mr. Bullbrook: All right. May I say this to you—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we have order in the House?

Mr. Renwick: But, Mr. Speaker, so I can clarify that—

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's objection is what?

Mr. Bullbrook: That he imputed motives to me. We happen to abide by—

An hon. member: He can't interrupt a speaker—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we should hear this member; then, if there's further to say about it, I'll hear you and then I will deliver my ruling.

Mr. Bullbrook: I take strong issue—

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much.

Mr. Bullbrook: My point of order is—

Mr. Speaker: I would like to hear what the hon. member had said, please; and I did not hear that, I must say.

Mr. Bullbrook: He'll repeat that for you.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can't recall the exact words, but—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member try to stay in order then himself, whatever it is?

Mr. Renwick: —when my colleague, the member for Sarnia, raised this matter, it went through my mind like a flash—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That doesn't surprise me.

Mr. Breithaupt: It went in one door and right out the other.

Mr. Renwick: —that perhaps the reason he was raising it was so that the Liberal Party would not have to support the motion made.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's not in order.

Mr. Renwick: But I knew, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that is not a legitimate suggestion or imputation of motive to make.

Mr. S. Smith: An imputation of motive.

Mr. Renwick: I knew I shouldn't do that, because that would be contrary to the rules of the House—

Mr. Lewis: That's right. Exactly.

Mr. Sweeney: When did you take up mind-reading?

Mr. S. Smith: Which you did, and Hansard will record it.

Interjection.

Mr. Renwick: My colleague, Mr. Speaker, directing my remarks to—

Mr. S. Smith: I wonder if you are doing this to avoid hearing the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson).

Mr. Lewis: He's got five hours.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to hear the hon. member's colleague all evening as well as this afternoon.

Mr. Breithaupt: We can arrange that.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sarnia has asked that you rule that the phrase in the motion addressed to this House on behalf of this party by the member for Ottawa Centre, which reads as follows, "condemns the misrepresentation by the Treasurer of the government's fiscal situation and Ontario's economic prospects," should be expunged from the motion. He quoted, of course, a voluminous reference of authority, namely May's Parliamentary Procedure, but without any reference to any page or rule or any other citation in that book.

Mr. Bullbrook: Of what consequence is that?

Mr. Renwick: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention the refinements of the English language contained in the phrase which my colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre, used. You will note, and I think it must be, the words "condemn" and "misrepresentation" that caused all the difficulty. So I went to the dictionary and I found that the word "misrepresentation" is a composite word.

Interjection.

Mr. Renwick: First of all, you have to look up the meaning of the word presentation, then the meaning of representation and then the meaning of the word misrepresentation.

Mr. Breithaupt: Both Miss and Ms.

Mr. Renwick: I did that, and the authoritative dictionary meaning of the term "presentation" is a statement. As was quoted in the July issue of Hibbert's Journal in 1907, at page 927—

Mr. Bullbrook: You are permitting a charade here.

Mr. Renwick: —as illustrative of the meaning of the word "presentation"—and I quote: "His presentations of the orthodox case—"

Interjection.

Mr. Renwick: I quote again. I would like the Treasurer to hear this.

Mr. Lewis: You just cut yourself off.

Mr. Renwick: "His presentations of the orthodox case are sometimes the merest travesties of what educated opponents really hold." That is the meaning of presentation, Mr. Speaker. The meaning of representation is a renewed presentation. The meaning of misrepresentation is a wrong or incorrect representation.

Mr. Lewis: Now, what's wrong with that?

Mr. Renwick: Therefore, there can be nothing wrong with the term misrepresentation in any sense of that word in the English language.

And then I turned to the word "condemn". I find that the first meaning is "to express strong disapproval of." My colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre, on behalf of this party, expressed strong disapproval of.

Mr. S. Smith: It sounds like an elementary school debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But those of us who don't have your intellect know exactly what you meant.

Mr. Lewis: You made a mistake on some other words.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Riverdale has the floor.

Mr. Renwick: If I could refer to the 1601 folio of Shakespeare's Twelfth Night, in Act III, scene four at folio 149, you find the quotation—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Michael, you are squirming a little.

Mr. Renwick: I quote—

Mr. S. Smith: This is a filibuster.

Mr. Conway: Save us from this.

Mr. Renwick: As Shakespeare in Twelfth Night said:—

Mr. Breithaupt: Full of sound and fury and signifying nothing.

Mr. Renwick: "I could condemn it as an improbable fiction." I wanted the House to understand the sequence of events. You will recall that—

Mr. Breithaupt: Now you have done it.

Mr. Renwick: —scene four took place in Olivia's garden. Perhaps for those who haven't quite recalled it, Olivia was a rich countess. Fabian was a servant to Olivia. Malvolio was steward to Olivia. Sir Toby Belch was the uncle of Olivia, and Maria was Olivia's waiting woman. And in the garden that evening—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do you realize what you are doing?

Mr. Breithaupt: I think he doth protest too much, milord.

Mr. Speaker: I think so too.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we're carrying this too far.

Mr. Lewis: I think the hon. member for Ottawa Centre should be congratulated on the use of the word.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think I should deliver my ruling at this time.

Mr. Bullbrook: There is a point of order. It is either in order or it is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this is being carried—

Mr. Renwick: I beg the opportunity to complete my remarks briefly.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we are carrying a little too far afield this afternoon. We have allowed quite a bit of leeway—

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, may I put in context the quotation that I quoted?

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the hon. member—

Interjection.

Mr. Germa: The whole point of order is frivolous.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would like the hon. member to conclude his remarks in about a sentence or two. I'll allow that. But we don't want a further long dissertation. Now, please, order.

[3:30]

An hon. member: The whole point has not been out of order.

An hon. member: It shouldn't have been allowed.

Mr. Renwick: I will speak relatively quickly. "Maria—"

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: No I mean very, very briefly. I think we've allowed the hon. member a great leeway and we want to get on with the business of the House and deal with this matter. If he's not satisfied with my ruling he knows what he can do about it.

Mr. Breithaupt: He can sit down.

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: "Maria: 'Get him to say his prayers, good Sir Toby; get him to pray.'

"Malvolio: 'My prayers, minx!'

"Maria: 'No, I warrant you he will not hear of godliness.'

"Malvolio: 'Go hang yourselves all! You are idle shallow things; I am not of your element; you shall know more hereafter.' "

And he leaves.

"Sir Toby: 'Is it possible?'

"Fabian: 'If this were play'd upon a stage now, I could condemn it as an improbable fiction.' "

Mr. Riddell: You people are prepared to face an election with that kind of claptrap?

Mr. Renwick: My submission, Mr. Speaker, is that what my colleague was saying is that he expressed strong disapproval of the Treasurer's budget because it was an improbable fiction.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I have not completed my ruling at this point, I would like to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you mind if I have a brief comment before you make your ruling?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Very, very brief; yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House are very clear. If yesterday's motion was out of order it should have been ruled out of order by you immediately.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not necessarily so.

Mr. MacDonald: I'm sure you are mindful of the fact that if you rule it out of order now, you are breaching the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer did not disagree with a word in the amendment, not a word. He sat and accepted it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. Speaker: All right, very briefly.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to this House that no word spoken or tabled yesterday by the member from Ottawa lost me one little bit of sleep.

Interjections.

Mr. MacDonald: That is personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I've allowed this to go on. I think I should make my ruling. If there's a question on it, it can be handled later.

I'm quite familiar and quite aware of rule number—I think it's 39—which uses the word "immediately"; it says also, "of the opinion."

Now when the amendment was placed yesterday I didn't have that opinion at the time, although it did cause me some concern. In other words, I hadn't made up my mind at that particular time. So the words "immediately" and "of the opinion" must be taken into account.

I've discussed this since that time with the other presiding officers in this House and together we have concluded that that use of the word, "misrepresentation" I believe it was, to accuse another member of deliberate misrepresentation or of deliberately misleading the House or of telling a deliberate falsehood, is clearly out of order. If the hon. member will refer to those particular words, any of these precedents would appear to apply in this instance.

I would accept a motion from the member to amend his motion by substituting another word for "misrepresentation", such as if I might be—

Mr. Lewis: We will give you one, we will find one.

Mr. Grossman: Don't help him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If he might substitute the word "misinterpretation" for the word "misrepresentation," I think that word might serve his purpose and be within the rules of this House. Will the hon. member so do?

Mr. MacDonald: Take time to consider it.

Mr. Speaker: The word "misinterpretation" instead of "misrepresentation", because this matter of opinion could be debated all day. Will the hon. member please substitute that word, or withdraw it completely as the case may be?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is clear that the House understands exactly what I was saying when I made my speech yesterday. I think it is also interesting that there was no objection raised from the government benches about the words that I used at that time, either during the speech when the word was used on a number of occasions, or during the motion.

Mr. Breithaupt: Are you going to withdraw or not?

Mr. Cassidy: However, in view of your ruling and in view of the fact that the House is clear about the meaning of the speech yesterday, I would accept your suggestion.

Mr. Cassidy moved that the word "misrepresentation" be stricken from his motion and the word "misinterpretation" substituted therefor.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, as the person who seconded the motion of my colleague from Ottawa Centre yesterday, I'm happy to have that substitution. But, as in the case of another word in this Legislature which caused

some anxiety, I think it's worth occasionally, if I may say, looking at the dictionary definitions. What my colleague, the hon. member for Riverdale, put to you about the wrong or incorrect representation of facts is not something that should be seen to be a violation of the rules of the House, although we bowed to your ruling, sir, and substituted the word.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. May I say I did check the dictionary. We had to put an interpretation on the English language, which isn't as precise sometimes as we would like it.

Mr. Lewis: Precisely.

Mr. Speaker: But that was the consensus of opinion. I want to thank the hon. member for agreeing to the suggestion, and it will be so changed on the records.

Mr. Lewis: Shakespeare says that defile can mean to impugn the reputation of, not violate physically.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A further point of order.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I have been dissatisfied with the answer of the Treasurer of Ontario concerning my question asked today—it was a repetition of a question asked last week. I would, therefore, like to give notice under standing order 27 that I would like to debate this matter this evening after the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The rule requires that this objection be made note of immediately at the end of the question period. We got into the next order.

An hon. member: This is immediately.

An hon. member: Twenty-four hours is immediately.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I may not have given the hon. member the chance to rise. I did accept one but I could be generous in this case in case I did not give the hon. member time. As I recall it, I hastily went into the next order and probably was unfair to the hon. member. I will accept it because it's so close to that, and it's the first time we've had the opportunity.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH ACT

Mr. Drea moved first reading of Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I understand this is a private bill.

Mr. Drea: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to discuss it.

Mr. Speaker: There's no explanatory statement necessary or allowed on a private bill.

Mr. Drea: I wanted to make a request of the chairman, Mr. Speaker, not a statement. The bill is of some urgency. It has been held up on technical language for some time. There is the opportunity on Thursday in the administration of justice committee to discuss it. I would hope that it could be brought forward to that committee by the Speaker's panel.

Mr. Roy: That is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I will have to study that request, just to see whether it's possible to do that, and report.

BOROUGH OF NORTH YORK ACT

Mr. Williams moved first reading of Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Motion agreed to.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Kerr moved first reading of Bill 59, An Act to amend The Environmental Assessment Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to.

CASGRAIN TOWNSHIP LANDS ACT

Mr. Lane moved first reading of Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Certain Lands in the Township of Casgrain.

Motion agreed to.

PENSION BENEFITS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. di Santo moved first reading of Bill 60, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1976.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. di Santo: The purpose of the bill is to permit employees to accumulate pension benefits while employed, due to disablement.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lewis: A point of order, following directly from something that was asked at the beginning of the orders of the day by the member for Rainy River. There was no accompanying compendium of material tabled by the Minister of the Environment as he undertook to do earlier this afternoon in his amendments to The Environmental Assessment Act. He sent over the amendments with their explanation plus a copy of the Act and only the statement he gave in the House; no background documents at all. Although in this subject, above all other subjects, there are endless numbers of background papers to which the House should be privy.

Mr. Speaker: A bulky amount of material came up when he presented his bill; I believe that's what that was.

Mr. Foulds: All it contains is a copy of the original Act, the material itself and the minister's statement.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order: I repeat, all you have here is the bill and the copy of the statement to the Legislature. This does not constitute background information, it is in violation of the rules in the absence of background information and it contradicts what the minister told the House quite explicitly earlier this afternoon. Since the Speaker is so anxious to give formal interpretation of the rules, and I encourage him in that, would you please take this into control, Mr. Speaker, because it is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, well, of course I couldn't possibly be aware of what was in the material but I'll certainly bring that to the attention of the minister in his deficiency—

Mr. Lewis: The member for Rainy River asked him and got an undertaking—

Mr. Reid: I asked him explicitly.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I cannot bring it to the attention of the hon. minister right now because he's not present but I'll do that immediately. I promise it.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. di Santo moved first reading of Bill 61, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to.

[3:45]

Mr. di Santo: The bill requires that employers with 20 or more employees hire injured workers with permanent partial disabilities.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE
(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Peterson: I must say I'm very grateful to rise on behalf of my party to participate in this debate. At the outset, I would just like to say how very grateful I am to many, many people for assisting me in this undertaking. I must say it's a massive undertaking. The books of this province are complicated and sophisticated. It takes a lot of assistance and a lot of help and I've had that from a lot of people outside of this Legislature who have been good enough to contribute their views and to assist us in the formulation of our policy.

In addition, I want to thank the really first-rate research department that we have in this party today.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When did they start? Yesterday?

Mr. Peterson: You just watch. You'll be devastated when you hear it. I want to particularly mention, if I may, two people, Mrs. Daphne Rutherford and Miss Jane Shapiro, who worked very hard on this and were a great help to me.

In fairness too, I want to thank the Treasurer because in my experience with the Treasurer and his department they have always been fair and honourable to me and to my staff in the presentation of their num-

bers, in assisting. God knows, we have lots of disagreements over the interpretation of those numbers, but never once have we asked and been denied. Never once have we, in my judgement at least, had things interpreted only in his light. I appreciate that kind of fairness.

Before I start, I will say—and it's probably the last nice thing I'm going to say about him today, so I should just say it—it's a measure of the Treasurer's confidence that he's willing to share these kinds of things and some kind of indication of his command of his portfolio. That's not to say he's right by any stretch of the imagination in a lot of the judgements he makes.

Mr. Conway: Maybe he is going for Joe Clark's job.

Mr. Peterson: At least he's got a little bigger chin than Joe Clark. He might be able to make it. But I do appreciate that. I must say that I wore a used suit today, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting that the member for Ottawa Centre had to take his suit back today. I think that's some sort of indication.

Mr. Moffatt: Who owns the suit?

Mr. Peterson: I want you to know that I own this suit. I do not rent this suit.

Mr. Ruston: He's had it for 10 years.

Mr. Peterson: Granted it's old and granted it's not very attractive, but it is mine. We value private property in this party and we don't think that you necessarily should have to rent everything. I want you to know that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Moffatt: Who owns the cloth?

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you put everything else on a blind person except that suit?

Mr. Peterson: It's my intention in the next little while to share with the Legislature and the people of Ontario our party's assessment of the financial state of the province at this time, our prospects for the future and our assessment of the prospects of this province for the future. We shall do this in the context of what are, in our judgement, some very serious fiscal and management errors in the past.

That's not to imply that this government alone is responsible for all of our problems, because that isn't the case. Nor is it the only government in the free world to have been seduced by the temptation to spend far beyond its ability to create the financial resources or trapped into unwise financial and management decisions. But the inescapable fact remains that the mistakes of others do not justify the mistakes of this government. They do not justify the failure to react or the failure to look ahead to protect the people of this province.

Clearly it is this government's past failures which have so severely limited the options available to us today. This province's capacity to pay and to borrow have been so overextended that now when we so desperately need massive stimulation to reduce the staggering unemployment rate in this province there simply is no room to manoeuvre. The government has created this situation and the government alone must shoulder that blame.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party in Ontario has always believed in and supported the concept of fiscal responsibility and we always will. I am proud that in a large measure we had an influence as a party in bringing this to the attention of the people of this province. We don't think the job of repair has been satisfactory enough; but we are responsible for that and I say that with some pride, Mr. Speaker.

It is our opinion that even within the confines of the present situation, the Treasurer could have done a better job with following a policy of fiscal responsibility, and at the same time relieving many of the hardships of the people of this province and also securing some kind of worthwhile future. I intend to set forth, in as clear and rational a manner as I possibly can, our carefully considered policy options, as well as analysis of past and present mistakes on the part of the government. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will be very cool and rational and I will not be excited when I do this.

It's obvious that when I do, when I point out to the Treasurer that he's wrong, he gets very excited and he starts to yell almost involuntarily. We don't want him to have a stroke or break a blood vessel, because there are enough dead people in the cabinet already. We are prepared to keep him alive for just a little while longer.

Mr. Breaugh: Marvin might get apoplexy.

Mr. Peterson: Where is Marvin? Has he died already?

Mr. Conway: Marvin's gone after the Social Credit nomination.

Mr. Breaugh: He's chairman of the committee.

Mr. Riddell: Where are the Tories? It is interesting to note there are four of them over there.

Mr. Peterson: Don't worry; we are going to mail them all copies of this.

Mr. Conway: We have the only one that's important.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Can we have some order please? The hon. member for London Centre has the floor, and I hope he will ignore the interjections.

Mr. Peterson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My party is becoming very unruly they are so excited about all of this.

Mr. Breaugh: Takes all the credit, doesn't he?

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, this government's recent policies have brought the province to a position where it is lagging behind the nation as a whole in virtually every leading economic indicator. Ontario's economy is suffering from the highest unemployment in decades; 312,000 people unemployed in March, a real rate of 7.9 per cent. We are suffering from continuing high inflation and under-utilization of our manufacturing industries. There is stagnation in our mining industry and widespread lack of confidence among consumers and businessmen alike.

The figures for 1976 produced in the recent budget provide a clear indication of the extent to which our economy is under-performing. Due to unemployment and underemployment, personal income tax revenues are $172 million below budget. As a result of lack of consumer confidence, retail sales tax revenues are $107 million below budget. The crisis in our mines is reflected in mining profits taxes which yielded only 42 per cent of their budget.

Weak markets, high costs and general uncertainty which have plagued businessmen, have resulted in a shortfall of $95 million in corporate income tax revenue to the province. Our budgetary deficit is now running $302 million over budget. Also over budget are: Net cash requirements, by $158 million; net debt, by $212 million; net non-public borrowing, including Canada Pension Plan, OMERS and teachers' superannuation plan, by $72 million.

This government has not, it is clear, been capable of living up to its own restraint measures. Our economy is in serious trouble and there are no signs of improvement.

Businessmen still lack confidence in our economic prospects. The Bank of Montreal questioned 1,212 Ontario businessmen recently. Forty-six per cent plan less capital spending this year than in 1976 and we have been behind consistently for the past five years. Eighty-one per cent expect their business will not improve in 1977 compared with poor performance in 1976. Consumer confidence remains low.

Now Mr. Speaker, a prudent government, a government which had cut back on deficits during times of prosperity, would not now be so limited in its ability to overcome an economic slowdown. A good Treasurer must be a little bit like a squirrel, Mr. Speaker. He has got to store up in the good times for the bad times. I must say that my analogy with the squirrel and this particular Treasurer only goes as far as a similarity in looks—I mean only when he chuckles, not all of the time.

This budget is at best a stand-pat budget. It is an attempt to repair the damage of the past. It is a backward looking, traditional budget, very much lacking in imagination, which demonstrates all too clearly that this government has made no adjustment in priorities and has no awareness of the changes that have taken place in our economy.

The day before the new budget was brought down, newspaper photographs showed the Treasurer with his feet up in the air, flaunting his 1977 budget and smiling from ear to ear. His sense of humour is somewhat peculiar because I can tell the House that this budget brings little cheer to many of the hard-pressed citizens of this province, especially to the thousands and hundreds of thousands that are unemployed.

By and large, it's a big guy's budget. It's disappointing to those in need of assistance, to those who are desperately seeking jobs—particularly a whole generation now coming into the work force—and to the ordinary people who are trying, against enormous odds, to withstand economic forces that are out of control. It is also a disappointment to those of us who are concerned about the future. It provides no leadership in vital matters of energy, environment or industrial strategy.

Before I embark on a detailed discussion of this budget, I want to review briefly this government's past economic performance, because this budget is part of a pattern.

In 1971, the year of the first Davis-McKeough budget, the Treasurer announced his intention to "maintain firm control over public spending." He was clearly less than successful in carrying out this intention because provincial government expenditures increased by some 15.5 per cent that year—almost $1 billion. The deficit reached a record

$1.018 billion that year—an election year. Final spending figures were more than $1 billion higher than budgetary estimates.

The Treasurer promised us rigorous restraint on spending in 1972. What he delivered was an expenditure increase of almost $450 million—about 7.5 per cent. That was the year that government spending increased 50 per cent more than the cost of living, the year government spending was more than $1 billion higher than original estimates.

The House will recall that the former member for London South, Mr. White, was Treasurer for the following two provincial budgets. He faithfully maintained the tradition of huge deficits and uncontrolled government spending.

Mr. Nixon: If we only had Charlie MacNaughton back.

Mr. Peterson: In 1973 the stated objective was to exercise maximum restraint in provincial spending. How was this interpreted in practical terms? By calling for a spending increase of $750 million, up 11.7 per cent from the previous year. When all the figures were in, spending had increased by some $811 million, $51 million more than the Treasurer had estimated. Spending was up 12.7 per cent in a year when inflation in Ontario was advancing at 7.6 per cent.

Presenting the 1974 budget, the Treasurer informed the people of Ontario, as if they didn't already know, that the most important problem facing us today is inflation. Is it starting to sound familiar? Spending in the public sector must be controlled, he said, and promptly called for an increase in government spending of 14.9 per cent, while at the same time predicting that the inflation rate for the general economy would be 7.7 per cent by the end of that fiscal year.

It was obvious that the government had yet again underestimated its spending requirements for the fourth consecutive year, because the predicted increase of 14.2 per cent had jumped to 20.8 per cent. The budget was overspent by approximately $385 million.

Apparently deficit financing had become almost a matter of government policy. In the 1970-71 financial year, Ontario's budgetary and non-budgetary deficit was $566 million. The following year, an election year, it was more than $1 billion. In 1972-73 it was $744 million. In 1973-74 it was $708 million.

When the provincial budget was brought down for the fiscal year 1975-76, we learned the government was going into debt by $1.7 billion, with government expenditures increasing by 16.8 per cent—$1.5 billion. A mini-budget was subsequently produced and updated to December 1975, by which time the increase in government spending had jumped from 16.8 per cent to 21.2 per cent.

An hon. member: A political whitewash.

Mr. Peterson: Budgetary and non-budgetary deficit figures updated to December 1975 were almost $2 billion.

Mr. S. Smith: The year of the big giveaway.

Mr. Peterson: In 1976, after five years of preaching restraint and the need for control over the economy, budgetary and non-budgetary expenditures finally came in $11 million below the original budget estimate. However, revenues were overestimated by $169 million, so that net cash requirements for 1976 increased by $158 million to almost $1.4 billion. Government spending is up by almost 12 per cent. The budget has been overspent by $55 million and the budgetary deficit is $302 million over what was estimated.

[4:00]

An hon. member: Work along with Davis.

Mr. Peterson: After all this talk about restraint, it is my judgement that this cannot truly be called restraint or disciplined financial planning of any type.

Mr. Conway: Profligacy.

Mr. Peterson: What kind of restraint and what manner of fiscal management are reflected in a record that shows that in the four years from 1970 to 1974 the province's accumulated net debt more than doubled—from $1.4 billion to $2.9 billion? By March 1976, two years later, this provincial net debt more than doubled again, rising to $6.2 billion.

Mr. Nixon: Plus Hydro.

Mr. Peterson: Whereas it would have cost $185.03 per person to pay off Ontario's debt in 1970, that figure has increased four and a half times in six years, so that by 1976 the per capita cost of debt is $735.43. The projection for 1977 is $840.42 per capita.

In summary, here's the Conservative legacy of fiscal responsibility since John Robarts' last full year as Premier: Budgetary expenditures almost tripled—from $4.2 billion to

$11.8 billion, an average annual rate of increase of 15.8 per cent. The projection for 1977 is close to $13 billion. Budgetary deficits total $4.8 billion; the projection for 1977 adds almost another billion to that deficit. The province's net debt has quadrupled; it has increased 300 per cent from $1.5 billion to over $6 billion. The projection for 1977 has the net debt rising a further 16 per cent to $7.2 billion.

The net debt per capita has increased 297 per cent, from $185.03 to $735.43, and is projected to rise this year to $840.42, an annual increase of 14 per cent. The net debt as a percentage of gross provincial product has increased by 93 per cent; with 1977 projection, that increase will be 100 per cent. The net debt as a percentage of budgetary revenue has jumped by more than three-quarters, from 31.9 per cent to 58.7 per cent. For 1977 the percentage is expected to rise to 60.1 per cent.

Interest payments on the public debt rose 325 per cent from $209 million to $889 million. Projections for 1977 show a further increase of 17 per cent to a total of over $1 billion annually in interest payments in this province. That's $2.85 million a day in interest. I regret that this speech is going to cost the taxpayers a lot of money, because every minute I am talking means something like $2,000 a minute in interest for this province.

Mr. Nixon: Shame.

Mr. Roy: Do you wonder why the province is in a mess, Darcy?

Mr. Peterson: What has transpired and what I want to discuss next, after putting the recent performance in a relevant context, is the effect of these massive deficits on the economy, and what has happened to our financial status and financial standing in the province at this time.

As a result of constant deficit spending, the triple-A credit rating of this province was placed in serious jeopardy last year. An extract from Standard and Poor's rating report contained the following comment: "While Ontario continues its dominant position among the provinces of Canada, we are concerned about its increasing deficits. We are continuing our high-grade rating on the province of Ontario's direct obligation debentures and notes, but we will watch Ontario's economic and financial activities closely." It was at this point that external forces started to govern this province.

Mr. S. Smith: That's right.

Mr. Peterson: John McDowell of Standard and Poor was quoted as saying, "Our big concern is the budget deficit in Ontario. They say it is to stimulate the economy. We could understand that when it was $200 million to $300 million, but this thing sometimes seems to be getting a little out of hand. We've gone along with it this year, but only on the basis that it is temporary."

Mr. S. Smith: You preach restraint, but it was forced on you.

Mr. Peterson: Both rating agencies, Moody's and Standard and Poor, issued a clear warning that they would like to see a fast reduction of the Ontario government's spending deficit. The implication of a reduction in our credit rating would be an increase in our cost of borrowing money, and a decrease in the availability of funds for us. The importance of this is obvious, when consideration is given to the huge borrowing needs of Ontario Hydro, the debentures of which are guaranteed by the province of Ontario. What clearer indication can the Treasurer have had of the danger of constant deficit spending, which he has guaranteed this province until 1981?

While the Treasurer may remain blissfully unaware of the seriousness of the problem, at least one of his cabinet colleagues is not. In a speech in Belleville earlier this month, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) stressed that drastic steps are needed to retain the financial credibility of Ontario.

Mr. Conway: Build another Minaki.

Mr. Peterson: Drastic steps to remedy this serious situation are nowhere to be found in the present budget. To date, Ontario has been relying on pension funds to finance its yearly deficit. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read into the record so this is very clear in everyone's mind, just how we are financing them, by how much and who is paying for these very serious deficits we are running.

I would like to read in the totals by year from various pension funds—Canada Pension Plan, teachers' superannuation fund, municipal employees' retirement fund, and others. In 1972-73 it was $780 million; 1973-74, $938 million; 1974-75, $1.156 billion; 1975-76, $1.23 billion; 1976-77, $1.318 billion; and projected 1977-78, $1.335 billion.

Mr. Nixon: It'll take all that borrowing to pay the interest next year.

Mr. Peterson: We are borrowing in projected 1977-78 from the following pension funds: Canada Pension Plan, $850 million; teachers' superannuation fund, $260 million;

municipal employees' retirement fund, $190 million; and other in-house, $35 million, for a total of $1.335 billion, to finance a net cash requirement of $1.077 billion.

The danger in this heavy reliance on internal pension funds to finance the province's deficit spending is that these borrowing sources will soon not be available. Here we have another external force coming into play, managing this province. The Canada Pension Plan will run out in about 1982 if the current contribution rate remains unchanged. That is the point at which payouts from the fund will rise to equal contributions into the fund and the surplus cash flow for the province will become negative.

The Treasurer has proposed in recent years the doubling of the contribution rate in order to keep a surplus available from which the provinces could borrow. What he's saying is that the taxpayer, the contributor to the Canada Pension Plan, should put in money to finance the provincial deficit. In my judgement that's totally irresponsible.

Mr. Good: Shame. It is not what the Treasurer says; it's worse.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would be interested where you got that quote.

Mr. Peterson: I will bring it over to you. I'll send you a copy.

The time has come to face up to the fact that inflation has resulted in the indexing of pensions paid out. It has therefore become increasingly more important for the investment of pension funds to earn the highest possible rate of return for their future recipients, and not the average seven or eight per cent currently being received from Ontario debentures.

A joint study group looking at investment policies of the Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System has concluded that the fund should be invested in a broader range of Canadian securities, to obtain a higher rate of return than the non-marketable province of Ontario debentures, in which it is now invested, are yielding. This is becoming increasingly necessary with inflation forcing the indexing of pensions. Higher payouts necessitate receiving the highest possible rate of return on investment.

Two of the questions upon which the joint study group based its decision are as follows: Should the province deny to OMERS the opportunity to maximize the rate of return on the system's investments indefinitely? Should the province's borrowing needs or money costs be a factor in the determination of OMERS investment policies? The major findings of the joint study group were: If OMERS future contributions were to be invested in a full range of marketable securities under The Pension Benefits Act and the regulations thereunder, rather than non-marketable Ontario debentures, the study group's studies support the finding that OMERS would achieve a higher return on the system's funds possibly from a minimum of, say, three quarters on one per cent per annum to a maximum of approximately one and a quarter per cent per annum. Such a high return, on the basis of the funds to be available for investment, would increase the system's investment income substantially.

Mr. S. Smith: You win your elections on the backs of the pension funds.

Mr. Peterson: Therefore, OMERS best interests would be served by the authorization of a programme to phase out the non-marketable Ontario debenture as an investment for OMERS within a relatively short period of time.

In summary, the major recommendation was, every investment specialist whom the study group consulted—investment dealers, managers of investments for pension funds, investment counsellors and others—was of the opinion that the best interests of the employers and the members of OMERS would be served if the moneys of OMERS were invested, as other pension funds are invested with minor exceptions, in marketable securities in the Canadian capital market.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No commissions paid.

Mr. S. Smith: You believe in free enterprise, don't you?

Mr. Peterson: The teachers' superannuation fund will in all likelihood follow this lead and broaden its investment portfolio, and the province then will simply not be able to borrow as much from these sources.

Again, as in previous years, the Treasurer has spent an amount equal to revenue, plus the amount of in-house borrowing available from pension funds. Once again there is no incentive to balance the budget any closer than whatever amount is available from these in-house sources. This amount is another $1.3 billion this year.

The problem with relying on these pension funds is that the government is building up a certain level of expenditures. When these sources are no longer available to finance government spending, the expenditure pattern

will have to be drastically altered. Think of the drastic measures the government will have to take to decrease spending this year if it did not have access to the $1.3 billion from internal pension funds.

This year's budget contained a five-year forecast aimed at balancing the budget by the year 1981. By a strange coincidence that is the last year that money will be available from the Canada Pension Plan as a borrowing source—the source that has sustained a lion's share of the Treasurer's deficit financing and which this year will supply us with $850 million. Had this large pool of capital been available for free enterprise in this 10-year period from 1971 to 1981, just think of what we could have done in housing, in energy, in mining and all the places that need the capital today. Our business climate in all likelihood would have been substantially healthier and the provincial government would not find itself in a situation of having to look for ways to stimulate our business environment. That is the tragedy.

Mr. Bain: The Treasurer is undermining free enterprise.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer has chosen to over-extend the province's spending every year, monopolizing the pension fund capital to finance the deficits, and now the residents of Ontario must pay interest for years into the future for the irresponsible spending habits of this government and its predecessors.

Mr. Bain: How far do you go back? To Mitch Hepburn?

Mr. Peterson: We have discussed with several senior economists and representatives of larger financial institutions the implications for Canadian capital markets if governments were not borrowing to this extent—the implications for capital availability and ultimately interest rates. For example, what would be the implication of freeing up the province of Ontario's pension plans and the CPP for private enterprise rather than for provincial use?

The consensus is that if governments were not crowding out private enterprise through excessive borrowing and use of Canada Pension Plan funds to finance increasingly large deficits, (1) inflation would not be nearly as high in this province, (2) the stock market would not have taken the beating it did when investment activity turned down in 1974 and (3) the greater availability of funds in the absence of government borrowing activity would have kept interest rates down and at least we would have not had as much pressure exerted on interest rates to increase. The effects would have been profound throughout the entire economy.

I want to read something that came from the Ontario Economic Council yesterday to support the proposition that the Treasurer may have no incentive to balance the budget. Our view that the Treasurer has no incentive to balance the budget any closer than the level of provincial expenditures plus the amount available from borrowing from the pension funds has been endorsed by the Ontario Economic Council in its report just released yesterday.

"One factor contributing to the continuing growth of the public sector has been the availability of large flows of non-public borrowing, wedded to net cash requirements, at a rate of interest less than the market rate." The report singles out as the most important development affecting Ontario's finances in the next decade the dramatic reduction in the future availability of non-public sources of funds. It strongly suggests that provincial government financing will be complicated in the 1980s by a decline in net financing from non-public sources such as the Canada Pension Plan, teachers' superannuation fund and OMERS.

The declaration of growth of the CPP funds has raised many questions about alternative methods of financing, the most obvious one being an increase in the contribution rate, as the Treasurer has suggested. It is known, however, that even this would only postpone—not eliminate—the day in which the province could no longer rely on CPP as a net source of new finance. The council warns that there is no reason to believe that the provincial government would not respond to this increased availability of funds from CPP by also increasing provincial expenditures. We in the Liberal Party have been aware of these deficits that have accompanied the years in which in-house borrowing was readily available.

With respect to the interest on CPP funds, the council notes that the province pays a rate of interest equal to yield on long-term government of Canada bonds, a rate below what the province would have to pay in the public market. The advisory committee of the Canada Pension Plan estimates this interest subsidy to be about 1.12 percentage points and therefore the advisory committee has recommended that the provinces pay interest on these funds at a rate commen-

surate with a yield that they would have to offer on securities sold in the open market.

[4:15]

The council concludes that section by stating: "To the extent that the availability in the past of CPP and other non-public sources of funds has served as a stimulus to government spending, then the reduced availability may exert a constraining influence in the future. For this dubious blessing, perhaps we should be somewhat grateful.

Reduction in borrowing requirements by all levels of government make for a healthier capital market, simply because it would mean that governments were not spending as much; therefore, more capital would be available. I would like to cite total amounts borrowed by governments in the private sector in Canada last year, based on Bank of Canada review statistics: Federal government, $2.6 billion; provincial governments, $3.7 billion; municipal governments, $500 million; corporations, $1.4 billion.

You will notice that all corporations in Canada raised $1.4 billion domestically. Yet the province of Ontario alone is provided with $1.3 billion from its own internal pension funds and its share of the CPP. In other words, the pension funds of this province of Ontario, along with the portion of CPP allotted to Ontario, could have single-handedly financed almost 100 per cent of the total money borrowed domestically by all corporations of Canada.

And those people on the other side of the House run around asking: "Who is killing free enterprise?" I can tell them it is not us and it is not even our friends that much to the right.

Mr. Bain: For Hansard, that's the NDP he referred to.

Mr. Peterson: It's those opposite. It's them who are crowding it out

It is them who are leaving no room for anyone else to move. All governments are guilty and this one is one of the big offenders.

Just to bring this into perspective, I want to discuss Ontario's position relative to the other provinces. Just to show that things can be done.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: The historical pattern of this government's fiscal policies is particularly significant when viewed against the background of similar development in other selected provinces and the Canadian national average. Let's consider the compound annual rate of growth in gross provincial direct and guaranteed debt in Ontario between 1968 and 1975; this was 14.5 per cent. This is the third highest growth rate in the increase of debt in this country. Moreover, the actual debt is greater in size than Quebec's by $4.5 million, Alberta's by $10.8 million and by British Columbia's by $9.1 million.

The per capita compound annual growth rate in gross provincial direct and guaranteed debt for Ontario between 1968 and 1975 was 12.5 per cent. This is the third highest growth rate in the country. In 1968, Ontario ranked second behind Alberta in having the lowest debt per capita. By 1975, Ontario had dropped to fifth place. While Ontario has the highest personal income per capita in the country at present, the compound annual growth rate of personal income, per capita, between 1968 and 1975 in Ontario was the lowest in Canada at—

Mr. S. Smith: That's right.

Mr. Peterson: 9.8 per cent compared to 10.4 per cent in British Columbia, 11.3 per cent in Quebes, 12 per cent in Alberta. In these circumstances we cannot hope and can't reasonably expect that Ontario is going to maintain its privileged position for a long time into the future.

Ontario's compound annual growth rate of provincial government gross annual revenues between 1972 and 1976 was 14.7 per cent, the lowest growth rate experienced by any province in the country.

The compound annual growth rate in Ontario's gross provincial product from 1970 to 1976 was 13 per cent, lower than the national average in terms of rate of growth of 13.6 per cent. What is this telling us? It's telling us we are falling behind the national average. And every time we are behind the inclusion of our figures drags down the average.

Another area in which Ontario's performance over recent years compared very unfavourably with the other provinces and the national averages is in terms of housing. With the exception of 1972, the annual percentage increase in housing starts in Ontario has lagged behind the national average since 1970 and the gap is widening.

If Ontario starts are removed from the national total the difference in percentage increase is dramatic. In 1975, Ontario experienced a decrease of 5.7 per cent over 1974 while nationally, excluding Ontario, there was an increase of 16.6 per cent in

urban housing starts. Again, in 1976 while Ontario had an annual increase of 5.4 per cent in urban starts, nationally there was a 15.3 per cent increase.

If the Ontario starts were excluded, the rest of the country experienced a percentage increase of 21.2 per cent. The trend continues to decline into 1977, with Ontario experiencing a decline in total urban dwelling starts of 18 per cent compared to a national decline of 12 per cent during the first two months of this year, over the same period in 1976. The decline in multiple dwelling starts of 15 per cent compared to a national decline of nine per cent is of particular concern, given apartment vacancy rates for selected Ontario cities in October 1976 as follows: Hamilton, 2.9 per cent; London, 1.3 per cent; Ottawa, 1.9 per cent; Sudbury, 1.2 per cent; Sault Ste. Marie, 0.2 per cent; Thunder Bay, 0.2 per cent; Toronto, one per cent; and Windsor, 2.2 per cent. In almost every case, these figures represent a decline in the apartment vacancy rate from October, 1975. Federal housing experts maintain that an apartment vacancy rate of three to four per cent is healthy, conducive to fair rents and the construction of more buildings.

The Conference Board predicts a decrease in housing starts in Ontario in 1977, compared with 1976, of 15.2 per cent. Meantime, the government is slightly more optimistic than these distinguished forecasters but then the government always is and usually it's wrong. Optimism notwithstanding however, the government itself predicts a drop in housing starts of 4,700 units in 1977 to 80,000. This is a far cry from the 100,000 starts which the government-commissioned Comay report four years ago said would be necessary annually for a decade to avert a housing crisis.

Mr. S. Smith: We're lagging on every major indicator.

Mr. Peterson: This decrease again outstrips the expected national decrease and is due to a high inventory level of newly completed homes. Clearly what is lacking in Ontario is not housing per se, but affordable housing.

Ontario has lagged substantially behind the national percentage increase in retail sales in 1973, 1974 and 1976, and the predictions are that we shall again be behind this year. In 1973 Ontario had a percentage increase of 11.3 per cent, while the national increase was 12.6 per cent. Ontario experienced a percentage increase of 14.4 per cent in 1974 compared to a national increase of 16.5 per cent. Excluding the Ontario figures the national increase for 1974 would have been 17.7 per cent. In 1976 Ontario had a percentage increase of 9.5 per cent, compared to a national increase of 10.9 per cent, there was an increase of 11.7 per cent if the lagging Ontario figures are excluded.

Ontario also lagged behind the growth provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and Quebec in 1973 and 1974, behind Alberta and Quebec in 1975, and behind Alberta and British Columbia in 1976. In its November forecast the Conference Board of Canada predicted a percentage growth in retail sales of 10.1 per cent for 1976 and 9.7 per cent for 1977. By January, 1977, the board revised its figures downward to 9.5 per cent for 1976 and only 8.4 per cent for 1977. This means that retail sales for Ontario will grow more slowly than for the nation as a whole again this year. This is due to an anticipated growth in personal disposable income for Ontario of about 10 per cent in 1977, compared to a projected rate of interest of 10.5 per cent for Canada. The 8.4 per cent is certainly a far cry from the Treasurer's prediction of 10 per cent in 1977. If the Ontario figures are excluded from the national total, the increase in retail sales growth would increase by 0.1 per cent to 8.7 per cent in 1977.

From 1970 to 1977, using Conference Board of Canada predictions for 1977 data, capital expenditures for the nation as a whole increased by 155 per cent. Ontario experienced an increase of only 103 per cent, again lagging behind the other growth provinces during this period. Alberta had an increase of 281 per cent; Quebec, 209 per cent; British Columbia, 126 per cent. If the Ontario figures are excluded from the national total the increase for Canada was 188 per cent for 1970 to 1977 compared to 103 per cent for Ontario.

Mr. S. Smith: Lagging behind on every major indicator.

Mr. Peterson: From 1970 to 1977 capital expenditures for machinery and equipment showed the same trend, rising by 152 per cent for Canada and only 105 per cent for Ontario. Again the other provinces fared far better: Alberta, 345 per cent; Quebec, 194 per cent; and British Columbia, 114 per cent. When the Ontario figures are excluded from the national total, the increase for Canada was 186 per cent, compared with 105 per cent for Ontario. The lagging trend for Ontario shows no signs of change—indeed it appears to be worsening.

Mr. S. Smith: We used to lead.

Mr. Peterson: Specifically the annual percentage increase in capital expenditures in

1976 was 7.6 for Ontario and 12.1 for the nation as a whole. In the entire country, only Newfoundland experienced a lower yearly percentage increase in 1976 at 5.2 per cent; while Alberta saw an increase of 27.6 per cent, Quebec 10.7 and British Columbia 10.2 per cent. For this year the anticipated increase for Ontario at 2.8 per cent is well below the national increase of 8 per cent.

Ontario's share of the country's planned capital spending in 1977 works out to 31 per cent, down from 39 per cent in 1970. This will mark the fifth year in a row—fifth successive year—that Ontario's advance in capital spending has lagged behind the national average.

I have presented a lot of numbers, and I thought that they were meaningful to have in the record—

Mr. S. Smith: Right.

Mr. Peterson: —to substantiate my story, to substantiate the great feeling of alarm that we have in this party. It's inevitable that this government is going to be defeated some day by someone, and I can tell you—

Mr. Cassidy: Not by you.

Mr. Peterson: —that it's going to leave an incredible number of problems for that person who takes over. They'll be lucky to be defeated—

Mr. Foulds: I thought it would be the party.

Mr. Peterson: —because the problems coming down on our heads through our slow growth rates, through the combination of lags in almost every sector of the economy, through our incredible debt financing and through our inability to borrow any more, are going to come crushingly down on our heads—

Mr. S. Smith: That's right. They mortgage the coming generations.

Mr. Peterson: —unless we have a government that's far-sighted, that looks to the future and that cuts out some of these incredibly wasteful and ridiculous things that are carried on by the government.

I want to talk at this point about government waste, because there are obviously two ways to decrease a deficit. You can increase your revenues or you can cut out your expenditures. We have always talked about, and will continue to talk about and will always present programmes aimed at ways we think money can be saved. We are very concerned about the growth of the public sector and the incredible waste that we see daily around here—the people who can be replaced with signs. That's the Treasurer I'm referring to; no, I wasn't really meaning him. But there are, just on a daily basis, and we probably all get conned into that mentality and take the easy way out of situations by putting money in rather than putting imagination in. It's going to take a new kind of direction, in my judgement.

I just want to add at this point from a very personal point of view that I think that President Carter's providing the kind of direction that I'd like to see, a personal direction. He is cutting out the limousines in his own house. Before he goes to the people and says, "I want you to cut back," he cuts back himself.

Mr. S. Smith: You guys won't even go down to mid-size cars.

Mr. Peterson: I think that kind of personal leadership is sadly lacking in this province. I really do. I'm not saying it's not lacking at other levels of government; it is. But what we have is 26 cabinet ministers sitting across the room.

Mr. Nixon: I only see two.

Mr. Peterson: I've heard it argued on many occasions that we should have a senate in this province just so we can recycle some of those people rather than having to expand the cabinet. At least if they were in a senate, they wouldn't cause us any trouble. It would be known that they didn't have to do anything.

Mr. Foulds: What about the expense, though?

Mr. Peterson: It's a real problem with a government that's been in office too long.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Speak to your friends in Ottawa.

Mr. S. Smith: It's cheaper than having to invent new ministries and make superministries that don't exist.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Why don't you speak to your friends in Ottawa?

Mr. Peterson: All these people who have acquired debts and obligations for the government—it has to find places for them. They have big pension plans. They slot them into major corporations or boards under government control. We have a recent example in this last cabinet shuffle where they had to

expand the cabinet rather than getting rid of a few. It's too bad. I wish we had a safe, harmless place where we could send them. At least they wouldn't foul up the affairs of state.

I think any government that's serious about financial responsibility has to start with itself, has to have the mentality to start with itself. I can tell the House very candidly, this party would have absolutely no problem running the government better with a fraction of the cabinet. We could easily do it.

Mr. Foulds: You'd have to, with the talent available.

Mr. Peterson: We could easily cut six or seven or eight people.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: What fraction? Ninety-nine one-hundredths?

Mr. Peterson: You'd be cut, Sidney. You're the first guy who would be cut, I've got to tell you.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Ninety-nine one-hundredths is a fraction. What fraction?

Mr. Eakins: Because the minister doesn't want to do the job.

Mr. Foulds: The Liberals would cut consumer protection, would they?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Tell us what fraction.

Mr. Nixon: You'd have to go back to work, Sidney.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: You must have learned your mathematics under Davis.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'm waiting for the fraction.

Mr. Peterson: I feel very strongly that we are in an age now when we need personal leadership. Personal leadership is far more important than mouthing a few words about restraint and then not doing anything about it.

Mr. Nixon: Running around in helicopters.

Mr. S. Smith: Restraint forced on you.

Mr. Peterson: I think that they should start there. I can tell the House that that's where we would start.

Even Maxwell Henderson, the Treasurer's good old friend, said, and I want to quote him: "The government has not distinguished itself in cutting back spending." In spite of all the rhetoric, in spite of all the noises we hear, in spite of all the false perceptions that the Treasurer is the friend of the efficient and the friend of people who are trying to get productivity in government—frankly, his record, in my judgement, could be a heck of a lot better.

[4:30]

I want to talk about some of those examples of waste because I think it's very important that we get those on to the record. Some of them are errors in judgement. We will, at any time, allow a government to have an error in judgement. That happens sometimes. The fault is in not correcting it; the fault is in perpetuating it. When the government makes one mistake why does it just keep going on and trying to cover it up. For example with Minaki Lodge, I will accept the fact that Ontario Development Corporation could make a bad loan and even write off $660,000. Any risk investor runs into those kinds of problems, but the mistake is not to say "I have made a mistake" and cut it off then and cut your losses. But we see this compounding of errors of judgement—

Mr. S. Smith: Putting good money after bad.

An hon. member: Thousands of dollars a day.

Mr. Peterson: —and I'll tell you that's not the only one, Mr. Speaker.

Over the years, we have consistently endeavoured to persuade the governent to set out on the road to economic recovery through cutting out these kinds of waste. I just want to cite some examples of that. In the 1973-74 fiscal year, we had three royal commissions costing a total of $791,295. In fiscal 1975-76, the number of commission tripled.

Mr. Reid: Judy LaMarsh—$250 a day to watch television.

Mr. Peterson: During the first year of operation, the royal commission on violence in the communications industry cost $765,237 —as much as all three 1973-74 commissions—

Mr. Reid: And that's the biggest crime right there.

Mr. Peterson: —and this does not include the cost of research of some 28 studies.

Mr. S. Smith: It adds to the taxes. It's going to hurt a lot of our citizens.

Mr. Peterson: And what's interesting about this is that we don't even have jurisdiction in this area.

Other countries, such as the US and Denmark, have produced highly regarded studies on the effects of violence in the media upon violence in society. It's highly doubtful that the LaMarsh commission will add anything more to these studies. Moreover, it is likely to be one of the most expensive inquiries ever in the history of this province. For the cost of the commission alone, we could have focussed attention on the very serious aspects of violence that we have some jurisdiction over in this province. I'm talking about racial violence and violence in the home. If you examine the statistics, that's where the majority of that kind of thing happens today.

The recent racially motivated attacks in the subway are common knowledge. There is no need for me to go into them here. Not so well known, however, is the fact that approximately 25 per cent of the total number of homicide cases in Metropolitan Toronto involve women as victims and men as killers. Previous violence—assaults, beatings, kickings, and so on—is usually reported in about 30 per cent of these cases. Some 70 per cent of women killed by men are listed as domestic homicides. In these areas there's a desperate need for research and crisis intervention centres. The LaMarsh commission budget would have been far better spent, in our judgement, in this connection.

Mr. S. Smith: This was real—not phoney.

Mr. Peterson: The commission on the Don jail was essentially set up to report on recent allegations of mistreatment of Toronto Jail inmates. However, it has turned into a prolonged inquiry which had already cost $655,005 by the end of March 1976. Because of the inordinate length of time the commission has taken, the mandate has been completely undermined and by the time the report is written, the alleged mistreatment will be ancient history. Again it's government by commission. Surely the fact that the ministry intends to close the jail within four years will ensure that the commission's report is totally irrelevant.

I mentioned Minaki Lodge, but it's just a classic example. I had the privilege of sitting on the public accounts committee and going through that and hearing the misinformation that the ministers had, that the deputy ministers had, that the civil service, through the Ontario Development Corporation and Northern Ontario Development Corporation—I assure you, if they didn't have tenure you'd fire them, Mr. Speaker, because it's absolutely incompetent. No one else would hire people who delivered those kind of services. You can only add the component of political considerations into that kind of a decision. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, they were bad, too. We're suffering on all accounts from that kind of thing, dumping $8 million in—it costs you $400,000 for it just to sit there—and still the government does not know what it's going to do, whether it's going to spend another $8 million or write it off.

Mr. Foulds: That's where we could have the senate chamber for Ontario that you proposed earlier.

Mr. Peterson: That's not a bad idea, Jim. That's the first constructive idea I've ever heard out of the NDP.

Ms. Gigantes: Wash your ears.

An hon. member: You should wash out your mouth with soap.

An hon. member: Oh, oh. Nasty.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: She's a mistress of repartee.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member will continue.

Mr. Cassidy: It was deserved.

Mr. Peterson: She looks so sweet.

Mr. Foulds: You look sweet too, David.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please, perhaps the hon. member will return to the subject matter and leave the discussion.

Mr. Peterson: It's not my fault. They're trying to distract me. They're trying to make me provocative. In 1972 money was funneled through the NODC to Thunder Bay Ski Jumps Limited—a company formed by NODC and of which it is the sole shareholder—to construct two ski jumps, the placement of which meant that after landing, jumpers would run onto the property at the Mount Norway ski resort which received $270,000 in NODC loans in 1972. In total, the amount of provincial money that has gone into this operation since 1972—

Mr. S. Smith: Great leap forward.

Mr. Peterson: —is $537,000, and still more money is required. The Globe and Mail reports that another $1.2 million is required in order to get it off the welfare list.

I want to deal with the Ministry of Community and Social Services which has made a practice of sending out payments to people who no longer need them, or whose entitlement had been reduced. In some cases, these cheques continued to go out for 186 days before they were stopped, and more than $19 million was paid through these and other means. The largest amount, $8.6 million, represents unrecovered portions of overpayments which were outstanding when recipients were cut off.

Administrative errors were blamed for $857,000 of the losses during the past three years and legal action has been considered in another 86 cases for which overpayments total $563,000. At least $70,000 has apparently disappeared in the form of replacement cheques for others; these have been lost or undelivered.

For many years, professionals have complained about the care of the elderly. A report of the interministerial committee on residential services was submitted to the cabinet committee on social development in April 1975. A full year and eight months later, its damning comments were released, only following considerable pressure from my leader. This report arrived at the stunning conclusion that 30 per cent to 40 per cent of nursing home residents of the 1974 population could, with support services, live at home rather than being institutionalized. The per diem cost of 40 per cent of all extended care beds in Ontario is $237,994, annually and that represents misused expenditures of some $86 million.

The escalation of costs in institutionalized care is due to the fact that most elderly people who are unable to cope with their needs at home are being admitted to general hospitals, chronic and special-care hospitals and nursing homes. Once treated in one of these heavy nursing care, very expensive treatment centres, the elderly patient languishes for weeks and months, waiting for placement in a lighter care facility such as a senior citizens' residence or municipal hospital. This situation results in a shortage of beds for emergency and active treatment patients in general hospitals, causes a scarcity of beds in chronic and special care facilities for very needy patients and causes confusion and emotional upset for the patient and his family because hospital stays are prolonged and futures left undetermined.

Meanwhile, the problem of over-usage exists in heavy nursing care, while many lighter care facilities, providing much less nursing care, are having trouble filling vacancies.

Another example of waste is the sound system in this Legislature. The sound system cost $171,000 by the time the second company has completed repairs. If the government had accepted the original bids some $42,000 would have been saved.

There are examples of this all over the place.

I want to talk to you about one of the most confused areas, which probably no one in this House, not even the experienced ones—the people who have been around here a long time—fully understand or appreciate; that is the myriad boards, agencies, commissions and little groups that are running around, staffed mostly with recycled government members or friends of the government.

The Liberal House leader prevailed upon the government to release a list of some 344 directorates, institutes, boards, tribunals, councils, courts and committees whose members are partially or entirely appointed by the government. These quasi-government agencies employ a full 40 per cent of all provincial employees.

Mr. Reid: They're not included in the statistics.

Mr. Peterson: I saw Doug Fisher on television the other day. He was saying to the interviewer that he was making a study of the agencies, boards and commissions of the Ontario government compared to the federal government. He said on that programme—and I can now substantiate it—that he found in Ontario that there were 200 per cent more of that type of body than there are in the federal government. That's interesting, when the Premier, the Treasurer and all these cabinet ministers are running around saying: "We don't want to intrude in people's lives. The government has gone too far in getting involved in the citizens' business." Theirs is the very government that has established all of these things, that is responsible for these massive intrusions into our lives.

In March 1973, the ninth report of the committee on government productivity suggested it would be a monumental research and procedural task even to make adjustments—

Mr. Cassidy: There is no government here for people to disagree on.

Mr. Peterson: —of nomenclature to differentiate, for the sake of clarity, between the functions of Crown agencies. To date, the government has not reacted to the need for consistent nomenclature for its agencies or to the urgent requirement for a comprehen-

sive system of review of the financing, staffing and policy outlook of a myriad agencies supposedly under ministerial control. The Workmen's Compensation Board is an administrative nightmare and a bureaucratic jungle. Everyone here, at least in the opposition, agrees with me in that.

Mr. Cassidy: There are no government people here to disagree.

Mr. Peterson: Will you phone them all and tell them so we will give them an equal opportunity?

A damning illustration of the manner in which a licensing agency can establish policy in critical areas—and this was of grievous concern to my leader and to the people in the Liberal Party—where the government, for political reasons or as a result of ignorance refused to act, is the Greyhound-Gray Coach controversy. We were very frightened by the implications of that. Government agencies have become so suspect that they are now frequently bypassed because of lack of confidence in their ability to fulfil the purpose for which they were established. In all but minor cases, for example, the Environmental Assessment Board now runs the risk of becoming defunct.

A royal commission inquiry was established to assess the impact of Reed Pulp and Paper's application for timber rights in the north. This is surely an indication of things to come because of the inability of the existing institutions to deal with it. It is all done on an ad hoc basis. There hasn't been serious thought to this whole procedure.

On a number of occasions the government has reiterated that it is committed to rationalizing government services, to spreading them throughout the province. The sincerity of this commitment is dubious when one considers that of the 344 government agencies, no fewer than 274 are located right here in Toronto, and even those services which would appear to be decentralized or should be decentralized relate to titular appointments to board of governors or trustees or public institutions such as universities and hospitals. Regional boards of health are probably the only area where there has been any degree of functional decentralization. I will have more to say on this later when I talk about regional economic development, which is another very serious concern to us.

There are two other issues related to the economic impact of agencies and Crown corporations in this province. The first relates to the overall provincial financial position, the second to the rather unorthodox—I was going to say misleading, Mr. Speaker; I guess that's not a very appropriate thing to say today—

Mr. Sargent: That's okay.

Mr. Peterson: —inappropriate manner in which the Treasurer consistently uses such corporations to change and manage our perception of provincial accounts. Some 20 large corporations appear regularly in the public accounts of the province as well as the annual report of the Provincial Auditor. Among these corporations are Hydro, Ontario Housing, Ontario Energy Corporation, Ontario Development Corporation, the Ontario Educational Capital Aid Corporation, and the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation. I will have much more to say on these latter two agencies in a moment.

Typically, these corporations are in large measure financed out of statutory appropriations against the consolidated revenue fund. The Treasury advances funds to these corporations and over a period of years receives back interest and principal from revenues generated by the activities of the agencies. Standard government accounting practice interprets disbursements and receipts of principal as non-budgetary transactions while repayment of interest on advances is recorded as budget revenue.

While this procedure is not of itself unusual, the dollar amounts involved are staggering. For example, in 1975 to 1976 public accounts show a full $1.7 billion Treasury expenditure by way of statutory appropriations. The Provincial Auditor has pointed out that during the year 1975 to 1976 payments relative to the statutory appropriations constitute approximately 16.5 per cent of total payments out of the consolidated revenue fund. This is no new phenomenon. The corresponding percentages for 1974 to 1975 and 1973 and 1974 were 20.4 per cent and 17.6 per cent.

The key point here is that the expenditures are completely beyond the scrutiny of the Legislative Assembly. They are not voted upon. They are not discussed except when they get completely out of control, as in the case of Ontario Hydro. Nor can we overlook the fact that according to the Treasurer's own latest estimates of receipts and disbursements for a number of provincial corporations in 1976-77, there is a deficit of $236 million on the non-budgetary account—in other words, one third the size of the estimated deficit for budgetary transactions.

Traditionally and inevitably, this has led to a net increase in lending activity and it has had and will continue to have a detrimental impact on the net cash requirements of the province.

In my view and our party's judgement we cannot permit these expenditure items to undermine the province's financial position without bringing them under legislative scrutiny. The Provincial Auditor in his latest report cites the following examples, and I quote:

"Disbursements to the Ontario Educational Capital Aid Corporation, the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation and the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation for development loan activity could, we feel, be voted by the Legislature, as could disbursements to the Ontario Development Corporation, Northern Ontario Development Corporation and Eastern Ontario Development Corporation for term loan activity. In 1975-76, disbursements for development loan activity and for term loan activity totalled over $148 million and $50 million respectively."

[4:45]

It's high time that these items were brought before the Legislature for examination, if for no other reason than that the present government needs our assistance in its newly announced efforts to balance our seriously distorted books.

I just want to discuss in a little more depth, if I may, two corporations, the sole purpose of which appears to be to disguise actual budgetary expenditures behind an accounting façade. In the process, by the end of fiscal 1975-76 the Treasurer had understated the provincial real net debt position by a full $2.45 billion and inflated the overall budgetary revenue and expenditure figures by creating superfluous interest charges well in excess of $100 million per annum.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that misinterpretation or misrepresentation?

Mr. Peterson: I'll take your advice on that, Donald. What should I use?

Mr. Bullbrook: Don't do that. We'll be back into Shakespeare and Sir Toby again.

Mr. Peterson: I should tell the member for Riverdale, I may be the only one in the House, but I very much enjoyed his little foray into Shakespeare this afternoon. I think he should be complimented on it.

Interjection.

Mr. Peterson: We've got to raise the sights of this dismal place occasionally.

Mr. S. Smith: He's a better actor than a parliamentarian.

Mr. Peterson: The public accounts 1976 statement shows Ontario's liabilities are more than $13 billion. Assets, including loans, advances, investments and cash holdings, total more than $8 billion. This leaves a net debt of approximately $5 billion. Of total provincial assets, more than $6 billion, or more than 74 per cent, are held in the form of advances to various agencies, including $2.3 billion in secured advances to Ontario Hydro and more than $4.1 billion in advances to 19 other major provincial corporations.

The rationale for listing these advances as assets is that, generally speaking, they are held in the form of interest-bearing securities which will, under varying terms, be redeemed by the operations of the various corporations. In other words, the corporations, and subsequently the Treasurer, will receive revenue from third parties—for example, Ontario Hydro customers. This is a sound financial procedure, consistent with effective fiscal management.

However, there are two glaring exceptions to this practice which have come to the attention of the Provincial Auditor and should be brought to the attention of the public. Two agencies, the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation and the Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation, together hold outstanding liabilities in the form of advances from the Treasurer of Ontario totalling almost $2.5 billion, administered, it would seem, by the senior officer of the Treasury and a handful of clerical staff.

The Provincial Auditor has provided a brief description of the financial operation of these two corporations. Advances received from the consolidated revenue fund in the form of non-budgetary statutory appropriations are lent to school boards and universities to finance capital construction. In return, the corporations hold debentures issued by the borrowing institution redeemable over a period of years, bearing interest in the range of 5.5 per cent to 9.5 per cent. However, when these debentures mature, interest and principal is paid, not out of revenues from any third party, but out of various budgetary expenditures of the Ministries of Education and Colleges and Universities.

I want to quote from the Provincial Auditor's report: "In 1975-1976 institutions effectively made principal and interest payments to the Ontario Education Capital Aid

Corporation totalling [about $106 million], of which [$104 million] was provided out of expenditure appropriations of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities." In other words, the money is being transferred from one ministry to another. We have a somewhat bizarre procedure here.

First, the $2.49 billion in outstanding advances is listed in public acounts as a provincial asset. Surely this is a strange asset. The Treasurer, through an incredible accounting manoeuvre, has capitalized what is, in reality, a liability. Debentures held by the education and university capital aid corporations are held against the Province of Ontario.

I'm glad to see the Treasurer back. I'd like to go for one too, but I'm staying here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, but you're making the same arguments that Deacon made five years ago. I sort of hoped you would come up with something new.

Mr. Peterson: It's good logic.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for London Centre will continue.

Mr. Sargent: You're not using figures from five years ago, are you?

Mr. S. Smith: It really is debt. It is not a capital asset.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: Regardless of how these entries are registered in educational institution accounts and the corporations, the inescapable fact is that the debentures are not payable by any third party. This surely is an integral part of any definition of this type of asset, and it is clearly not a definition that has any applicability to the transactions of the two corporations concerned. I submit, therefore, that the Treasurer has understated the real net debt position of the province. If he is serious about balancing the books by 1980, he should get his figures straight. The debt which must be ultimately financed is not $4.9 billion, but rather $7.37 billion.

These figures are for fiscal 1975-76. The budget has an interim net debt calculation for 1976-77 of $6.2 billion and an estimated net debt position of $7,199 million for fiscal 1977-78. As the Treasurer has not seen fit to specify the liabilities or assets for either of these years, it is impossible to calculate the error in current terms. However, if accounting is consistent with past performance, our present net debt position is now rapidly approaching the $10 billion mark.

Secondly, the Provincial Auditor notes that with respect to payments by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities to the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation, 1975-76, of a total of $106 million, some $84 million went towards payment of debenture interest, while only $22 million was applied to the principal of the Corporation's outstanding advances. Furthermore, the expenditure by Colleges and Universities was reflected as revenue in the Treasurer's accounts. This means that while this particular transaction had no effect on the province's budgetary deficit, in reality it inflated the overall revenue and expenditure needs of the province by over $84 million. The accounting practices of the Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation, though somewhat more complex, are wholly analogous to this procedure.

Surely, it is reasonable to ask why is the province paying interest to itself? Is the Treasurer being altogether candid in his presentation of all the facts? Successive Treasurers have engaged in this exercise, thus burying major budgetary expenditures in the short run while in the long run producing serious distortions in the presentation of the net debt figures of the province, and creating inflated and unnecessary demands on the taxpayers of this province.

This criticism is implicit in the Provincial Auditor's report under items 17 and 51. It reflects the concern of the Committee on Government Productivity, which observed in 1973 that "in the main, practice in the use of disposition of revenue is generally inconsistent and graduations occur in the extent of capital financing and control by the government."

I would urge—the Liberal Party would urge—that the government take immediate action to rectify this situation, with respect to the capital aid corporations, and with respect to the more general problems of quasi-governmental agencies. These agencies should be made accountable to the Legislature. I think that a general review by a committee of this House could have a very major impact on trying to simplify this great myriad of government that has been created by the people opposite.

Mr. S. Smith: It's hidden debts, and nothing else.

Mr. Singer: A financial nightmare, again. A financial nightmare.

Mr. Peterson: Don't despair, Mr. Treasurer, I am about one-tenth finished.

I want to talk, if I may, about the area of health, very briefly. I wish we had time to go into a lot of policy areas but I want to get onto the financial implications of some of the policy areas, and what I think are some of the principal areas of waste.

Between 1970 and 1976, the Ministry of Health incurred an average annual percentage increase in expenditure of 16.7 per cent. In 1973, expenditures rose 23.4 per cent; in 1974, 23.5 per cent; in 1975, 18.3 per cent; in 1976, 14.6 per cent. The Health ministry overspent its budget in 1976 by $87 million, to a total of $3.4 billion, the largest single expense in our provincial budget.

An expenditure increase of this magnitude is in principle unacceptable during a period of financial restraint and when it is experienced by a ministry that is already out of control. We have lots of examples—from the Provincial Auditor and everyone—of ways to clean up the administration of that organization. Both financially and administratively, it cannot be tolerated. The abuses of the OHIP system—a bureaucracy so notorious for its inefficiency, ineffectiveness, and sheer size that it is unlikely to be matched in any other jurisdiction—are representative of the mismanagement of the Health ministry, a mismanagement which we all know threatened the very existence of a number of provincial hospitals. It is so interesting, with a little hindsight, to look back on that fight a year ago and the incredible incompetence with which that was handled—a tremendous disruption of so many people's lives—with the net result that it was all unnecessary and just disruptive and costly. It really was a tremendous example of incompetence, in our judgement.

You will recall that OHIP was once again a main focus of attention in the most recent Provincial Auditor's report, which devoted some 14 pages to the Ministry of Health and abuses of the $800 million OHIP fund. According to the Auditor, the Ontario Health Insurance Plan had paid out millions of dollars in claims without properly checking their validity. July 31 records show claims covering over 12 million participants in the health insurance plan, although the province's population a year earlier was somewhere over eight million.

When the medical review committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons was set up in 1971, it was hoped that improper claim payments could be controlled. However, the committee has yet to issue decisions on some 175 cases, many dating back to 1974, and has recommended the recovery of money in only 115 cases, making no recommendation for action in the other 254 cases. It has failed to explain many of its decisions.

The Provincial Auditor stated that existing legislation makes prosecution of fraud charges almost impossible while the government and medical professional rules have been far too lax. And surely the government has a responsibility to manage this portfolio far better—to be more stringent in the application of existing legislation. If this is inadequate, it should recommend amendments to the Legislature which I'm sure we would all support, and which would prevent further abuse of the OHIP system.

It's the only system that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker, that pays out this fantastic number of hundreds of millions of dollars and the consumer doesn't know his involvement. It seems to me that in any cost-conscious ministry, the first way you start to make people aware of the rise in costs is to let them know. We certainly think that as a first step to cutting costs, the public should be made aware and every citizen of this province who uses the facilities should be sent a statement saying what kind of cost he has been to the system.

I think that those kinds of figures would dramatically change people's perceptions about health care. It would bring them into co-operation with the government, which is the first step to bring some kind of regulation into the incredible and exploding costs in that ministry.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about land assembly. That's been an area that many of my colleagues have been very concerned about and, I say with some pride, they have brought it to the attention of this House on many occasions. We're concerned about the abuse from activities of corporations associated with the Ministry of Housing. Here, however, the agencies have a more direct relationship with the ministry and with its policy directors. Accordingly, criticism as such must, in large measure, be directed toward the current Minister of Housing and his often over-exuberant predecessors. I refer here to the highly questionable land banking programme of the Ontario Housing Corporation and the Ontario Land Corporation.

Four specific land acquisitions over the past 10 years highlight the fact that in the housing field the Conservative government is becoming increasingly incapable of planning programmes effectively and of implementing policies either efficiently or fairly. Last fall

we were all witness to the sorry spectacle of agents of this province being accused by the Ombudsman of deceiving residents in the $214 million North Pickering development site in order to induce them to sell their properties to the province at prices below what they reasonably expected to receive. I don't intend to go into the details of this particular situation, Mr. Speaker, but I think everyone realizes that the truth was effectively blurred by the necessity of creating a political stand-off in a manner which was unique in the circumstances of the time. So we shelve the incidents for the time being.

However, lo and behold, within six months we get a repeat of the entire scenario—this time at the 12,690 acre, $28.2 million, South Cayuga land site. This, incidentally, is in addition to the 13,440 acre assembly costing $33.5 million some 20 miles away in Townsend township. The same actors with the same accusations of harassment and deception. One wonders what's going to come next.

This aspect of the government's land purchase programme requires thoughtful adjudication. I am inclined to wait before I make a final judgement myself on the actions of the government's agents. However, now the more general purchasing policies of the government are falling into disrepute. The multi-million dollar acquisition of land by Ontario Housing Corporation near Ottawa is a case in point.

Here a justice of the federal court has suggested that the Ontario Housing Corporation policy of making of block purchases on the open market is neither prudent nor economical. In this assembly one specific example worth noting was the purchase of 200 acres of land for more than $1,000 an acre which had been bought for $283 per acre a brief eight months earlier.

Items like this simply do not make a great deal of sense. They suggest to me that either successive Ministers of Housing have lost touch with the activities of their agencies, or that they simply do not have the capacity to make fiscally sound expenditure decisions on behalf of their departments.

In this score, it appears to me that we have the support of at least one member of cabinet. It was the Minister of Industry and Tourism who observed before the assembly was announced that "we'd be completely off our nut to build a new industrial park there . . . Whoever is assembling the land won't get encouragement from me and it is extremely difficult to believe that the government can justify such a purchase."

Now, on a yet more general level, we have the very real prospect that the entire process of land assembly, and the administrative headaches which have come to characterize it, may turn out to have been a complete waste of time, emotional energy and money.

[5:00]

Specifically we have the example of a 300-acre assembly in the Kitchener-Waterloo area which was purchased in 1968 at a cost of $5.25 million. Ministry officials slowly came around to acknowledging that some of this land may not be required for housing. In fact, the official Kitchener-Waterloo plan showed clearly that 2,000 of those acres would definitely not be necessary for this purpose. So ultimately the decision was made to return the land to individual owners to be used for the same purposes as almost 10 years ago.

The tragedy of this story can only be related by the individual owner-occupants, many of them farmers. They have been forced to operate as tenants under six-month or yearly agreements and have found it extremely difficult to make long-term decisions as to capital investments of any kind.

The Kitchener-Waterloo situation lists a dramatic Conservative flip-flop off the ground. In March, the current Minister of Housing is reported to have announced, a little apologetically perhaps, that there will be no return to massive land banking. "We have been severely criticized for that and probably with some justification," he said. It is good to see the minister has now joined a number of his colleagues in listening to the Liberal Party on these matters. Land banking, he adds, was seen as "the panacea some time ago. It isn't any more." We should all applaud the minister for that statement and for that dramatic turnaround.

Mr. Nixon: However belated.

Mr. Peterson: Now we enter the era of reprivatization with a subtle twist. To salvage some measure of return for the massive investments in land we have "reprivatization for profit." Twenty-three thousand acres of land will be sold to private developers during the next few years with a potential profit of $180 million. In this matter, however, ministry officials caution us not to project long-term figures from the $2-million profit expected in 1977-78. We shall be most interested to see the final number on that.

This new revenue will certainly be a welcome addition to the provincial coffers though

I fail to see how it will benefit the home buyer. Furthermore, it is hardly adequate compensation for the true costs of the government's ill-conceived programme. How do you account for the lost output due to uncertain tenure conditions in prime agricultural land, Mr. Speaker? How do you measure the actual cost resulting from serious disruptions in the economic and social lifestyles of individuals obliged by government fiat to relocate? What is the true price that the taxpayers have paid in terms of opportunity costs related to the tens of millions of dollars sunk into pie-in-the-sky ventures, dollars which could have been invested in employment-creating or socially-beneficial government endeavours?

In this, as in so many other areas, a public accounting of Conservative policies is long overdue. I trust that the government's acceptance of the resolution of the member for Wilson Heights before the House last week is a sign of things to come in this regard. I hope the government realizes the concern of my colleague, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, and other members of this Liberal Party, which has been voiced so often in the Legislature, is a sincere and deep conviction and will not diminish in the future.

Mr. S. Smith: The UTDC is another one like land banking.

Mr. Peterson: I want to talk about a failure in women's programmes, if I may. We are very much in favour of the programmes but when you see the investment of money and the results, I am sure you will share my disappointment, Mr. Speaker.

Women's programmes in most Ontario government agencies and ministries have been set up in response to a memorandum from the Premier in October 1973 initiating action on the green paper on equal opportunity for women. This is now known as the Affirmative Action Programme. Directives aimed at promoting the equality of women employed by the provincial government have been in place since 1974. Over the last three years we have been told that "the Affirmative Action Programme is oriented towards results rather than procedures"—that "visible, top-level support of an initial and ongoing nature is a key element for successful affirmative action," and that "care should be taken to ensure that the women's adviser in each ministry has the resources and authority needed to accomplish the task."

Over the three-year period we have seen the Affirmative Action Programme spend $1,631,583 for a mere 130 "significant" advancements. This means an expenditure of $12,550 on each effort to promote the 130 women. Over half of the 1975-76 budget was spent on salaries of programme personnel.

While 28 ministries and agencies were directed to participate in 1974-75, only 16 actually did so; in 1975-76, 29 ministries and agencies should have participated but five failed to do so. Consequently, three years after its initiation, over 2,300 women are still untouched by the Affirmative Action Programme. In spite of yearly budgets of at least half a million dollars, the programme directives are not being taken seriously.

Does the Premier really have any hope, any intention, that this programme shall be a success? Even his own office has one of the worst records of all the ministries and agencies in the entire government. How can other ministries be expected to take Affirmative Action Programmes seriously when the Premier has contributed very little top-level visible support and involvement in his own office?

The status of women employed by the government of Ontario remains deplorable. In the Ontario Public Service there are 25,900 women employees. Forty per cent of them make under $9,000 while only five per cent of the men make under $9,000. Viewed the other way, 35 per cent of males earn over $15,000 while less than six per cent of women employees do so. Predictably, any bracket under $11,000 is over-represented by women. However, only 162 women earn over $25,000 in the total government labour force of 68,225.

Women still hold 95.6 per cent of all office support—clerical jobs. Only 29 women out of a total of 743 hold senior management positions at the programme executive level and above. Gestures such as the Affirmative Action Programme, which appear to be more symbolic than real, will simply not suffice.

About 1.4 million women participate in the Ontario labour force. This represents 44 per cent of the adult female population and 36.8 per cent of the female labour force is self-supporting. The government has failed dismally to set an example to employers across the province in upgrading the status of women employees and providing them with equal employment opportunities and equal pay for work of equal value.

In many respects it would seem that there has been little change in the government's attitude to the question of women's equality since the spring of 1975 when the then Minister of Labour said that "society is not completely sold" on the concept of equal pay for equal work. At the same time he indicated

that in his opinion "the legislation now in effect does as much as society is prepared to accept."

Another example of a large budget with very, very few results. I don't call it waste, I just call it inefficiency and a failure to get the kind of results that are necessary.

I want to discuss regional government briefly, if I may. You know our party's position on regional government.

Mr. Foulds: No.

Mr. Peterson: I can take the next two hours to explain it to you, but I won't. I'll do it briefly.

The figures on the increase in local government spending in Ontario from 1970 to 1975 are very interesting. Regional governments' increase, 159 per cent; Metro Toronto, 102 per cent; the rest of Ontario, 65 per cent. Inflation affects all areas. Why does it hit the regions with disproportionate severity? One reason is that when local governments merged to form a region, all salaries and benefits were invariably increased towards the highest level existing in the area prior to reorganization.

Other reasons for the enormous costs of regional governments include: a tendency for salaries in regions to be higher, especially for senior administrators, than those paid in other comparable jurisdictions in the province; additional staff and temporary duplication of staff as a new bureaucracy is created; significant expansion in spending by lower-tier municipalities on services which remain in their jurisdictions; and a tendency for municipalities about to be reorganized to cut back on major capital expenditures—sewer construction and so on, for several years so that the regions can help pick up the tab. There has therefore been a surge of spending coincident with the imposition of regional government at a highly inflated cost. You can see those numbers anywhere.

The increase in spending is dramatic and in regionalized areas far outstrips the non-regionalized areas. Higher unconditional per capita grants and special grants and assistance payments are made to regional governments. Some $24.1 million alone has been paid to the regions for organizational expenses and for the development of services on a regional basis. Another $36 million has been committed to 1980 for this purpose.

Although each of the 12 regional governments cost Ontario taxpayers on an average an extra $2.5 million per year, many residents of regional government areas do not perceive the benefits which accrue from these costs. And that's the key. Indeed, many feel they are even more remote from local governments and decisions than ever. The concept and present structure of regional government must be rethought with a view to making them compatible with requirements of efficient government and the needs of the people.

I want to sum up and give you our suggestions, Mr. Speaker. You can see that I have mentioned a great number of policy areas and I think there are some common threads. I think we have to start with some government direction at the top in this area and I wanted to sum up with our specific proposals to deal with some of these admittedly complicated policy areas.

We recommend a programme of deregulation. This would function on two levels. At the first level it would look at all committees, boards, agencies, groups of every type under the aegis of the government of Ontario, to try to attempt to streamline, to try to attempt to demystify and try to attempt to bring some efficiency to this great myriad of agencies that surround it. We think in our judgement, this could be done with a committee of this Legislature on a non-partisan basis, everyone working together. We think we would be doing the people of this province a great service.

I think another great service we could do in this particular area is to have a deregulation committee, looking at all statutes and laws and regulations on the books in this province. It's incredible the number of things that sneak up on us year after year. We spend so much time creating laws and so little uncreating laws, and so many aren't appropriate any more. We think a conscientious effort should be made to deregulate and to that end we would be happy with a select committee of this Legislature to do that kind of thing.

I was very happy to see the Treasurer's suggestions about zero-based budgeting. Of course we've been talking about that for a while. We agree with that. Why we like it most is because it forces every agency, every ministry and virtually every person to re-examine in toto and fundamentally his function and his place in the structure of government on an annual basis, and we think that is a good thing.

We all are aware of stories of things just creeping and growing from their own momentum. We need this constant re-examination, and to the Treasurer I say that we support very strongly his management initiatives in those ways.

I have another suggestion that I think would be very worthwhile. Before any regulation or any law is brought into this Legislature to be passed for the people of the province of Ontario, there should be tabled with that law an economic analysis of all the implications of that law. Increasingly, a law that affects one aspect of the public body can have detrimental effects on the other one. I think it's important that before we get into new regulations and laws—and granted there's a great temptation to do that constantly—the government should be forced to table an economic analysis.

For example, in environmental law, what are the complete ramifications of adding five cents to the pop can? This study should be before us clearly so we can all study it and examine it, because frequently these laws become highly inflationary and they contribute to waste and inefficiency in other aspects of the system. I think in my judgement that would be a very good stricture that the government should put itself under.

We're very concerned, in looking at expenditure by month of the ministries, at the terrible abuses. Even with the Treasurer's attempt to launch a programme to bring discipline into government spending by ministry, the results are only marginally satisfactory. We find, for example, that theoretically expenditures should run about eight per cent a month of the total budget, but last year the Ministry of Industry and Tourism ran 30.7 per cent in the last month, Agriculture ran 24 per cent in the last month, and Environment ran 25 per cent in the last month.

What it says is, there are ministers jamming through their budget in the last month in order that they won't be cut off for next year. That's a natural human tendency; anybody in business faces that and anybody in government I'm sure faces that. I think the government has to bring more discipline into that area, I think it has to watch for those kinds of things, and I think it has to punish those kinds of ministers.

Mr. S. Smith: That's right. It begs for waste.

Mr. Peterson: One other specific suggestion I have in this area is more long-range planning, certainly in the area of municipal finance. I'm glad to see the Treasurer is projecting out to 1981. I suspect his motives, but I still think it's a good thing. I would like to see more specific planning on a long-term basis, because I think everyone will gain from that kind of thing. If the Treasurer has some ideas and he forces his junior ministries to come to him with planning for a period of time—

Mr. Conway: Maybe they can hire John White.

Mr. Peterson: —I think he would get better results. Just coming back to the economic cost implications of all of the actions that the government undertakes, it is my judgement, looking at the Minaki Lodge situation, that nobody truly understood the cost of the actions they were undertaking because there was a shortage of information or whatever. Had they understood it, they probably would not have made the decision they have.

Mr. Foulds: No, they would have still gone ahead.

Mr. Peterson: I'm not sure; I'm taking the charitable view. You may be right. But I am saying, had the minister been fully briefed, had he and the cabinet and Management Board been fully informed of all the costs they may have made another decision. That's why I say, obviously the cabinet and Management Board should be fully informed of all potential costs. That was one of the recommendations of the public accounts committee, on which I sat—that clearly that same kind of logic should be brought into all new laws and regulations brought down by this government.

[5:15]

Mr. Foulds: Don't they have a local minister they should have kept informed of this?

Mr. Conway: They were building a palace for the governor.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a few more policy areas which I think are examples of not getting the maximum efficiency for the dollars spent, and I want to just briefly allude to some of them.

In the area of agriculture, this year's budget provides no assistance to one of Ontario's basic industries, agriculture, which generates hundreds of thousands of dollars in gross national product. There is no change of direction on the part of this government, no attempt to improve the viability of an industry which the Ontario Federation of Agriculture has estimated employs directly or indirectly some 400,000 people in this province. One-third of Canada's agricultural output comes from Ontario—for 1974, this

amounted to $1.04 billion. Ontario farmers spent about $1.6 billion on farm production items in 1974. The food processing sector employs 85,000 people in Ontario. The agricultural equipment industry had additional value totalling $188 million in 1974 and employed 10,000 people in Ontario. Ontario farmers spend $125 million to $150 million on fertilizer and lime annually.

There is considerable potential for developing export markets for several Ontario farm products, and I have been involved in some of those myself personally. There must be an all-out effort by Ontario to pressure the federal government to change our outdated tariff structure.

We cannot overlook the fact that agriculture is an energy-intensive business. Energy prices and possible energy shortages are the big question mark for the future of agriculture in this province. Obviously, the government's objective should be towards energy self-sufficiency for farms; and I'm going to be talking about this a little later, because it's something we feel very strongly about in our party. But this budget does not include any mention of the programmes and policies which are necessary to maintain and expand the agriculture industry to ensure that our farming community and our food industry meet the demands and challenges of the modern technological era.

Mr. Riddell: It's time the farmers got some consideration from this government.

Mr. Peterson: I think if this government just listened to my good friend, my colleague from Huron-Middlesex, they would solve all the answers to their problems.

Mr. Riddell: Right on.

Mr. Peterson: I'll leave that for him for another day.

Mr. Riddell: We'll do that after the next election.

Mr. Peterson: I want to talk about mining, because when we talk about some of our resources industries we're in very serious trouble in this area. I know the Treasurer knows this and I know he's worried about it. I don't think he's done anything about it, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Bain: I wouldn't even say he's worried.

Mr. Ferrier: He hasn't done much for the gold industry.

Mr. Bain: If he was worried, he should have done something.

Mr. Peterson: For the first time since the Second World War, no new major mines are under construction in Ontario and there are no new mine openings scheduled anywhere in the province in the foreseeable future. Ontario's metal mining industry is in the fifth year of a slump.

A position paper prepared by the division of mines section of the Ministry of Natural Resources has found that an early important warning indication of the health of the metal mining industry in Ontario is the level of exploration activity. According to this indicator, Ontario can anticipate a continuing decline. Exploration expenditures in Ontario during the 1972-76 period were about $15 million per year, compared with $23 million in the 1967-71 period. No discovery leading to probable new mine construction has been made since 1971.

The position paper also found that the Ontario metal mining industry provides jobs for about 40,000 people directly and for many more indirectly, and produces directly about three to four per cent of the gross provincial product.

The position paper blames the decline in provincial exploration on burdens imposed on the sector by the Ontario and federal governments.

Given this deteriorating situation in the mining industry, and the Treasurer's own admission in a Globe and Mail interview that "It's disturbing; we really are relying on the resource industry to provide a certain number of jobs . . . and a certain amount of taxes too . . ."—he always get that in—"What may be needed now are incentives to encourage basic production rather than bonuses for refining."

Mr. S. Smith: Where were they in the budget?

Mr. Peterson: It is difficult, even impossible, to comprehend the total absence of measures in the present budget to reinforce and revive this essential industry.

Remedies include, in our judgement, revision of provinicial mining tax to make the expected rate of return more attractive in relation to alternative investment opportunities. Ontario could influence federal attitudes to the industry by reviewing the effects of federal taxes in mining and making proposals on the most suitable combination of federal and provincial taxation.

Let me say in this regard, Mr. Speaker, my leader and I had a meeting with the mining industry about six months or so ago

to discuss this whole matter of taxation. I can tell you that they're upset; they think that, by and large, they've been treated reasonably fairly by the federal government. It's the provincial government that's fouling the whole thing up.

Mr. S. Smith: That's right. That's a wealth-creating industry.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's utter nonsense.

Mr. S. Smith: Nothing in your budget on that. Nothing

Mr. Peterson: Ontario could also influence the federal government to restore capital gains tax exemption for prospectors, provisions for 10-year averaging of income. Other solutions include negotiating a federal-provincial agreement on resource taxation with a reasonable ceiling on total taxation, establishing some stability in the tax system instead of continuous change. The present MEAP programme on specific properties could be expanded to more of the province, and the budget increased from the present level of $500,000.

The Ontario government could carry on airborne geophysical surveys of geologically favourable areas, similar to those being done in Quebec.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Peterson: Tax breaks should be given to people living in remote and unpopular areas, where expenses are considerably higher than in southern Ontario. We are very concerned about that and we try to be as constructive as we can so the Treasurer can—

Mr. S. Smith: Whatever happened to that OSC review—

Mr. Peterson: —go to his colleagues with our ideas for their consideration. We are continually falling behind in the regeneration of cut-over Crown lands in Ontario and I know my friends from the left, who sit to the right, have been very concerned about this—as have we and our northern members. Indeed, as have members from all over the province.

Years of Conservative mismanagement of cutting more trees than are replaced has led to a crisis situation. If no changes are made, forests will soon be unable to support the demand for wood. The government's Report of the Special Programme Review of November 1975 stated that "confirmed plans for industrial expansion will increase the total consumption of roundwood in Ontario to an estimated 900 million cubic feet by 1980. Thus, Ontario will reach its projected 2020 consumption by 1980, indicating a need for an increased silvicultural activity at a level above the present implementation schedule.

Obviously, insufficient emphasis is being given to management and regeneration when only one-third of forested acreage is being actively regenerated. As Professor K. A. Armson recently stated in a report to the Ministry of Natural Resources, Forest Management Ontario 1976—I quote: "In view of the impact of restraints which have been imposed by the provincial government, it has become imperative that a strong reiteration of support be made for the forest production programme if it is to proceed."

The government must make a commitment to sustain regeneration of all cut-over lands. Adequate financial support is essential if the forest management programme is to develop. However, no such commitment has been made by the government. In fact, in the current period, there's every indication that present government support—both money and staff—is greatly falling behind the production policy objectives in terms of the area given regeneration treatment. The situation was made even more serious by the increase in cut areas.

In 1974-75 reforestation operations on all lands cost $7.8 million out of a total forest management expenditure of $28 million. Revenues from stumpage and protection charges for the same period were $$30.6 million. Spending only 22 per cent on regeneration, the government has thus spent on the whole forest management section less than it received in taxes from the forest industry. Last year the Minister of Natural Resources himself described the present provincial reforestation programe as inadequate. He stated, "It is true that there has been a gap between the amount of area requiring regeneration and the amount that is being regenerated." In 1974, this difference was about 170,000 acres.

The government's forest management programme is outdated and inadequate. The inadequacy of the present provincial tree-planting and regeneration programme is aptly demonstrated by an analysis of the figures from the Ministry of Natural Resources annual reports.

In 1972, the area of cut-over Crown lands was 345,000 acres. The area regenerated by silviculture treatment was 167,000 acres—I'm leaving off the decimal points, Mr.

Speaker. In other words, 178,000 acres were left unregenerated.

In 1973, the area regenerated by the ministry was 165,000 acres. No figures were given for the number of acres cut over and in need of regeneration, but it is interesting to note that this figure is below the number of acres regenerated in 1972, while wood cut in that year had increased.

In 1974 the number of acres requiring regeneration was 271,000 acres. The Ministry of Natural Resources, however, regenerated only 145,000 acres; again, 126,000 acres were left unreforested.

In 1975 we had a record number of forest fires and 42,000 acres of forest land were destroyed. In 1976, we faced the worst ever total number of fires—3,946, a high of more than 1.3 million acres of forest burned. For the 1977 season there is already the likelihood of an even worse year. Already this year, there have been 84 forest fires.

The present level of government action is totally unsatisfactory and will not achieve the production target objective for cut-over lands. As Professor Armson has concluded, "There does appear to be a question as to the relative degree to which a productive programme with long-term economic consequences should be reduced in a period of fiscal restraint to the same extent as other administrative or regulatory programmes."

The forestry industry in Ontario, now at a watershed mark in terms of its future productivity and ability to generate profit, accounts for more than 60 per cent of employment in northwestern Ontario and for more than 65 per cent of the value of goods shipped from the region. Forestry and its related enterprises account for 20 per cent of the jobs and 15 per cent of the value of goods produced in all of northeastern Ontario.

In Sweden, the forest industry has always received a high priority in assessment of economic development. There is an institutionalized system for periodic re-evaluation, which allows shifts in taxation policy when and if necessary.

Mr. Bain: Good old free-enterprise Sweden.

Mr. Peterson: In terms of taxation, the government sets the viability of the industry as its main objective.

The Ontario Forest Industries Association, in February 1976, called for a comprehensive study to determine whether the current level of taxation was consistent with the industry's ability to pay. In light of recent experience, this request has considerable merit.

Mr. Bain: Those socialists sure know how to grow trees.

Mr. Peterson: In 1974, the pulp and paper sector produced $1.3 billion in products. The overall forest industry provides 75,000 jobs, and has an annual payroll of $700 million and total revenues in excess of $2 billion a year. Within a decade or less, the forest industry may be unable to meet the demand for timber.

The pulp and paper industry is probably the most energy-intensive of the province's manufacturing industries, accounting for between three and 10 per cent of total operating costs of forest-based industries in Ontario. Energy costs are imposing a significant burden on the industry. Testimony before the Ontario Legislature's select committee on Hydro last year indicated that the pulp and paper industry provided, perhaps, the greatest opportunity for meaningful conservation. What is needed is a government commitment, perhaps the setting up of a task force, to initiate research and special incentives.

Such an approach was undertaken in Sweden, when the government became concerned over the fate of the forest industry. In 1975, the National Swedish Industrial Board was entrusted with the task of reshaping the pulp and paper industry to make its energy use more effective. The National Swedish Industrial Board's mandate was "to pinpoint energy consumption and to assess what technological methods and other measures were available in the short and medium term for rationalizing utilization." Given a comprehensive programme of saving, it has been estimated that energy consumption in the Swedish pulp and paper industry can be reduced by seven per cent over the next five to 10 years.

In contrast to the forest tenure system in Ontario with its long-term contracts and cutting rights over huge tracts of land, the Swedish system emphasizes short-term arrangements and private competition. I think that's very meaningful at this particular time.

Mr. S. Smith: Did you hear that, NDP? There's private competition in Sweden.

Mr. Peterson: Excuse me, Albert, don't steal my speech.

Mr. Roy: How are you making out?

Mr. Peterson: We're getting through.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Is it worth stealing?

Mr. Roy: There's a lot of good stuff. You should be making notes.

Mr. Gregory: When are you going to start on the telephone book?

Mr. S. Smith: I'm sure you don't know one number from the other, member for Mississauga-whatever-you-are.

Mr. Peterson: I want to talk about education because it relates so fundamentally to many aspects. I think it's important to put it in perspective in the economy—where we're going and how we're going to get there—because our future so relates to what we're doing with our young people today.

In 1970-76, the Ministry of Education experienced an average annual percentage increase in expenditure of 12.1 per cent. Expenditures increased 13.3 per cent in 1974, 11.3 per cent in 1975 and 11.8 per cent in 1976, despite the decreasing enrolment. In 1976, the ministry overspent its budget by some $20 million.

Mr. S. Smith: If there were no more students in the world they would be still increasing their expenditures in that ministry.

Mr. Peterson: Many people in Ontario question whether the enormous amount of money spent on the education system is money well spent. Education expenditures were almost $2 billion in 1976, and proposed 1977 expenditures amount to $2.1 billion.

Mr. Conway: People at TV Ontario think the Treasurer is "hard-nosed."

Mr. Peterson: I can't speak to that. Leslie Frost, when he was Minister of Education, used to proclaim that this province had the best system of education in the world. No one contradicted him then because it seemed self-evident.

When the present Premier became Minister of Education he acquired responsibility for a school system of which the people of Ontario were justly proud. It was a system that operated efficiently, the students were urged to strive for excellence and graduates who accomplished this successfully met tough and fairly defined standards.

Under the aegis of the present Premier, education costs soared and the general public became increasingly concerned about the standards of education of our young people. All too soon it seems that uniform, reliable standards disappeared, province-wide examinations were abolished in 1967, and students graduated from the system with widely varying abilities and levels of knowledge. We are very pleased in this party that the government now appears to be paying some attention to the pressure from the general public and, I say with a great deal of pride, from my leader in the Liberal Party.

[5:30]

Mr. Bullbrook: Changing things around singlehandedly.

An hon. member: Maybe they will teach the government how to count.

Mr. Peterson: It was interesting when we released our paper and the minister weaseled out of his office with his wet ink and called a quick press conference to tell his story—and you know something? Some people in our party were upset about that. I really didn't mind because we are willing to help the government all we can.

Mr. Ruston: You need a lot of help.

Mr. Peterson: I think that part of our job is to share our ideas with the other side. We hope the government will adopt them and I want the Treasurer to feel free—when this whole speech is finished, I won't be a bit embarrassed if he takes it home. I know he is going to reread it tonight after he goes home, but if he adopts every single one of these policies tomorrow morning, I won't be a bit offended. I won't even take any credit and I will come and help him do it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Isn't that generous?

An hon. member: That is what minority government is all about.

Mr. S. Smith: It is more than fair.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer is losing his sense of humour. He has been hearing too much of this stuff.

Subsequent refinements of the education system which the minister has made indicate that he has already read our policy carefully. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. We must feel complimented that the minister is following our advice.

The education system in Ontario is financially supported by the people in the belief that a literate, skilled and articulate population is vital for the well-being of this province. Our schools have a very important role to play in providing our young people with the skills they need to become productive members of society, as well as informed citizens.

Ontario is suffering from the worst unemployment in years. Some 15 per cent of the labour force under 25 years of age are unemployed. Graduates of Ontario's expensive post-secondary educational system are experiencing great difficulty in obtaining the jobs for which they have trained, or indeed any job at all.

Dr. Rodney May, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, recently pointed out the shortage of trained personnel in certain industrial fields. According to Dr. May, Ontario needs 350 occupational health nurses, 270 occupational hygienists and 250 safety engineers.

Since the beginning of the 1970s, there has been a poor labour market for highly qualified manpower. Despite this fact, post-secondary enrolment in Ontario, both full time and part time, has continued to increase every year. No relief is in sight for the growing oversupply of young graduates. Current policies in Ontario will do little to stimulate the demand.

Most high school students still aspire to white collar jobs, although opportunities are limited and likely to remain so. Neither the high schools nor the post-secondary institutions of Ontario cultivate the qualities of entrepreneurship—and I am going to deal with that later because that's something this government has removed and not fostered in any way in this province.

Mr. S. Smith: That's right. They are responsible for a decline in the free enterprise ethic.

Mr. Peterson: Career counsellors appear to do little to redirect student aspirations, to channel them into the blue collar skilled labour, service and entrepreneurial jobs where a demand for workers exist and will continue to exist. It would appear the system can neither create enough jobs for the young nor provide them with the skills and values which would help them to create their own opportunities.

The number of potential workers with post-secondary education, seeking higher level white collar jobs, is growing far more rapidly than the supply of such labour. On the other hand, a future labour shortage in various blue collar occupations is a very real possibility. In the past, these blue collar labour requirements have been met through immigration. It will be difficult to sustain the required levels of immigration if we have a large number of well educated young people with high expectations but with few employment prospects.

Little attention has been given to the potentially socially disruptive consequences of youth unemployment and the very real prospect of relatively highly educated young people accepting jobs below their expectation levels, in the process displacing other, less educated workers.

There is a need and a very basic need for a fundamental reassessment of the link between the educational system of Ontario and the present and future requirements of the labour market. Many things could and should be done.

Stimulation must be provided to create employment opportunities for the young. We need research and development of "knowledge industries" in Ontario, which would employ some of our highly qualified manpower in a meaningful sense. Work study programmes should be established to facilitate a smoother transition between school and work.

A thorough reassessment should be made to clarify exactly what we are getting for our education dollar, particularly in the field of post-secondary education. Serious attempts must be made to provide forward-looking rather than purely reactive policies, bearing in mind the social and economic disruptions which lie ahead, if we continue as at present, rather than adapting to modern day realities.

I want to talk about housing because it's of very serious concern to us.

Mr. Conway: Certainly to the member for Carleton.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: You can see me listening with great attention.

Mr. Conway: Have you got that rent control digested?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Absolutely.

Mr. Peterson: In the four years since its creation, the Ministry of Housing has experienced an annual increase of 85.2 per cent in expenditure; 91.8 per cent in 1974 and 180 per cent in 1975. In 1976 the expenditures actually decreased $2 million to $169 million.

During the years of the enormous spending increases, Ontario was not producing anywhere near the 100,000 annual starts deemed necessary by the Comay report. Indeed, in 1974, the year expenditures rose by 91.8 per cent, urban housing starts in Ontario dropped by 29 per cent; and the following year, when expenditures rose by double that amount, urban starts fell by an additional 5.7 per cent. In that same year, starts rose nationally by 7.3 per cent.

Mr. Bullbrook: Kind of an inverse ratio.

Mr. Peterson: The member for Carleton agrees with me.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They were catching up.

Mr. Roy: Catching up?

Mr. Conway: The member for London North has been writing the minister's speeches.

Mr. Roy: It's not obvious from the budget that you're catching up.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They were catching up with us.

Mr. Peterson: It is evident that the funds allocated to housing programmes are not being properly channelled. The lack of affordable housing, and particularly of multiple dwelling starts, in this province is deplorable, and I earlier read the current figures into the record. However, I fail to see how a decrease in expenditures will solve the problem.

The Treasurer would have us believe that we suffer from an excessive inventory of unsold housing units. What we truly suffer from is a serious lack of affordable housing. This year the government is predicting a drop in housing starts of 4,700 units to 80,000 units and since its predictions are normally overly optimistic, and the more reliable Conference Board forecasts only 72,800 starts for Ontario in 1977, we can assume the shortage of housing units will continue in Ontario. This situation is intolerable. Efforts must be made to use expenditures effectively, to get serviced land on to the market more cheaply and more quickly, to streamline the municipal approval process, enabling municipalities to play their part in providing affordable housing.

The government's so-called housing policies have been a complete failure. No attempt has been made to live up to commitments to provide suitable and affordable housing for the majority of our citizens. In the two-year period, 1973-74, the Ministry of Housing failed to take advantage of some $103 million made available to it from the federal government under CMHC funding arrangements.

During the last election campaign, the Premier himself got into the act, when he promised help with mortgage rates—a yearly allowance of up to $500 to reduce interest charges on residential mortgages over 10.25 per cent.

Mr. Roy: Yes. Whatever happened to that promise?

Mr. Peterson: He was hardly off the campaign trail before he abandoned the idea.

Mr. Conway: Promise the moon and deliver a thin slice of rancid cheese.

Mr. Peterson: The average home buyer is still faced with an enormous initial capital outlay, followed by years of bondage to high monthly mortgage payments. As if the situation isn't bad enough, the government has placed municipalities in a position where they are literally forced to substantially increase property taxes.

The president of the Canadian Institute of Public Real Estate Companies has pointed out that "the real estate industry, more than any other segment of our society, has been plagued by federal, provincial, regional and municipal intervention and layers of red tape. We have witnessed first hand [he said] the costly delays in registration of plans of subdivisions the proliferation of hearings . . . the duplications of approval procedures . . . and the excessive and frequently nonsensical controls and restrictions. This regulatory 'overkill' has more than anything destroyed the Canadian dream of home ownership by pricing it beyond the reach of the average family through the additional costs of unnecessary government interference."

Let me state this very strongly: Our party believes in home ownership. We believe that everybody should be put in a position to be able to have a stake in this community. "No other activity of this government would contribute more to the stability and security of our towns and cities than extending the right to home ownership to a far broader sector of our population. Our society is based on the concept of a small property-owning democracy. Opportunity for equity build-up, security of tenure and an economic stake in the community must remain a viable option for Ontario families." My leader has said that many times, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell you that all the members of this caucus support him completely.

The means must be found to offer more initiatives for the construction of housing units, through start-up and tax incentives. Possibly lower-cost subdivision servicing standards should be developed and encouraged. Increased provincial funding is necessary for trunk servicing of sewers and water supply in co-operation with municipalities.

The government has now yielded to our continued pressure to get out of land-banking, but has not yet taken up our suggestions for land servicing, which we have brought to its attention on many occa-

sions. We also need a land inventory showing which land is serviced, land which is close to services, and land which is capable of being serviced. Bureaucratic red tape must be, if not eliminated, at least drastically reduced. Faster decisions on zoning, site-plans, and subdivision applications are vitally important. We have pointed out in the Legislature only recently, Mr. Speaker, how we could assist in the unemployment problem in this province today by creating jobs, by accelerating the planning procedure. We have called for that, and still no action.

Provincial sales tax should be taken off residential building materials, or at least offset with grants to purchasers of new homes.

We need a province-wide development plan, within which local land use plans can be established and implemented without constant interference from Queen's Park. Rather than initiating grandiose plans for new towns, existing communities should be encouraged to expand. These already have sewage, water, schools, churches, recreational facilities, and so forth.

One aspect we must never overlook in our search to find solutions to the housing problem is the need to preserve our agricultural land. Housing should not be built on prime agricultural acres—there is plenty of less desirable land, and we must evolve new land servicing methods that will make this land accessible for housing development. On this point, as an authority I would like to quote my friend Charlie Farquharson, Mr. Speaker, who says, "Ontario is becoming a place to stand, but there's no place to grow."

Because of the present tax assessment procedures, there is a tendency to build houses which are too large, too expensive and—in view of the energy situation—too costly to heat.

Mr. Bullbrook: What are you shaking your head about?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: He is wrong—the member for Parry Sound objects.

Mr. Peterson: It has sometimes been suggested that municipalities engage in assessment planning by adopting defensive servicing and zoning standards. At last year's community planning conference, the Deputy Minister of Housing said that "municipalities are planning communities of such high standard that more than 50 per cent of the people in Ontario cannot afford to live in them."

Property tax has for years been an excessive tax burden at the local level. This tax is utilized to finance a large proportion of the soft services, such as social service programmes, schooling and recreation. As a result, land is viewed in terms of tax capacity. Obviously, it is no simple task to develop alternative sources of finance for municipal soft services, but an adequate supply of affordable housing cannot be realized easily if high property taxation continues.

We must bring competition and free enterprise back to the housing market. An increase in serviced building lots would accomplish this to some extent, and would encourage smaller builders to enter the field.

Possibly the key to achievement of a reasonable price level for single family lots is the establishment of a massive land servicing programme in the environs of our cities, towns, and villages. The government has formerly spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on land banking. Instead, it should spend the same amount of money on the provision of water and sewage trunks and to streamline the subdivision approval process, to encourage an over-supply of lots on the market.

In short, then, the provincial government should concentrate on the provision of more serviced land in co-operation with municipalities and reduce red tape which slows down approvals, raising housing costs as developers hold land for an excessive length of time. We must encourage reasonable expansion of communities which have already installed hard services, and make adequate provision of soft services, instead of building new towns. Standards should be made more flexible, so that, for example, septic tanks can be used where conditions rule against sewers. Incentives should be provided to municipalities to encourage development of a variety of housing, geared to the needs of poorer families and senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, again I give that to the Treasurer to take to his colleague, the Minister of Housing, with our blessings and hope he will institute it tomorrow morning. Thank you.

I want to talk about Industry and Tourism, because it's a big concern to us.

Mr. Conway: The minister is something more of a concern. Maybe now that he is married he may straighten out.

Mr. Peterson: Well, it hasn't straightened out the rest of him.

The Ministry of Industry and Tourism has experienced average annual increase in expenditure of 12.4 per cent in recent years. In 1974 and 1975 percentage increases in expenditure were 42.3 per cent and 37.8 per cent; in 1976 expenditures were forecast to

increase an additional 23.5 per cent. In spite of these increases in expenditure, business failures in Ontario, as a percentage of the national total, rose from 34.8 per cent to 50 per cent during the period 1970 to 1976.

That is to say, in the years of heavy expenditure, namely 1974 to 1975, bankruptcies rose from 39.9 per cent to 48 per cent of the national total, rising to 50 per cent the following year. Some 80 per cent of the business failures in Ontario were in the construction, trade, and service industries, all of which are labour-intensive industries which must not be allowed to flounder.

Funds allocated to Industry and Tourism are expected to remain unchanged in 1977. We have, in this particular connection, a small business policy that I am going to discuss with this Legislature a little later. But we think that is one of the answers when we are faced with very serious deficits in terms of balance of payments with respect to our tourism. We think that we have a real plan to help the independent operator in the tourist business, and I will be discussing that a little later, if I may.

[5:45]

Mr. Conway: We used to have the Premier's face in Times Square.

Mr. Peterson: I want to talk about decentralization. It is a very, very, very important belief that the Liberal Party has. It pervades all our thinking in many policies. We are strongly committed to decentralization of government, of expenditures, of decision-making, and particularly of industry. I want to talk about this programme and lay before the House our suggestions in this particular area.

We think, frankly, all the forces have been conspiring the other way in this province. All the forces fed by the government of this province have been to draw growth and draw people into Toronto and the Toronto area, and to centralize all the things but we think the time has come to reverse.

The government has talked about decentralization a great deal, there's no question about that and so far we've seen very little result. Clearly the time has come when we must give urgent and serious consideration to effective methods of decentralizing growth in our cities and industrial areas and encouraging development in the rest of the province. We can no longer ignore the need to evolve some system of developing balanced growth throughout Ontario.

Obvious to anyone who travels at all, and all the members of this House do, are the glaring discrepancies that are visible to the naked eye as one travels about this province between the southwest and the north and east.

In the past, Ontario's population was concentrated to a large extent on urban centres in the central and southwestern portion of the province. These centres have become surrounded by sprawl, which results in high servicing and transportation costs, the loss of irreplaceable farm lands, pollution of our environment, misuse of energy resources and the destruction of unique landscape features. The notion that Ontario is a land of limitless space is a myth for most of us today.

Today, nine out of 10 residents of Ontario live in the southern part of the province, which has an overall population density higher than that of India—nearly 170 people to the square mile. By contrast, we have seen lack of growth, economic stagnation and decline of many rural areas, particularly vast regions of northern and eastern Ontario. Nor are these trends expected to change in the foreseeable future. According to TEIGA documents such as Ontario's Changing Population, published in March 1976, central Ontario will continue to increase its proportion of the province's population while every other region's will decrease.

Of the six major cities of the province, all except Ottawa are located in southern Ontario. These cities are expected to increase their proportion of the total provincial population from about 60 per cent to about 80 per cent by the year 2001. By contrast, most of the counties of eastern and northern Ontario will experience net migration losses.

Closely related to population changes are job opportunities in the various regions. Employment in central Ontario increased from 57 per cent of the provincial total in 1951 to 62 per cent in 1971. Nor is there any indication that the rate of concentration is decreasing.

There is a widening gap between different parts of Ontario with respect to economic opportunity, population size and lifestyle. The difficulties and dangers involved in living in a political jurisdiction with sharply divided identities, values and concerns are well known to us all. Yet the Progressive Conservative government has done little to resolve this problem.

In 1966, the then Premier, John Robarts, introduced a policy statement known as Design for Development, which ostensibly had as one of its goals a more equal share of growth for all regions of the province. More than

10 years later we are still moving in the opposite direction, increasing growth and opportunity in certain regions at the expense of others.

A study of northern Ontario development published by the Ontario Economic Council in 1976 shows the objective of decentralizing economic and population growth to the northern and eastern regions of Ontario is not being achieved. In northern Ontario, for example, there has been a relative decline in the labour force tied to the two primary resource industries—forestry and mining, which we have discussed earlier. The population growth has been slower than that of the province as a whole, incomes tend to be below the provincial average, and the level of common social and cultural amenities is acknowledged to be low.

The second focus of provincial regional development policy was to be the containment and structuring of growth in the Toronto central region, where pressures to expand in the form of urban sprawl were the greatest. Yet growth has continued to concentrate in the area west of Metro and expectations of eastward growth have not materialized.

Mr. Conway: That's obvious.

Mr. Peterson: Agricultural land and recreational facilities in the vicinity of Toronto have come under relentless development pressure. Water quality in the Great Lakes, the Kawartha Lakes and particularly Lake Simcoe has been deteriorating. Both the provincial COLUC task force report, published in 1974, and a recent publication by the Bureau of Municipal Research have concluded that little has been done to reduce the problems of increasing sprawl in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

In April 1976, TEIGA released a document entitled Ontario's Future Trends and Options, as a further development of the Design for Development concept. The report shows that the same population employment trends which resulted in original concern about the need for regional development in 1966 had intensified by 1976. Why did the government publish a document in 1976, undoubtedly at great cost and bureaucratic effort, which merely repeats the need for corrective measures, a need which was recognized 10 years earlier?

Mr. S. Smith: It is a poor effort to pull the wool over the eyes of the people.

Mr. Peterson: Two of the major regional development thrusts of Design for Development were the dispersal of economic growth and development of the lagging regions of Ontario by the containment of sprawl, and by the sound staging of growth in the Toronto area. Neither of these have been achieved in the 10 years since the programme was first announced.

Closely related to any regional development strategies are provincial development strategies. In 1974 it was announced in the House that a provincial land-use plan, an important component of a provincial development strategy, was about to be produced. Such a provincial strategy is essential to provide guidance to local and regional planners and to give us all some indication of where various types of growth are to be encouraged. No overall provincial strategy has yet appeared.

The trends and options statement maintained that the provincial government does not have an entirely free hand in determining the rate of development in various parts of the province. However, through various measures, the government could have a much more positive influence in the decision of where we choose to live.

Consider the location of government offices and services—and this is where in my judgement, the single biggest failure has been. This government is the biggest employer in the province. It has the most money. It could have spread that growth out all over the province. There is nothing more stabilizing in a community than even a small civil service payroll which tends to be mobile; it has a profound ripple effect throughout a community. And the government has failed.

Mr. Conway: You have sent Leo Bernier north of the pork barrel.

Mr. Peterson: This could have been done. Only recently has the government announced its first tentative move to decentralize the ministries in what it considers a meaningful way. These steps are inadequate both in scope and magnitude. They are just a pale start.

Some 1,650 civil service jobs in Metro Toronto are to be relocated in Kingston and Oshawa, as part of a move by the province to go east. Imagine, as far as Oshawa. Very inspiring to the citizens of eastern Ontario. The head office of OHIP division of the Ministry of Health will move to Kingston, involving the transfer of more than 900 jobs; but moving the head office of the Ministry of Revenue to Oshawa will probably only mean that some 750 employees will commute. This is really not solving the problems that it is

designed to solve. In three or five years Toronto will be there anyway.

Virtually all the government operations being transferred will remain fairly close to home at Queen's Park.

With regard to government agencies the sincerity of the commitment to rationalize and decentralize government services is also dubious when one considers that of the 344 government agencies no fewer than 274 are located right here in Toronto; and even those services which would appear to be decentralized relate to titular appointments to boards of governors and public institutions. Regional boards of health are the only ones that have worked.

By way of illustration, such agencies as the Agricultural Tile Drainage Licence Review Board, the Dairy Herd Improvement Advisory Committee, the Farm Products Marketing Board, the Ontario Apple Marketing Commission and the Ontario Cream Producers' Marketing Board are all located in Toronto, which, while prosperous, can hardly be considered the fertile agricultural heartland of Ontario.

Mr. S. Smith: There really is no excuse for that.

Mr. Peterson: To cite another example: The Natural Resources Advisory Committee for the north-central and northeastern regions are both located in Toronto, as are such urban-related agencies as the Game and Fish Hearing Board and the Crown Timber Board of Examiners. This just doesn't make sense.

The Liberal Party has for years been calling for decentralization; and I repeat that. In our judgement there should be a freeze on growth of the civil service in Toronto. It should immediately be looking outward. Rent out some of the office space the government has here.

My principle objection to that famous old Hydro building—and you will recall the issue, Mr. Speaker—was the fact that it was located where it was. Why do we need to bring in those thousands of people who work down there, creating pressures on urban transportation? Every time that number of people are brought into an urban setting it causes many more problems. The building could have been located in many other areas in this province. In my judgement, it was very bad planning.

Mr. Speaker, do you want me to carry on for another four minutes? What is your judgement on that?

Mr. Speaker: It was my understanding that the hon. member had until 6 o'clock.

Mr. Peterson: Okay, I will continue. I want to speak about some of the inequities in terms of municipal financing in this province.

The tri-level conference held in Edmonton in October 1973: John White, Treasurer at the time, said, "The Ontario government, therefore, gives this guarantee to its local governments—provincial assistance in future years will grow at a rate not less than the growth rate of Ontario's total revenues."

From this statement it would seem that to pass on to the municipalities any amount below the provincial gross rate of revenue is contrary to the government's commitment. However, the amount of funds that should have been transferred to municipalities was reduced in 1974 by $99 million and in 1976 by $22 million. The provincial government claimed that due to an overpayment in 1975 it did not need to give municipalities the full growth rate in revenues of 14 per cent in 1976. By granting an eight per cent increase in 1976 it felt that because of the previous overpayment, it was, on a cumulative basis, adhering to the Edmonton commitment.

The confusion surrounding the Edmonton commitment has resulted from the interpretation of the guarantee which I have quoted, particularly the words "not less than" with regard to the amount of the revenue transfer. These words appeared in the original version of the position paper on public finance presented at the conference; were deleted entirely in the summary of the same document; appeared again in a statement in the Legislature, and were once more deleted in their entirety in the 1974 budget statement. The government's inconsistency in wording led to different conclusions about the extent of the revenue transfers on the part of the municipalities and the province.

Mr. S. Smith: Quite purposeful.

Mr. Peterson: In a statement in the House on December 11, 1975, the Treasurer set out the provincial position which was: Moneys due under the Edmonton commitment represent the maximum amount of moneys which may be transferred to local government; and further that the commitment should be interpreted to mean moneys due on a cumulative basis. The municipalities, on the other hand, felt the commitment represented a minimum level and therefore rejected the argument that transfers be calculated on a cumulative basis.

Despite pious words about its support of local government, the provincial government

would have been the ultimate beneficiary of the Edmonton commitment however interpreted. By applying its own interpretation, it has benefited that much more.

In the position paper, John White made the following revealing statement: "Ontario's own fiscal capacity is increasing about 10 per cent per year, in keeping with the growth of the economy. This growth rate enables Ontario to finance its own programmes, but does not provide the capacity to cover increasing municipal deficits. In the period 1970 to 1973, assistance to local government grew 50 per cent, while Ontario's total revenues increased 35 per cent. The net result has been that the province has increased the size of its own deficits to cover the local financial deficiency and prevent mill-rate increases."

Prior to the Edmonton commitment, transfers to local government were increasing at a higher rate than the increase in Ontario's total revenues. By limiting the future rate of such increases to ". . . the rate of growth of the total provincial revenue," this commitment had the effect of reducing the rate of increase in transfers to local government.

The municipalities, and by extension property taxpayers, have been the ultimate losers. At the present time, by its own calculations, the government owes the municipalities $108 million in transfer payments. The province has not fairly dealt with these municipalities. Its much-heralded advance presentation in September to the municipalities of its 1977 transfer intentions is simply not enough.

The province should undertake a three-year commitment of funds to municipalities. This would allow them to plan and to set their own priorities, rather than forcing them to respond in an ad hoc fashion to provincial decisions. A multi-year provincial plan, something this province has long been in dire need of, would assist municipalities in ordering their priorities.

Mr. Speaker: Would this be an appropriate place for the hon. member to break his remarks? I understand, though, there has been a later agreement which I had not been informed of earlier that he will continue at 8 o'clock.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 26, 1977

Manpower control, statement by Mr. Auld 879

Environmental assessment, statement by Mr. Kerr 879

Points of order re compendium of information, Mr. Reid 880

Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid, Mr. Foulds 881

Reed Paper, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds 882

Restitution by courts, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Stong 882

Insulin prices, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Moffatt 883

Aid to the Third World, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Good, Mr. Roy 884

Restitution by courts, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. McKessock, Mr. Roy 885

Fire prevention, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Foulds 886

Women in labour force, questions of Mr. McKeough: Ms. Gigantes, Mr. Cassidy 886

Wintario funds, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Kerrio 887

Downsview Airport development, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. di Santo 887

Public health nurses, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. O'Neil 887

Racism in schools, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Grande 888

Northstar Yachts Limited, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Riddell 889

Inco emissions, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Germa, Mr. Bain 889

Aggregate resources, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Gaunt 889

Land speculation tax exemption, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Nixon 890

Atikokan Hydro plant, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Reid 890

Housing programme, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Breaugh 891

Services to the handicapped, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Ruston, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. G. I. Miller 891

Benefits rates, questions of Mrs. Birch: Ms. Sandeman, Mr. Cassidy 892

York Regional Council, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Stong 892

Voluntary fire departments, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Wildman 893

Sales tax on insulation materials, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Haggerty 893

Hydro blackouts, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Foulds 893

Canadian history, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Sweeney 893

Notice of dissatisfaction with answer to oral question, Mr. Makarchuk 894

Speaker's ruling re petitions 894

Point of order re Speaker's ruling, Mr. Breaugh 894

On point of order re amendment to budget speech motion, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Welch, Mr. Renwick, Mr. MacDonald 894

Speaker's ruling re point of order 895

Notice of dissatisfaction with answer to oral question, Ms. Gigantes 900

Borough of Scarborough Act, Mr. Drea, first reading 900

Borough of North York Act, Mr. Williams, first reading 900

Environmental Assessment Amendment Act, Mr. Kerr, first reading 900

Casgrain Township Lands Act, Mr. Lane, first reading 900

Pension Benefits Amendment Act, Mr. di Santo, first reading 901

Point of order re tabling compendium of information, Mr. Lewis 901

Workmen's Compensation Amendment Act, Mr. di Santo, first reading 901

Budget debate, continued, Mr. Peterson 901

Recess 932

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.; Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)

Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 23

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Tuesday, April 26, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Peterson: I trust everyone enjoyed his little break, Mr. Speaker. I know I did.

I want to finish up with a few other areas that are of great concern to us and I'll try not to take any more time than I have to. One of the things that had been bandied around and deferred on almost a constant annual basis is the whole matter of property tax reform in this province. Perhaps the most blatant example of government waste and lack of return for dollars spent is the three commissions appointed to investigate, to make recommendations and reform the property tax:

The Ontario committee on taxation under Smith dealt extensively with property tax reform in 1967.

Taxation in Ontario, a programme for reform under John White, did the same thing the following year. Neither of these reports has ever been acted upon, although the need for reform remains acute.

In May 1976 the government appointed yet a third commission under Willis Blair with the same intent—to study property tax reform based on the proposals put forward by the government in budget paper E of the 1976 budget. Again the government is stalling. As the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) conceded in an interview after the Blair commission report early in March, there is virtually no chance of implementing a province-wide system of taxation based on market value assessment as scheduled next year. One can speculate as to the reasons why. However, the Treasurer supplied the best one himself when he said that basically we are dealing with something that affects 3,500,000 property owners in this province. I can think of few issues that are more potentially explosive in a political sense or any other sense you want to name. That's a lot of voters and many more are affected and concerned, and the issue is most definitely explosive. The citizens of Ontario are angry at many of the proposals.

If the Premier (Mr. Davis) is still fishing for an election he may be interested in looking at the Blair commission proposals on budget paper E. I was just reading tonight over dinner a speech that the Treasurer gave at 1 o'clock this afternoon, talking about honest politicians, dealing honestly with the issues that faze us. This is a perfect example of an inability and an unwillingness to face up to real issues. We've seen these deferrals for almost 10 years now and depending upon the political climate at any given time, I don't look for any action in the near future. But more of that speech in a little while.

I want to deal with budget paper E and the Blair commission report. As the leader of my party said of both the proposals and the report:

"The whole thing is a misguided, tangled, and futile exercise which should never see the light of day. It fails to address itself to the real problem which is the sickness affecting municipal financing today—a sickness that is almost terminal. Municipal financing needs rejuvenation, not tinkering. The government fails to understand the nature of the problems which face the municipalities. We need municipal diversity and autonomy. Instead, the government seems determined to create a whole series of games and amusements for bureaucrats. The use of market value as the standard for property taxation is completely arbitrary. We do not believe in it, and we feel that other standards of comparison between communities, based on per capita income, would make far more sense. Furthermore the municipalities need a share of other taxes more than they need adjustments to property tax."

As we stated in our brief to the Blair commission, the government has put the cart before the horse. The property tax proposals represent yet another case of government action taken without careful and thoughtful planning. The uncertainty that has surfaced in much of the discussion of the proposals across the province is attributable to the lack of in-depth studies on the effect of the imposition of the proposals will have on specific communities.

Detailed assessment figures should have been released prior to the commission hearings. Municipalities would then have had an opportunity to assess them and to determine

if major shifts in local taxation would occur. Such shifts would of course affect local planning and priorities. Concerned groups have not had available to them the data necessary to them to evaluate and comment upon the new system.

With regard to proposal number one, taxes on residences, which the commission concurred with, we feel that only detailed studies will yield the appropriate percentage of property tax which residences in Ontario should bear, and we know the government has not undertaken such studies. The municipality is the level of government best equipped to determine what percentage of tax load should be borne by residents and what percentage by industry. It may well be best for the tax rate to be set at the municipal level so it is flexible and can vary according to commercial and residential tax bases available in each individual community.

The commission's recommendations concerning proposal number two, especially as it affects golf courses, are a small improvement on the government's original proposals, which would have put many golf courses out of business. We believe golf courses and other open recreational spaces deserve encouragement and protection and should not suffer at the hands of this new proposal.

Proposal number four on farms and managed forests stated that farm land, farm buildings and managed forests be taxed at 100 per cent of market value and that those taxes be paid by the province.

It is evident from the objections being raised loudly and clearly across the province that farmers do not want the province to pay their taxes. As responsible members of the community, they feel it is their responsibility and duty to contribute a fair share through tax dollars.

Further, many feel payment of taxes by the province is tantamount to government control of their land, that their status as independent businessmen is being constantly eroded, and that this trend could ultimately lead to the government dictating what and how much is to be produced. Farmers are also sensitive to the notion that may arise among the non-farming public as a result of the implementation of this proposal, that farmers are a heavily and perhaps oversubsidized group in society, a privileged group. Such a notion is simply untrue.

As a response to the outcry on the part of farmers to this proposal, the commission recommended that the farmers pay 10 per cent of the property tax on the abovementioned properties and that the remaining 90 per cent be paid by the province. To us, this is ridiculous. Whether the government pays 90 per cent or 100 per cent of farm land tax is irrelevant. Either the system is totally opposed to the wishes of Ontario's farmers, or it isn't.

All they ask is that they should pay their fair share of the taxes according to the productive capacity of the land—no more, no less. Tax for soft services such as educational and social services should be eliminated from farm land and farm buildings. The present farm tax rebate system is still preferable to the government's new proposals.

One of the main objectives of budget paper E was to achieve a more neutral business assessment rate. If the commission's proposal on business assessment is implemented, it will deal a harsh blow to business, especially owner-managed business, while providing a favourable tax bias for enterprises such as breweries, distilleries and financial institutions. The proposal discriminates against the already hard-pressed small businessman and against businesses with low earning capacity, especially new businesses, and bears no relationship to the income-earning capacity of business or its ability to pay tax.

Mr. McCague: Are you sure about that?

Mr. Peterson: I'm absolutely sure.

No explanation has been given by the government for adopting 50 per cent additional assessment of market value as the appropriate rate. The only clear reason for putting forward this proposal is that it is simple. There is no excuse for the discrimination which will result.

We believe that non-profit and charitable organizations should continue to be exempt from property tax. The proposal to remove this exemption would only serve to erode the viability of the voluntary sector. Voluntary organizations play a valuable and irreplaceable role in community life, helping people to help themselves, fostering and supporting an attitude of self-reliance and community spirit. If these organizations are subject to property taxation, donors will be discouraged from giving and much of the time and energy that volunteers now devote directly to community services will have to be diverted into fund-raising activities. This is not only a waste of a valuable human resource, but it may also serve to erode the base of volunteer support as many feel they will no longer be working to provide services but to pay taxes.

The government's suggestion of providing grant assistance to non-profit and charitable

organizations is not acceptable to us. As stated earlier, grant systems are uncertain, negate the possibility of long-range planning and increase the likelihood of government interference in the decision-making of organizations concerned. In any case, to take the money and then give it back is bureaucratic idiocy. Further, the government has traditionally denied grant support to private schools and secondary schools past grade 10. There is no indication that this policy is about to change.

The commission recommended the creation of exemption review committees at the municipal level, which would decide if exemptions should continue to apply in certain circumstances. Inevitably, this proposed system with respect to tax exemptions for charitable and non-profit organizations will lead to chaos and confusion. The system of periodic review, and the establishment of review committees, will lead to organizations lobbying politicians and influential people to gain exemptions. This might give a tremendous advantage to strong organizations and discriminate against smaller but equally worthwhile groups. I repeat, there should be across-the-board exemptions for charitable and non-profit organizations.

The Liberal Party feels the property tax structure must be the subject of major reform. Tinkering with the present system, which is all the proposals presented by the government and the report of the commission will accomplish, is not an adequate response. As far back as the election of 1943, the Conservative Party under George Drew promised a sweeping revision of the whole property tax system in order to reduce the burden of real property taxation, and to make home ownership more accessible. Over 30 years later that promise remains unfulfilled. During that time the responsibilities of municipal government have grown enormously. The property tax system is simply not a sufficient revenue source to deal with these new and onerous burdens. A massive review of the system of real estate taxation is long overdue and must be undertaken immediately.

One of the reforms Liberals advocate is the taxation of residential buildings and a specified amount of accompanying land for services to land—for hard services such as roads, water, sewer, police and fire protection but not for services to people, or soft services, so-called, such as education and welfare. Payment for soft services by means of the property tax represents a form of regressive taxation. The Ontario property tax credit goes some way in reducing the regressivity of the property tax itself. However, the proportion of the tax that pays for soft services still applies equally to all taxpayers, regardless of ability to pay.

Mr. McCague: What about Blair on that?

Mr. Peterson: What about Blair on that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for London Centre has the floor.

Mr. Peterson: The inclusion of soft services in the property tax also discourages the construction of affordable housing.

Mr. Davidson: How can you judge a report when you haven't seen the report yet?

Mr. Peterson: The added burden that relatively-high-density, low-cost housing places on the provision of municipal services, leads many municipalities to place barriers in the way of construction of low- and moderate-cost housing. The removal of these services from property taxation would greatly facilitate municipal approval of housing at prices which people could afford. Genuine reform of the complete area of municipal finance is necessary and long overdue.

That should give you chaps something to talk about in the next campaign.

Mr. McCague: Don't be provocative now. There are a few holes in that.

Mr. Peterson: In my judgement I am coming to the single most important area in the budget that was neglected. It is of a very great concern to me personally. It's something that I've been interested in for a long time and I see continuous default by the government in terms of coming to grips with it in any meaningful way. That is the whole area of energy policy.

Mr. Haggerty: Look out, Jim, he's rolling up his shirt sleeves.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Pugilistic.

Mr. Peterson: I regret to say that the failure in this connection has been even greater at the federal level and I'm not proud of that. I think they should very seriously be pressured into a national energy policy. However, in fairness I have to say that just because the federal government has not reacted I don't feel that is any excuse in any way for the failure of this government to protect the future of this province or to protect the people of this province or the consumers of this province. Let us not forget that this is the major energy-consuming province in this country.

It has long been my view that it is an indication of the Premier's view of the situation that he has only relatively recently established the energy ministry. He really doesn't understand or appreciate fully the implications of the problems. In addition to that, he has neglected to grace that portfolio, I'm sorry to say, with a minister of insight, courage or clout.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Careful, now.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, don't get personal.

Mr. Peterson: The only consistent policy has been to blame the federal government for all of our problems. I am glad the minister is here to hear this because I feel very strongly we will push him, we will do everything we can to make him come to grips with this issue. His report last week did not do it.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It's about time you understood what the situation was and understood—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: Well, we have understood the situation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: You've never understood the situation.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You have just confessed your ignorance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: Well, we'll wait and see about that.

Mr. Ruston: What is the matter, Jim? My goodness, did you have sour milk for supper?

Mr. Peterson: I can say this to you.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You know better than that.

Mr. Peterson: If I was Premier of this province—

Mr. Kerrio: One more year of your energy policy and the lights will go out.

Mr. Peterson: This portfolio should be considered in the top two or three most important portfolios and it is not because you are in it. If the Premier thought it was serious, he wouldn't have put you in it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member speak through the Speaker, please, and continue his remarks over the interjections?

Mr. Peterson: Would you convey my remarks to the minister, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I didn't expect anything flattering from you.

Mr. Peterson: You won't get it.

No policy area will have a greater impact on the lives of the citizens of this province and the future of this country, and indeed, the entire western world. Energy policy in the future, even more than at present, will have an impact on human settlements—

[8:15]

An hon. member: You've been rehearsing.

Mr. Peterson: —on economics, on environment, on transportation and the whole social structure. In our judgement, it's absolutely imperative that governments understand and appreciate this fact and start to act accordingly. I desperately hope that President Carter's new initiatives will instil in this government a sense of urgency and a sense of priority, just as I hope they will do the same for the federal government—to get off their duffs and do something about this. I must say, I was frankly insulted when I read in the paper about the federal Minister of Energy saying it may make his road a little easier. I thought he was absolutely ridiculous, the way he handled that situation. These things should have been done before. He's at fault and this government is just as much at fault.

An hon. member: There you are.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Why don't you get the facts before you start talking?

Mr. Wildman: Why don't you get the facts?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Peterson: We had our warning in 1973 when oil prices began to increase dramatically. Daily, we've had new evidence of how precarious our position is. Even the minister acknowledged this recently in his paper, The Energy Future.

I must say I was impressed last week that he had at least revealed some understanding of the problem. I have yet to see one concrete proposal.

I want to share some of the realities of the situation as we see them in the Liberal Party and I will send the minister a copy of this paper, right after. I hope he'll start acting on it.

In Canada, we have the highest per capita consumption of energy in the world—the equivalent of 49 barrels of oil annually at a cost of $9.75 a barrel. That's approximately $440 per capita.

Of course, world prices in refining would be substantially more, but the Resources for the Future Institute, a Washington-based think tank, maintains that Canada uses 20 per cent more energy to produce the same amount of goods as the United States. Granted, we have different weather and transportations needs—I'll give the minister that. But Sweden, with a relatively similar climate and a relatively similar standard of living, uses on average 60 per cent of the energy per capita that we do here.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You aren't telling me. You've been reading my speeches.

Mr. Peterson: You've been reading our speeches. You've only had the job for about three months, and you haven't mastered it yet.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I'm still 'way ahead of you.

Mr. Wildman: Sweden is a good country to learn from.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Have you ever been there?

Mr. Peterson: Roughly 80 per cent of our $7.5 billion worth of energy is imported, which has a marked effect on our balance of payments and our standard of living.

Mr. Nixon: Don't bend my coat.

Mr. Peterson: That total of $7.5 billion breaks down roughly this way: transportation, $2.9 billion; residential, $1.3 billion; commercial, $1.1 billion; industrial, $1.9 billion; other, $0.3 billion—for a total of $7.5 billion.

In my judgement, we need a detailed analysis of all the areas where major consumption goes; we must take effective measures immediately, start attempting to curb our annual growth in demand which has, historically, been at the level of five per cent.

Just to inform the House and the members that this is possible, let me recount a study by the Brookhaven National Laboratory which estimates that on average—and granted these figures are rough, but very revealing—we waste, in North America, 68 per cent of the energy in utilities; 50 per cent in industry; 60 per cent in residences; 87 per cent in automobiles; 84 per cent in transportation and 60 per cent in commercial applications. In other words, we waste approximately two thirds of our energy. In Ontario that would be about $5 billion annually.

Mr. Nixon: And the government continues to drive those limousines.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: What about you?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: How about Mitchell Hepburn?

Mr. Nixon: We're going to auction them off.

Hon. Mr. Norton: In Varsity Stadium.

Mr. Nixon: It just occurred to me.

An hon. member: It's a good idea, Bob.

Mr. Riddell: And, furthermore, we've got an auctioneer who can do it.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You don't know a car from a cow.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member for London Centre has the floor.

Mr. Peterson: Even if we could eliminate half this waste, or even a percentage of this waste, it would result in massive savings to the people of this province.

It is our belief that the cornerstone of an energy programme must be conservation. I can tell you, I've sat through committee meetings, I've listened to ministers in estimates and it's been pooh-poohed constantly. I must say in fairness, it's only been in the last two or three months there's been any understanding of that fundamental precept at all.

Mr. Nixon: Do you mean since Mr. Taylor became minister?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That's right.

Mr. Peterson: He was told to do so. Somebody wrote him one reasonably good speech.

Mr. Lewis: What speech?

Mr. Nixon: His mother.

Mr. Lewis: Jim Taylor? A reasonably good speech?

Mr. Peterson: I am trying to be charitable and constructive. It is not easy.

It is my belief that with imaginative and tough programmes—

Mr. Singer: There is something about these evening debates that's most edifying.

Mr. Peterson: Particularly if you have been at La Scala for dinner, Vern, or the Albany Club.

It is my belief that with imaginative and tough programmes, we can substantially reduce our growth in demand without in any material way affecting our standard of living or creating major personal discomfort. A general, fair, equitable winding down of our consumption habits is preferable to what in my judgement will be some day soon a catastrophic day of reckoning. That's why I am going to lay before the Energy minister, and before the House, some very specific proposals which I recommend to him and I hope he takes courage from the strong initiatives that President Carter has instituted. We recommend a comprehensive compulsory set of insulation standards for all new buildings, be they residential or commercial.

An hon. member: Tax free.

Mr. Peterson: Imperative, no question.

An hon. member: Windmills are next.

Mr. Peterson: Number two, we advocate a comprehensive and compulsory programme of thermal upgrade, retrofitting and insulation for all existing structures. I want to talk about that for a minute, because I think it's very important and critical to the debate at hand. If we brought our existing housing stock up to 1975 federal standards at a cost of approximately $860 per unit, we could save 36 per cent of our residential heating bill or the equivalent of 824 million gallons of oil, which would mean about $412 million annually.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Have you checked the federal government building code?

Mr. Peterson: Sure.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: And the provincial building code? You don't even have this in the federal building code. We have them in the provincial.

Mr. Peterson: You do not. You don't have any.

An hon. member: Where were you for supper, Jim?

An hon. member: You copied it. You copied the federal code.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Can we have some order please? Will the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox and the member for Cochrane North please try to contain themselves. The hon. member for London Centre has the floor.

Mr. Peterson: Just to put the savings in relative terms, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Cochrane North? Has he been banished to Cochrane North?

Mr. Peterson: To save 10^6 Btu in energy through insulation costs about 50 cents. Mackenzie Valley gas when delivered will cost about $5.00 per 10^6 Btu. That's the relative cost of what we are talking about.

In our judgement the cost of this massive insulation programme should be capitalized and spread out over a term of years, so that even though the home owner was paying for insulation, when the cost was set against the savings in his fuel, his total bill would be less.

The advantages, apart from the savings in energy, in our judgement, right now are absolutely immense. This type of work is highly labour intensive—approximately 50 per cent of it. It would immediately create jobs. It is highly decentralized and it would include, to a large measure, small business. The technology is simple and available. All that is lacking is government direction.

Does the government want to create jobs? Does it want to create them tomorrow morning? Bring in a programme like this and it can be financed with no additions to the public purse. My problem with the NDP programme, frankly, is that it is going to increase the deficit. I am saying this can be capitalized. I am saying it can be spread out over a 10-year period or a five-year period, and it can be done.

Mr. Renwick: There was nothing in the remarks of the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) that would increase the deficit.

Mr. Peterson: In fairness now, the NDP position was that there should be contributions up to $500 or a third of the bill depending on the price. That sounds to me very much like a handout in these kind of situations. I think everybody in this province is in this difficulty together. I think with leadership and direction you can actually prove that the bill would be less if you capitalized it over a term of years. Government can come in with low-cost assistance.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It's not direction, it's dictation.

Mr. Nixon: If only we had a senior Minister of Energy. Bring Darcy back.

Mr. Peterson: We estimate, Mr. Speaker, and I will grant you that this is rough, but this kind of programme at this particular point in time would create—and I think the NDP figures are a little different from mine—but about 150,000 man-years of work at about $15,000 per annum.

Mr. Renwick: I think the minister would prefer it if Gerry Ford was in the White House.

Mr. Peterson: He would prefer it if Calvin Coolidge was in the White House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no responsibility on the member for London Centre to react to the interjections.

Mr. Nixon: Or the member for Riverdale to interject.

Mr. Peterson: I really enjoy it though, Mr. Speaker, no kidding.

Mr. Singer: He had his time this afternoon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Just ignore the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Singer: It's easy.

Mr. Peterson: In addition, we propose that motor vehicles should be licensed on the basis of weight or a formula related to energy consumption—not on the basis of the number of cylinders because that's a very inexact guide, as the minister knows. The number of cylinders is not an accurate measurement of efficiency. The Treasurer in his budget pays only lip-service to energy conservation. It's a throw-away line when he starts increasing the fees.

We believe that a phased increase in motor vehicle licence fees to discourage inefficient vehicles and encourage efficient models is the answer. It would be phased, and everybody would be on notice that it would be over a period of years so that people could start adjusting their own habits and the manufacturers could start adjusting their production. We think that's fair and reasonable.

We recommend a series of tax credits for the installation of renewable energy equipment. In addition, we must remove any increment in local assessment where renewable energy devices are now installed. In certain applications already in existence, a combination of solar and oil heating devices are competitive with fossil fuel applications.

In our judgement we need efficiency standards for all energy-consuming devices, including houses. This should be clearly displayed and tagged in terms understandable to any consumer. There are various ways of doing that. It can be an efficiency rating, but the preferable way to do it, in my judgement, is in terms of dollars so everybody understands the financial implications of any purchase of an energy-consuming device.

I want to repeat something that we've said for a long time. We think we need a rate structure in both electricity and natural gas which is progressive, i.e., the more you use the more you pay. Our current rate structure encourages consumption in that the more you use the less you pay per unit. The Liberal Party view is that the exact opposite should be the case. We have an obligation to people on low and fixed incomes to deliver, as a matter of public policy, a quantity of energy at as low a rate as possible. Thereafter, the larger consumer and the excessive consumer would pay progressively more.

We believe that we should introduce a time-of-day pricing structure for hydro to discourage use in peak periods and to assist in better load management. We think that would have a measurable improvement in load management and would assist Ontario Hydro in its capital programmes.

We need programmes to stimulate the development and manufacture of renewable energy devices here in Ontario; and I'm talking about a whole myriad of them, including solar, wind, biomass and methanol. I want to say a little bit about methanol technology. My colleague from Halton-Burlington (Mr. Reed) is an authority on this, and I'm sure he'll be speaking at other times in the House on this. But methanol technology is a perfect example of a renewable resource which could be grown and synthesized completely within our provincial borders. It has the potential to make a major impact on our petroleum requirements.

Mr. Nixon: Methanol can't be put to any other use.

Mr. Peterson: Some of the Tories will recall that Hitler ran the last two years of his war with it.

Feedstocks are any carbohydrate source—wood waste, special energy crops, garbage or sewage sludge. Professor Donald Mackay of the University of Toronto in a current study indicates that the cost per gallon ranges from 45 cents to 69 cents. The technology is currently available and operating in plants in such places as West Virginia.

The advantages are immense. All raw materials are indigenous to Ontario, it could help solve our waste problems and it would

substantially assist in the balance-of-payments problem. We need direction in that area, in my opinion, and that's one the government should be leading in, when we have these massive tracts of forest here; unfortunately, the government's not reforesting them.

I semi-agree with the minister's proposal that we need a federal-provincial agency to co-ordinate more, but I would take it much further.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Don't get too cosy now.

Mr. Peterson: I want to repeat what we think the function of that federal-provincial agency should be. This agency should make some of the energy investment decisions which have previously been reserved only for private companies. Its board would determine investment priorities among a full range of energy options—and that's a new problem we're running into today—including exploration, research and development, renewable resources, provision of nuclear energy, energy conservation, coal gasification and whatever. In many cases, these options would be implemented through partnership agreements with private industry.

What we don't fully understand is the tremendous competition for capital that's going to go on in this country; and, Lord knows, we have those problems now. It's going to be highly inflationary; it's going to alter our whole savings and consumption pattern in this country, in my judgement. I think we are better off co-ordinating this and having some of those tough decisions made in co-ordination with governments and private enterprise. That's why I say the kind of body that the minister proposes should go one step further.

[8:30]

In addition, let me just say by way of interest, it is estimated that in the energy field alone we are going to need some $125 billion in the next 10 to 15 years. That's substantial, and it's going to affect everyone's way of life. We cannot afford to waste it, we cannot afford to misappropriate that money and that's why we need much better co-ordination.

Mr. Nixon: That's for Canada.

Mr. Peterson: In addition, the joint federal-provincial agency would function as an energy ombudsman for Canadians, with the power to examine the books of energy companies, to independently assess oil and gas reserves and determine the potential of other energy sources for Canadian use.

I want to say this—and I don't pretend to have laid out a comprehensive energy policy, there are many other aspects to it which we will come to. But I have made a number of suggestions which in my judgement and in the judgement of the Liberal Party would impact immediately on this province. Not only in massive savings in terms of our provincial balance of payments, but also in terms of immediate job creation.

To the Treasurer, to the minister and to the government I would say this, as forcefully but as charitably as I can. They have been derelict in this area; they have been lead-footed, and they have been irresponsible—

Mr. Nixon: Ham-handed. Unimaginative.

Mr. Peterson: —and I think they've got a lot to do, and they should start now. I really hope the Minister of Energy has the clout to pull it off in cabinet. Because if he has, we're going to be right with him, and I am sure that our friends of the left who sit to the right will be there too, because by and large they would share a lot of these thoughts—maybe not all of them, but a lot of them. It's important this should become a non-partisan issue. If the minister comes up with tough measures, I can almost assure him of the support of the people in this part of the House. We are all in it together; it's a collective responsibility to make sure everybody in this province understands it.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, we've only got six more weeks to put up with these people, anyway.

Mr. Eakins: Monday it will be all over.

Mr. Nixon: You will be the minister, David.

Mr. Eakins: Can you hold out until Monday, Jim?

Mr. Ferrier: We will let you vote for our amendment.

Mr. Peterson: Before I take a detailed look at some of the provisions in this year's budget, I want to make a couple of observations on two previous budgets brought in by the Treasurer. In many respects, the people of Ontario are still paying the price of the 1975 election-year budget, in which—

Mr. Nixon: The price was $600 million.

Mr. Peterson: —the government introduced programmes blatantly aimed at vote-catching. You know what's so interesting to me, Mr. Speaker? Here we are in 1977, if you read back the old speeches of 1975 when he opted for this massive stimulation—

Mr. Nixon: Marvin Shore's speech.

Mr. Peterson: That's irrelevant in the political annals of this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk doesn't have to interrupt his colleague.

Mr. Peterson: If you listen, Mr. Speaker, they're awfully clever.

Mr. Kerrio: That is asking for direction.

Mr. Peterson: But it's curious to watch the shift in economic philosophy, depending on the political circumstances at the time. Obviously the Treasurer's reading is restrained to the measure of the day to day. In 1975, not nearly as in serious shape as we are in today, he had a totally different philosophy, a totally different set of precepts. And it is interesting to me to read and follow through those great disparities. It really speaks a lot, in my judgement, to the consistency of the government across the hall—across the pit, the middle.

The people of Ontario are still paying the price for that 1975 budget in which the government introduced programmes blatantly aimed at vote-catching. Revenue lost to the province, for just three items—a two per cent reduction in provincial sales tax, the tax rebate on cars, and the first-time home owners grant—was almost half a billion dollars. That year alone the deficit rose by $934 million, an increase of 171 per cent over 1974, to a total of $1.5 billion. The debt burden carried by every person in the province rose by 41 per cent, or $172.17 that some year.

And Marvin Shore agrees with me. Marvin agrees with us.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Marvin is a very agreeable chap.

Mr. Shore: That is the only part I agree with.

Mr. Nixon: Now, now, back to the Hunt Club, Marvin.

An hon. member: These were your notes from last year, Marvin.

Mr. Peterson: Net cash requirements were 2.8 per cent of gross provincial product that year as compared to 1.6 the year before.

Mr. Shore: Good faith.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the member for London North wants to agree or disagree he will do it from his own seat.

Mr. Kerrio: Wherever that is.

Mr. Edighoffer: Where is his seat?

Mr. Peterson: You pointed that out very well. He doesn't know his seat, and he doesn't know whether he is agreeing or disagreeing. You pointed it out very well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Swart: He's lucky if he finds the right side of the House, let alone his seat.

Mr. Nixon: He's closest to his spiritual home now.

Mr. Peterson: If the money required to service these enormous deficits had been available on the markets these past two years, the economy would have been in far healthier condition than it is now, even given the effect of those stimulative measures.

What was the effect? In budget paper A of the 1976 budget, the Treasurer quotes an article by Professors Jump and Wilson indicating the sales tax reduction, including exemptions for production machinery, reduced the rate of inflation by 0.3 per cent. Had the Treasurer quoted further, we would have learned that these professors also believed that in 1976, the end of the temporary reduction would serve to increase that rate of inflation by 0.2 per cent. That's selective editing by the Treasurer.

Because the sales tax reduction reduces transaction requirements for cash, the impact of the provincial measures upon interest rates is minimal in the current year. Next year, however, the increased borrowing puts upward pressure on interest rates, with short-term rates rising 39 basis points and long-term rates eight basis points by the end of 1976.

To some extent the automobile sales tax rebate may have stimulated sales, but these were at a near record level just before the tax break was announced. Possibly one effect of the tax rebate was that sales would slump, because people planning for a new car in 1976 took advantage of the tax rebate and bought in 1975.

The home buyer grant, which cost this province $90 million in revenues initially, has become the most notorious item of the three. In its eagerness to get the $1,000 cheques out to the people before the election, the government did not bother to establish a proper mechanism to screen applicants.

Mr. Nixon: The Tory candidates delivered them by hand.

Mr. Peterson: The only rule in getting that out was, the cheques have to move fast. No affidavit, no affirmation required.

Mr. Eakins: Just Lorne Henderson.

Mr. Peterson: I have heard testimony before the public accounts committee that that was the only criterion—move the cheques.

Mr. Nixon: Spend the money.

Mr. Peterson: Of the 87,000 people who received cheques, the ministry now estimates that as many as 9,000, perhaps more, went to ineligible applicants. This means that the programme cost at least an additional $9 million which the government, in an expensive audit procedure, is now trying to recover. Depending on the number of ineligible recipients who are discovered, the government will be paying out up to an additional $4.35 million in the next two years in supplementary grants.

And the impact of all this spending? Well, it is estimated that about half of those who received their grants would have purchased their first home in any case. Further, 1976 housing starts were reduced by the amount of demand which was shifted into 1975 by virtue of the tax. Again, Professors Jump and Wilson, whom the Treasurer was so proud to quote, assume about one third of the increased demand in 1975 represents such borrowing from 1976 demand. We have paid and are continuing to pay now for a budget designed with no greater purpose than a re-election.

As for the 1976 budget, what more need be said about it than that the Treasurer has been dead wrong in his predictions?

Mr. Nixon: McCague wouldn't be here without that $600-million bribe.

Mr. Peterson: He could be had for about five cents, I'm sure.

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes, his price is a lot less than that.

Mr. Peterson: He told us there would be 116,000 new jobs created in Ontario in 1976.

Mr. Nixon: Where's the Treasurer?

Mr. Peterson: In fact, 76,300 jobs were created, a shortfall of almost 40,000 jobs. Ask me about predictions by this Treasurer. His estimates of the government's net cash requirements were underestimated by $158 million, his budgetary deficit by $302 million, and his budgetary expenditures by $55 million. His estimates of revenues were overstaffed by $169 million—or overstated by $169 million.

Mr. Nixon: He's overstaffed too. He's got one too many legislative assistants.

Mr. Peterson: It's interesting to look at his predictions for next year. He's predicting four and six per cent growth. Today the Conference Board came out with a three per cent growth rate for Ontario. We're going to find—you mark my words—we're going to find that his revenue predictions are totally off again. We're going to find ourselves in the same pickle, and we're going to find the Treasurer next year being still around talking about restraint. We're going to be talking about the same old things, and he's going to be just as wrong next year as he was this year.

Mr. Nixon: He won't be Treasurer next year.

Mr. Peterson: I wish the Treasurer were here because he was learning a lot this afternoon when he was here.

Mr. Nixon: He's finishing up dessert at the Albany Club.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Because you are not going to extricate yourself.

Mr. Nixon: He's a great one for dessert.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I want to look at some of the specific proposals in the last budget, and I want you to know that I'm drawing reasonably close to the end of my remarks, unless there's a popular request that I go on.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer asserts, "We remain convinced that the highest priority has to be allocated to a strategy for the 1980s and that this strategy should embrace, in a comprehensive way, the key aspects of our economic and social life. This is not the time," he says, "to slide off into makeshift remedies because they will come back to haunt us and our children for many years." It is shades of the past. It is very curious—

Mr. Shore: Are you for it or against it?

Mr. Peterson: We are against the government. We are for responsibility.

Mr. Shore: Who is going to make that speech next year?

Mr. Peterson: This is precisely the kind of budget that we have here.

Mr. Nixon: Marvin, you are not going to be here to make any speeches.

Mr. Peterson: A Band-Aid budget, a series of isolated incoherent measures.

Mr. Nixon: Back to the drawing board, Marvin.

Mr. Shore: Who is going to make the speech next year?

Mr. Wildman: You know how Liberals can straddle the fence, Marvin.

Mr. Eakins: You won't have to work nights next year, Marvin.

Mr. Conway: Anyway, they got you on sale.

Mr. Shore: How are you doing, Sean? Did you come in for the day?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's have some order, please. The hon. member for London Centre still has the floor in spite of the opposition from the member for London North.

Hon. Mr. Handlemn: You've been saying that now for three hours, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, in our judgement there is no evidence of a strategy here of any type of the kind the Treasurer describes. There is no evidence of a comprehensive assessment or a plan for the economy as a whole, or even for the crucial segments of the economy. In the 1976 budget considerable emphasis was given to the need for a realistic energy policy and for a revitalization of the auto industry. Indeed, an entire supplementary budget paper was devoted to an analysis of Ontario's performance under the auto pact. It is interesting, I am going to get into this a little later, but I have a copy of a speech given by the Treasurer at noon today to the auto parts industry. I'll get to that a little later, because I can't pass it up.

Mr. Nixon: He is making a lot of speeches, have you noticed? About three a week, all scripted.

Mr. Conway: I hear he is the one who is going to talk to the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Peterson: He did nothing then and he has done nothing today.

Mr. Nixon: I don't know what he has in mind, because the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) is away ahead of him in the leadership race.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We don't need the interjections from the member for Renfrew North or the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Peterson: The Minister of Energy is ahead of him in the leadership too. That is how grim things are.

In his 1977-78 budget, energy, acknowledged to be one of the most crucial problems facing us today, is virtually ignored. Concern for the auto industry is reduced to one line which says only that Canada's role and share in the auto trade pact has to be a matter of great concern to us. No strategy is in place. There is no evidence of any kind of follow-up to some of the previously designated problems. The problems we face today in our judgement are mammoth and are going to have much impact on our future.

Mr. McCague: Who wrote this?

Mr. Peterson: What we need is a comprehensive series of policy proposals in many vital areas. I am proud to have participated today in the presentation of some of these policies.

There is a lot of allusion made to productivity. It is a concern in everybody's mind today. Everybody reads about productivity. Are we behind or are we ahead? We look at C. D. Howe's revised figures and ask, are we behind the United States or aren't we? Let me say this: It is a very difficult concept, and nobody really has a precise handle least of all the Treasurer of this particular province.

Mr. Nixon: And his staff.

Mr. Peterson: It is my judgement that this should be a fundamental area of concern, particularly in this province with its very strong manufacturing base, which has the most to lose in the context of the present economic forces, the energy problems and all of that kind of thing. He should have a handle on that. He should be studying those kind of matters, even if he had to direct the Ontario Economic Council into those kind of studies.

In Canada today, for example, we have twice the capital intensity of Japan but the same productivity. We have roughly the same capital intensity as the United States but, in most people's judgement, we are running 20 per cent behind in terms of productivity.

Mr. Conway: Gordon Walkers says the Tories are too pink anyway.

Mr. Nixon: Whatever happened to Gordon Walker?

Mr. Grossman: That could have been your last speech, Sean.

Mr. Peterson: What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, apart from the low quality of the

interjections coming from members of my party—they have declined since the one about the moon and the cheese—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Interjections by your own colleague, I might add; from the member for Renfrew North specifically.

Mr. Grossman: They're the best part of the member's speech.

An hon. member: He is a good man.

Mr. Peterson: Let me say, I think the Treasurer's priorities are wrong. He is spending his time—

Mr. McCague: You are wasting our time.

Mr. Peterson: He has appointed a commission on inflation accounting.

In my opinion, in a provincial context alone, that isn't worth a damn—excuse me, isn't worth a hoot, Mr. Speaker. He has a study on pensions. But he should be studying this very difficult concept of productivity —the labour input, the technology input, the capital input and all the constituent elements —to get some kind of a consensus of all the people in this province about some kind of an industrial strategy.

[8:45]

Constantly the Treasurer harps that there is no such thing as a federal strategy. We need one. We need one provincially. It's the richest, strongest province with the greatest manufacturing base. I repeat, we have the most to lose. I would urge him to go into a massive study. As evidence of the Premier's inability to deal with this problem, I want to quote to you from Hansard on November 23, 1976. I asked the Treasurer a question here.

Mr. Martel: Did he answer?

An hon. member: He didn't know the question.

Mr. Peterson: The question is, "Does the Treasurer have any plans or any projections that he is going to require capital investment of so much to get so much increase in productivity? Does he have any plans or goals in this area?"

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Peterson: "Mr. McKeough: Nothing that I would say specifically. I think there is no question that productivity"—and here he went into one of his basic grade one lectures —"productivity is the sum of several parts"—

Mr. Shore: It's a grade one question.

Mr. Peterson: "It happens to be—to put it in lay terms—how hard we work"—

An hon. member: It's a kindergarten answer.

Mr. Peterson: —"how much money we invest; how technologically advanced the machine is. It will be a combination of a number of these things which is going to bring about productivity gains or continuing productivity gains.

"Without being specific this afternoon I can only tell the member that the Premier, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Industry and Tourism, the Provincial Secretary and others have been giving the whole subject a great deal of thought."

Mr. Nixon: Segal wrote that answer, you know.

Mr. Peterson: "We have nothing definite to put before the House at this time."

An hon. member: Very profound.

Mr. Grossman: He can't read the answer —how can he understand it?

Mr. Peterson: I think frankly it's going to go against the myth of the competence of the Treasurer that he doesn't have something more precise to say on this kind of subject; that he doesn't have more plans on this kind of subject. He should have, and I would recommend that he start very quickly.

Mr. Nixon: Bad case, Larry. I don't think he can run a plumbing retail store.

Mr. Peterson: Well, he can't. Why else is he here?

Mr. Grossman: He could, but wouldn't have it.

Mr. Peterson: When the federal Treasurer brought down his budget on March 31, our leader expressed our disappointment that the budget failed to meet the most important economic challenge in Canada and Ontario— the urgent need for new job creation.

Mr. Shore: Are you for or against it?

Mr. Peterson: While the investment incentives are a step in the right direction, they will provide no significant assistance to labour-intensive small businesses. The Treasurer plans to balance the budget by 1980-81, an admirable objective. However, we can have little confidence in his ability to achieve this goal in light of the past management of our economy, particularly the size and increase of the deficit.

Obviously the Ontario Economic Council shares our doubt for a study prepared for the council by economists from the University of Toronto predicts deficits of $3.9 billion in 1981 and $4.2 billion in 1982. These are a long, long way from the Treasurer's projections. Nor can we overlook the fact that as the Treasurer tentatively undertakes this noble task, three other provinces either have or are projecting balanced budgets for this year. Alberta had an overall budgetary surplus in 1974 and 1976—

Mr. Eakins: There's leadership.

Mr. Nixon: How did they do that?

Mr. Peterson: —with a surplus of $248 million projected for their 1977 budget. That province estimates an increase in expenditures of 12.4 per cent and in revenues of 14 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: That's real good management.

Mr. Peterson: British Columbia has brought down a balanced budget this year with increases in revenues and expenditures of only 5.9 per cent over 1976. They worked steadily at lessening the deficit from $511 million in 1975 to $28 million in 1976 to a balanced budget this year.

Mr. Nixon: A lot of Liberals in that government.

Mr. Peterson: Nova Scotia also plans a surplus budget in 1977. Now, there's a good Liberal government.

Mr. Nixon: That Premier is going to go places.

Mr. Peterson: They are projecting a 12.5 per cent increase in expenditures this year and a modest overall surplus of about $92,000.

Mr. Nixon: Oh boy, that Regan is a great leader.

Mr. Peterson: Ontario could and should be doing as well or better than these provinces yet we continue to flag. The Treasurer would have us believe that the Ontario economy at this time is displaying "signs of solid strength in several sectors where we have produced positive results in terms of rising incomes and jobs as the year unfolds." As we pointed out earlier this afternoon, before all you people fell asleep, Ontario's performance in all the leading economic variables—

Mr. Shore: It is the only observation you recognized.

Mr. Peterson: —in 1976 leads one to a totally contrary conclusion.

Mr. Roy: You agree with that, eh Marvin?

Mr. Shore: The falling asleep, yes.

Mr. Roy: That's what you said last year, remember?

Mr. Peterson: His belief that the annual rate of growth of the Ontario economy will move from four per cent a year in the first half to a rate of six per cent by the last half is not shared by the Conference Board in Canada—

Mr. Shore: Did the noise wake you up, Albert?

Mr. Peterson: —who feel it will grow by about three per cent in real terms this year.

An hon. member: Read your own speeches.

Mr. Peterson: I want to take issue with the Treasurer's statement that in "the Speech from the Throne the Ontario government announced a wide range of initiatives to reinforce and guarantee an expanded role for small business in the economy."

Mr. Nixon: What a difference a year makes.

Mr. Peterson: There is virtually nothing of substance in the Throne Speech or in the budget initiatives to truly assist hard-pressed small businessmen.

Mr. Nixon: There is nothing but Liberal policy that will help them.

An hon. member: There was nothing in it —nothing.

Mr. Peterson: Proof of this government's sincere interest in promoting small business would be an integrated set of policy proposals, such as our party has developed. Instead, the government provides a hodgepodge of Band-Aid solutions that at best would affect only existing business, and do nothing to assist new business.

Mr. Grossman: Marvin, he is reading your old speech.

Mr. Peterson: A true indication of the direction in which the government is moving is spelled out clearly in the section called "Industrial Rationalization" where the Treasurer states, "We cannot afford in many instances, with our relatively small market base, to have many firms competing in one sector." I guess that here his plan is to buy it and then let it go bankrupt.

Mr. McCague: Is it your party that did that?

Mr. Peterson: I continue to quote the Treasurer, "For this reason, my colleague the Minister of Industry and Tourism fully supported the recent industrial consolidation of our electrical appliance industry which was achieved through the merger of the major appliance divisions of General Steel Wares and General Electric Company to form the Canadian Appliance Manufacturing Company. We need to encourage more of that kind of rationalization. In doing so, we can rely on imports to provide effective price competition to the benefit of consumers and we can take full advantage of the economies of scale which industrial rationalization brings."

Mr. Grossman: Not like Shakespeare.

Mr. Peterson: That's only a very small part of the answer. The Treasurer fails to understand that this is only part of the solution. To quote James Conrad, director of legislative affairs for the Canadian Federation of Small Business, the Treasurer "is locked into the obsolete bigger-is-better philosophy." Mr. Conrad's opinion shows the Treasurer is looking to large corporations to stimulate the economy. I believe the Treasurer is so obsessed with bigness that he's forgotten the small business sector, employs 60 per cent of the labour force and is able to create new jobs quickly. Perhaps this is why his job creation proposals continue to fail year after year.

Mr. Nixon: And he figures what is good for Union Gas is good for Ontario.

Mr. Grossman: I thought you were going to say unions.

Mr. Peterson: The Liberal Party believes in the worth of small business, of free enterprise and a healthy competitive economy. Our policy paper, released only recently, deals in a comprehensive way with the problems and needs of small businessmen.

Mr. Nixon: Right up to date.

Mr. Peterson: It recommends a complete programme to promote and encourage the growth and prosperity of this sector. I was very interested in the remarks of the member for Ottawa Centre yesterday. He was identifying with the NDP policy of trying to leap on any cause that comes its way.

Mr. Nixon: A handful of votes there for them.

Mr. Peterson: He was trying to maintain that the NDP was the only party identified in any way with small business.

Mr. Nixon: Just because he's a small member.

Mr. Peterson: I may be wrong, but I'm not sure. Is there one businessman in your caucus? Certainly if there is a successful one they would not be in that caucus. Is there one?

Mr. Roy: What I want to know, Jim, is are you going to go after corporate contributions this time round?

Mr. Peterson: I want to say that the promotion of small business is consistently and has been, a fundamental principle that the Liberal Party adheres to.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Give the hon. member an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Peterson: I want to read into the record some aspects of our small business policy. I will spare you the reading of the whole thing.

Mr. Wildman: Did you say small?

An hon. member: Read it.

Mr. Peterson: We have extra copies in our office. Any of the members interested in a copy will be welcome to drop in after the speech and pick one up.

Mr. Nixon: On the payment of a small fee.

Mr. Roy: The Tories will probably steal it word for word.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I will mail it to every voter in my riding.

Mr. Peterson: I do want to state our philosophy and policy with respect to small business. Liberals are committed to the free enterprise system, in the support of the independent entrepreneur.

Free enterprise is an important part of our democratic tradition in Canada. It has helped the country to grow and to prosper in the past and has an important role to play in the future.

Mr. Conway: —in the public trough.

Mr. Peterson: Survival of the free enterprise system depends not only on the survival of big business but, more importantly, in a flourishing small business sector.

Mr. Lawlor: It doesn't exist in big business, come on.

Mr. Nixon: And a strong agriculture community.

Mr. Peterson: My leader has said very well on many occasions: It doesn't really matter to a person—if he's working for a large company —if his shares are owned by the government, as you have it, or by a large corporation. The real feel of people for the free enterprise system, with its scope for social mobility and growth, is through independent business. We are not doing enough in our educational system, or through any government policy, to foster that quality of entrepreneurship which, in my judgement, is going to be one of the few things that may allow free enterprise to have a chance in the future with this kind of policy.

I am obviously bothering the member for Riverdale. He would have preferred I just mail him a copy of my speech, but—

Mr. Renwick: We're obviously in complete agreement.

Mr. Grossman: No, no. He wants you to recite a bit of Shakespeare.

An hon. member: Recite most of it.

Mr. Peterson: The Conservatives in Ontario are committed to a policy of large scale. In a recent submission to the royal commission on corporate concentration, the Treasurer stated that he needs more concentration. Liberals do not accept the inevitability of concentration and strongly resist moves in this direction. The NDP are committed to the support of large unions and therefore are also committed to business on a large scale.

Mr. Nixon: Whatever Joe Morris says.

Mr. Peterson: Both these parties think in terms of bigness, in business and in government.

Mr. Wildman: And unorganized workers as well.

Mr. Peterson: Liberals believe in the need to deconcentrate economic and political power to give individuals a feeling of importance and a genuine stake in society and to enable them to contribute in a meaningful way. Liberals have a fundamental commitment to competition and diversity—

Mr. Roy: That's us.

Mr. Peterson: —as essential elements of a prosperous democratic society.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Diversity is the key word.

Mr. Roy: That's us.

Mr. Peterson: In recent years, governments have hindered the growth of the private sector through bureaucratic regulations and red tape and by taking over an increasing proportion of available resources themselves, leaving less and less to the more competitive and efficient private sector to develop. For our economy to grow in a healthy manner, a new balance must be established between the public and private sectors. Each can assist the proper functioning of the other.

Mr. Conway: I hear Marvin bought a Bricklin.

Mr. Peterson: A healthy economy should consist of a mix of small, medium and large firms, since each enterprise has a different optimum size in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, depending on the market it serves.

An hon. member: Excellent policy.

Mr. Peterson: A constant flow of new venture start-ups is necessary in order to preserve this mix by preventing a natural tendency towards industrial concentration. Small firms do operate effectively and efficiently in specific sectors.

Mr. Wildman: Is he going to read that whole thing?

Mr. Peterson: While government policy has done much to assist medium and large corporations through the use of tax incentives, write-offs, credits and deferrals, little has been done to aid small business. This sector must be viewed as a separate entity. Policies designed to benefit large corporations often have a negative impact on small business. At least their problems and needs are not the same and it is now time—

Hon. Mr. Welch: He reads well.

Mr. Peterson: —indeed it is long overdue for government to come to the aid of small business.

Hon. Mr. Welch: When are you going to start the yellow pages?

Mr. Peterson: You're going to get it.

Mr. Nixon: Where did the minister come from?

Mr. Peterson: If I really wanted to bore you, I'd read back one of your old speeches.

Mr. Nixon: We thought you were out drawing tickets.

An hon. member: No more Wintario to give out, eh?

Mr. Peterson: We define small business as follows—

Hon. Mr. Welch: What about the St. Catharines phone book? The yellow pages.

An hon. member: What happened to that rule about reading speeches?

Mr. Peterson: —a small business concern is independently owned and operated and a small business concern is not dominant in its field of operation.

Mr. Nixon: The minister must have got out of the Albany Club early tonight.

Mr. Peterson: The Minister of Culture and Recreation should like small business.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That's right.

Mr. Peterson: The small business sector employs between 50 and 60 per cent of all working Canadians. Because of its size, small business is flexible, able to adapt quickly to changes in the market and possesses great potential for technological and other innovations.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We would like to look after the tenants of Ontario. We have got rent review to do and the Essex school board Act.

An hon. member: Oh, they don't want that.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: Are you against small businessmen or what?

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: Most important, small business is labour intensive and can create new jobs more quickly and cheaply than—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Treasurer told us about that in his budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's have some order, please.

Mr. Peterson: I agree with you.

Mr. Grossman: We thought you were finished.

Mr. Peterson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eakins: A good job somebody's for the small businessman.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Why don't you take it as read?

Mr. Peterson: It's estimated that the small business sector can produce a new job for in the order of $5,000—of course, that's variable —while the capital intensive sector may require anywhere from $70,000 to several hundred thousand dollars in capital investment, depending on the industry.

It is for these reasons and foremost its capacity for job creation that the Liberal Party believes that the small business sector must be supported and promoted. Small business has demonstrated potential for dynamic, innovative production. To continue and to expand its role in the economy, government assistance is required. This is not to be confused with government regulation or control, which would certainly be rejected by independent entrepreneurs. Rather, incentives and programmes specifically designed to ameliorate the problems facing this sector are required.

This whole paper that I am reading from is devoted to an analysis of the problem—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hope you won't read at any great length, quoting from a document, because that's not permitted.

Mr. Peterson: Well, Mr. Speaker, in our judgement—

Mr. Nixon: That's a new application. I haven't heard that since 1918.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Not any one document anyway.

Mr. Shore: He has been reading for three hours, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: He has copious notes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peterson: If we can keep the interjections from the Chair down, Mr. Speaker, I can get through this a lot faster.

Mr. Conway: The Premier set a new low in that regard last Monday night.

An hon. member: You bet he did.

Mr. Peterson: This paper is devoted to an analysis of the problems facing small business in Ontario and the presentation of options for their solution.

[9:00]

All actions should be directed towards the development of business capacity for self-regulation and self-sufficiency. At the outset there are several factors that should be considered that constitute important parts of the environment in which small business operates. First, a study of small- and medium-sized businesses recently released by the European Economic Community says small- and medium-sized undertakings are important for job stability and the maintenance of industrial peace, and that legislation should be geared towards maintaining independent business.

Second, an extensive Canadian managerial and entrepreneurial class has failed to develop. The dynamic free enterprise system in Canada depends on Canadian entrepreneurs. Every small businessman is a manager, therefore a flourishing small business sector will automatically produce a strong Canadian entrepreneurial class.

Third, rising energy costs are making large, highly-automated capital- and energy-intensive centralized enterprises less viable. This problem brings to the fore the need to move in the direction of small, energy-conserving, labour-intensive industries. Small business has an important role to play in determining the future of the health of the Canadian economy.

Finally, governments at both the federal and provincial levels are increasingly becoming competitors with the private sector. In Ontario, this competition takes the form of direct government operation of services such as the Ontario Housing Corporation or occurs in the recruitment of personnel. Governments are often able to pay more for similar services, or can offer fringe benefits beyond the reach of the private sector, particularly to their friends.

Government activity dominance in these areas only serves to restrict the growth and prosperity of the private sector and therefore the economy as a whole. This competition is particularly harmful to the small business sector, as they do not have the capacity of large companies to compete with big government.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, if I can, and I'm going to spare you because—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member for Windsor-Riverside has a point of order.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, rule 16, section 4, says a member must not read unnecessarily—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: What do you say about the member for Ottawa Centre yesterday?

Mr. Burr: —unless he is complaining about something that has been said or is defending himself against misrepresentation. This is certainly not the case.

Mr. Roy: How often do you get up and speak without reading?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's point is well taken and I think the hon. member for London Centre has just completed his quote.

Mr. Peterson: I would say you are quite right, Mr. Speaker. I should say in fairness, I think maybe the distinguished hon. member's eyesight is failing. These are just notes. He can't distinguish between copious notes and a speech.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Don't follow them quite so closely.

An hon. member: What about the Premier's speech last week?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for London Centre may continue.

Mr. Peterson: I just want to put into the record our suggestions to create a viable small business.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is just a filibuster to stop us passing legislation.

Mr. Nixon: The other parties are not very interested in that.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: 1. We would establish entrepreneurial advisory centres to be funded by the government and administered by the private sector.

2. We would decentralize advisory services and locate centres in every municipality with a business community large enough to support one.

3. We would undertake an extensive advertising campaign to inform the public of the existence of the advisory centres and the services provided.

4. We would provide a special service to the advisory centres to allow businessmen to fill out a single application for financial assistance, which would be channelled to all agencies providing funding.

5. We would sponsor educational programmes and seminars to potential existing entrepreneurs given through community colleges, business associations, OECA and cable TV.

Mr. Wildman: Where can we get a copy of this?

Mr. Peterson: 6. We would allow a full tax deduction against other income for investment in venture capital corporations, for small business start-ups and expansion by both corporations and individuals.

7. We would provide for government sharing of losses actually experienced by financial institutions on loans provided to small businesses.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must again caution the hon. member that he can't quote at great length from any document.

Mr. Peterson: Sure, I can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, you can't. No, you can't.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, in fairness—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, you cannot.

Mr. Peterson: —these are notes that we are using to—this is just a short—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If that is your own speech, a speech of your own making, it is quite acceptable. But if you're going to quote at great length from another source, it is not permitted.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I wrote this in anticipation of this, so it is clearly my own work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry, I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. Peterson: I wrote this, Mr. Speaker, clearly in anticipation of this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If that's of your own making you may continue. If you're quoting from another source, it's not permitted.

Mr. Grossman: What's the title of that document?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Dispense with it.

Mr. Ferris: There's a precedent if I ever heard one.

Mr. Peterson: And you must admit, Mr. Speaker, it's a very fine piece of work.

An hon. member: Who wrote the Premier's speech?

Mr. Nixon: So you can read it if you wrote it yourself, right, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Peterson: We would clarify the role of the Ontario Development Corporation so they would address themselves specifically to small business and expand it to include start-ups and a broader category of small business.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Why don't you table it?

Mr. Peterson: We would ensure that the Ontario Development Corporation emphasized the support of Canadian owner-managed firms.

10. We would enable the Ontario Development Corporation, under special circumstances, to take equity positions in small businesses.

11. We would extend the provision of government-assisted loans, negotiated through lending institutions.

12. We would encourage lending institutions to provide, at least, equitable financing and access to credit for small businesses.

Mr. Wildman: How?

Mr. Peterson: Would you like me to read it out?

Mr. Grossman: What is the title of the document?

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, there's a request.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Would you table that paper?

Mr. Makarchuk: We've read it.

An hon. member: He's reading the short form.

Mr. Peterson: We would lower the corporate tax cost to small business to assure their ability to develop internally-generated sources of equity capital. We would assist with payroll taxes for each individual worker employed by a firm in a given year, up to a net gain in manpower of a specified number of persons over a three-year period to create employment.

We would provide tax credits in the form of deductions against corporate income tax, for energy conservation investments. We would extend the forgiveable succession duties on small business corporations to apply to businesses where shares are owned by more than one family.

We would simplify and integrate tax jurisdictions. We would urge the federal government to extend a five-year loss carry-forward limitation on non-capital losses under The Income Tax Act.

We would discourage government dominance of research activity by having each ministry and agency contract out as much

R and D work as possible. We would give preference to Canadian owner-managed businesses in allowing research grants and loans. We would require any innovation resulting from government-funded R and D conducted by foreign-owned firms be translated into jobs for Canadians in the secondary sector. We would simplify and streamline the application procedures and information programmes for R and D.

We would provide incentives to small industry-related businesses to form co-operatives for the provision of central services. We would undertake a publicity campaign to explain the benefits of co-operative associations. We would provide advisory service on the mechanics of establishing co-operatives.

We would undertake a preferential purchasing policy for all government contracts from small business. We would set a target of 40 per cent of all government contracts and sub-contracts to be awarded to small businesses within a three-year period.

Mr. Conway: Only 50 per cent to the Tories.

Mr. Peterson: We would encourage big business to sub-contract to small business, particularly in government contracts.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, the last recommendation is to establish a unit within the Ministry of Industry and Tourism promoting Ontario-produced goods, both domestically and internationally, particularly as a general marketing service for small business.

Mr. Nixon: That's a very good programme.

Mr. Peterson: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, if you wanted any more details, as was the request from one member, I would be happy to provide them.

Mr. Wildman: Absolutely not.

Mr. Maeck: Why don't you just table it?

An hon. member: We don't mind if you steal our policy.

Mr. Peterson: You're very welcome to it.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. member: It was a better speech than Segal's, eh?

Mr. Peterson: I want to deal briefly with two or three more matters, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grossman: Briefly?

An hon. member: I was just wondering if you could keep your head up.

Mr. Peterson: We, in the Liberal Party, are very, very uncomfortable and displeased with—

Mr. Eaton: Do you mean your leader?

Mr. Peterson: —the Treasurer's new projection of 5.3 per cent target of full employment. This means that something like 236,000 people have been resigned to being permanently unemployed in this province.

In his budget statement, the Treasurer described Ontario as being "unparallelled abundance" and is quite prepared to consider the province to have full employment while 236,000 people cannot find jobs, nor is he willing to design a strategy to assist them. We know of no other government in the western world that's prepared to accept this—that would lie down on its back with that kind of a rationalization and say: "We have hit full employment."

Mr. Warner: Give up.

Mr. Wildman: Supinely surrender.

Mr. Peterson: According to former federal Manpower Minister Andras, given a seven per cent unemployment rate, about four per cent is due to structural or frictional problems; 2.6 per cent is due to economic problems; three per cent is the result of problems with seasonal variation. The assumption that 2.6 per cent is caused by economic stresses can be addressed effectively and relatively quickly the acceptable rate of unemployment drops to 4.4 per cent. That's almost a full percentage point below the Treasurer's acceptable level.

I would like to remind the Treasurer that eight years ago Ontario had a functional unemployment rate of four per cent and that five years ago in an earlier budget he said, and I quote: "Any unemployment figure in excess of three per cent is not acceptable to the Ontario government." How this Treasurer changes his philosophy and his views consistently is to me very alarming.

Mr. Reed: Political expediency.

Mr. Peterson: I also bring to the Treasurer's attention the fact that in Saskatchewan and Alberta unemployment has been around four per cent for some time. How can it be in Ontario, this land of opportunity, that we are going to allow 1.3 per cent over that amount?

Mr. Wildman: Ontari-ari-ario.

Mr. Peterson: And as for the government's much-touted job creation programme, what does it really amount to? At a time when an additional 12,000 people, an increase of five per cent, are expected by the government to be unemployed in 1977, and when unemployment in the construction industry is running at 19.2 per cent as of January this year and 3,356 jobs are to be created in the construction sector at a cost of $22,500 each, it is frankly a drop in the bucket.

Mr. Makarchuk: Right on.

Mr. Peterson: Yet these are the only jobs of any duration proposed in the budget. They are expected to be completed within this fiscal year. There will be no employment spin-off from these jobs because they are all in repair and expansion projects. There are no capital projects planned. This measure is no more than a holding tactic at best on the part of the government.

Mr. Nixon: Well, you can make jobs in the cabinet for only 45.

Mr. Peterson: We are not at all more encouraged with the job creation programme for Ontario's youth. With a single minor exception, not one of the jobs created is designed to last more than 16 weeks. This means most of the 143,000 unemployed in Ontario between the ages of 15 and 24, representing almost 15 per cent of the labour force in that age group, will be back on the job market in the fall.

Mr. Wildman: But they get 250 jobs.

Mr. Peterson: The expanded regular summer employment programme is a 16-week programme, as is the Experience 77 programme. While Ontario's Career Action Programme functions year-round, the jobs are only for 16 weeks in most cases although a very few are for 32 weeks.

Hon. Mr. Norton: There are 700 for year-round. What are you talking about?

Mr. Peterson: Read the budget.

Mr. Nixon: The population of the province is eight million.

Mr. Peterson: It is an apprenticeship-type programme that carries no guarantee of future employment.

The youth care for senior citizens, another 16-week programme, is creating employment for 250 young people in the budget at an exorbitant cost of $10,400 per job. Finally, there is the new Ontario youth employment programme. Contrary to the Treasurer's contention that the programme will provide a 16-week subsidy for up to 20,000 young people at a cost of $10 million, in fact the programme will fund fewer than 16,000 summer jobs, each lasting only 16 weeks, and will not necessarily create one new job.

Mr. Nixon: Shame.

Mr. Peterson: That is up to the private sector to decide and the government hasn't done anything for the private sector. Ministry officials assured us there was no administrative cost involved in the funds allocated for this programme, which means that no attempt will be made to check whether the programme is functioning as intended. In other words, whether the subsidy is, in fact, being used to finance new jobs or whether existing employees will be fired and new ones hired to fill the same positions but at a subsidized rate, we don't know and we will never know it because already the government has set out a shoddy, superficial programme that allows it to go around and talk about 20,000 new jobs. In our view, it is functionally useless.

Mr. Wildman: Functional overlay.

Mr. Peterson: In sum, the Treasurer proposes to create 6,131 man-years of work for Ontario's youth but only one job for every 23 of our unemployed young people and only for the summer.

Mr. Conway: Shame.

Mr. Warner: Absolutely shameful.

Mr. Peterson: Ontario's total unemployed figure at this time is 312,000. Yet the Treasurer is proposing only 9,487 man-years of new job creation, one job for every 33 unemployed Ontarians. Even at this, the Treasurer's projection of 6.3 per cent unemployment remains substantially below the Conference Board's estimate of seven per cent for Ontario.

None of the other measures proposed in this budget will do anything directly to create jobs in the economy. In other words, not one single measure is directed towards long-term job creation. I don't know why, for example, and I agree with my friend, he couldn't raise the exemption up to 25 cents to keep the chocolate bar industry, for example, rolling at this time when it is in dire trouble. I don't know why he is so intransigent on these kinds of issues when all of the evidence has been before us that he should take that kind of action. To us, it is just elementary and we support that kind of a move.

[9:15]

One of the things that concerns us is that the Treasurer has really not come to grips with serious problems but he has attacked certain problems in certain funny ways as revenue-raising devices. It has been a failure in trying to deal with energy conservation, for example, through motor vehicle licences or dealing with litter through the pop can tax. He just fools around with it, using the tax mechanism as a device to punish certain kinds of unacceptable social behaviour. Why doesn't he address that form of behaviour?

The increased motor vehicle registration fee served no other purpose than to generate revenue. It's another Band-Aid solution. I've talked about this earlier, and our policy is clear on this: We think it's just a cheap trick to raise revenue.

Mr. Grossman: State your policy.

Mr. Foulds: That is their policy.

Mr. Peterson: The environmental tax also falls into the Band-Aid category. It's clearly meant to be a generator of provincial funds rather than a solution to solid waste pollution problems. This tax is a licence to litter; government now has a stake in litter. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, when you give government a stake in this kind of thing they keep increasing their role and they never solve the problem.

Mr. Kerrio: It should have been a deposit.

Mr. Nixon: Just like the profit in booze—$450 million this year.

Mr. Peterson: If the government was genuinely interested in reducing the volume of solid waste in Ontario, it would have introduced a five-cent deposit on all cans.

Mr. Kerrio: Taking it from the kids.

Mr. Peterson: Such a proposal makes far more sense, as it encourages people to return empty cans when they can be recycled. This is particularly important when it is realized that collection is the major cost—some estimates put it as high as 70 per cent—involved in recycling.

Mr. S. Smith: The member for Carleton should be Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Peterson: I just want to make a couple of remarks about the venture investment corporations proposal, which we think is half-baked and totally inadequate. What it's going to work out to—mark my words—is a tax dodge for major corporations and isn't really going to solve the problem of creating new business or new jobs or new venture companies in this province.

Three years is long enough for a complete set of government proposals to have developed in this area, and it has taken three years of fooling around and mentions in almost every budget. Even this proposal will have little effect on small business. I want to quote Mr. Conrad again: "Rather than support venture investment corporations, which benefit only large companies, what is needed is a tax system to encourage individuals to invest in small business." Not venture capital corporations, but individuals. That's where it sits.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That is what it is for.

Mr. Peterson: It is not. The minister should read the legislation; he doesn't understand it.

The Treasurer's proposal, on the other hand, will be mostly of benefit to large business. Past experience demonstrates clearly that venture capital corporations have a propensity for investing in larger, high-technology enterprises, usually for the international market. They are not normally labour-intensive and so contribute little to Ontario in terms of job creation.

Finally, while the Treasurer asserts that Ontario has demonstrated its concern for those in our society who are less fortunate, we find absolutely no provision for that kind of people. It really is, in my judgement and in our judgement, a big guy's budget.

I have laid before the House and the members a lot of policy matters that I wanted to raise, and I want you to permit me a couple of more remarks, if you will.

Mr. Conway: More. More.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer spoke at 1 o'clock today to the annual meeting of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers Association. This speech is just hot off the press. It's almost like the education policy of the government; the ink is still wet. But the Treasurer now is attempting, through a series of speeches, to explain the budget ex post facto.

I want to deal with some of the things he mentioned in that speech today because, in my judgement, it shows no contrition and no understanding of the issues that have developed after the presentation of the budget. I wish the Treasurer was here, because I must say it is a very deplorable speech. He said very nasty things about you, by the way, as per usual.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, he said delicious things about me. I am very pleased about it.

Mr. Peterson: I want to just take issue with some of his remarks. He said: "I call for a national industrial strategy that focuses our efforts on industries where Canadians have special talents and special skills." Clearly, what is lacking is an Ontario industrial strategy. It's a clear case of putting his responsibility over on to the feds; it's easy to do and it could be done if he had the will.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: How can you do that without controlling tariffs?

Mr. Cassidy: The minister shouldn't get so excited. He may not be back.

Mr. Peterson: He calls for "a major public assessment and review of the productivity problems in Canadian industry, along with examination of its capital requirements, and the development and implementation of a strategy for upgrading productivity." Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, he's done nothing about it. He mentioned the auto pact in the last budget and he's done nothing about it since. He's just carping, complaining and shifting the responsibility.

He says: "This economy requires a boom in long-term investment." You know, he should talk to the Premier. The Premier was quoted as making a speech just a few days ago saying the problem with this province is that people aren't spending enough. He is trying to encourage people to spend, the Treasurer is trying to encourage people to invest. Those two should get together. One believes in the trickle-up theory, one believes in the trickle-down theory, and it's all going to trickle down right on all of your heads, pretty soon.

Interjection.

Mr. Peterson: You gave this speech last year, Marvin.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for London Centre will continue his remarks.

Mr. Peterson: I probably won't go through the rest of this speech, I just commend it for humorous reading to everyone in the House.

I just want to say one thing before I wind up, on a personal note. I think a marvellous opportunity faces the government, and indeed, all the people of the Legislature at this time of national crisis. I am one of those people who believes that part of our problem, collectively, is that all parties, all levels of government, have not efficiently delivered services to the people of this country. They see incredible amounts of duplication. They see federal and provincial departments of labour; federal consumer and corporate affairs, provincial consumer and corporate affairs. I would say respectfully we are all in this together. Almost the whole history of federal-provincial relations has been one jurisdiction looking for a loophole or an area and jumping into that area, either for reasons of revenue or to assert their power as an election goodie.

It seems to me it is time for that kind of thing to stop, now. I would recommend to the government that they take a lead in this kind of thing; sit down, with a new redistribution of powers—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for London Centre only, please.

Mr. Peterson: I just want to share this personal reflection, because I think it's going to be one of the keys to keeping this country together. It's not the whole answer, obviously, but it is one of the keys, that we make people feel we are not unnecessarily and continuously squandering their tax dollars. When we see these endless rounds of federal-provincial conferences, with minister of energy spatting with minister of energy; and industry and tourism against industry and tourism; and environment against environment; and all these kinds of things, in my judgement, it undermines the credibility of government at all levels.

I am saying we need a new separation of powers. You are going to have to give some up, you are going to have to take some; and you'll have to do it more efficiently. I assure you that with the good intentions expressed by the Leader of the Opposition and by my leader to this kind of thing, I feel very confident that you can involve all members of the House in that kind of co-operative effort. I recommend it to the House. I recommend it to you as fast as is humanly possible.

I was part of a commission from the University of Toronto Law School when it made a submission to the bi-and-bi commission about 1964, when I was very young. At that time, we suggested to the bi-and-bi commission that they look at a new redistribution of powers, that they look very closely at the German system where the upper house makes provincial appointments and has a substantial influence over national policy. I want you to know that I am still very much attracted to that kind of a philosophy and that kind of a point of view.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That's where he got his energy policy.

Mr. Peterson: I leave it with the government to try to take some major initiatives in that kind of an area.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Trudeau would never believe that.

Mr. Peterson: I am just coming to the end, and I must say I thank the members of the opposition and the worthy members opposite for their indulgence.

Mr. Conway: Marvin did that.

Mr. Peterson: I have enjoyed this. It has been a long time, and I have taken a lot of time of the House.

Mr. Conway: More, more.

Mr. Peterson: I appreciate the opportunity to lay our very solid, constructive proposals before this House. I can say to you that they are done as charitably, as honourably as can be done. We have some fundamental disagreements. Some are with the government's words, some are with its strategies, and a lot with its policies. We lay them there for you. Use them, pick them up, take them; we'd be delighted, we'd be flattered. You've done that before, you'll do it again; and we're delighted.

What we need now is not a lot more rhetoric and a lot more nonsense—I have contributed my share to that and I'm about to sit down—we need to start, collectively, with the great task of creating jobs tomorrow morning. There are lots of suggestions for you; take it up, use it, and good luck.

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lewis: Why was the minister in such a rush?

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT

(concluded)

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 28, An Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: When we rose I believe the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) had the floor, but he is obviously not here to continue his remarks.

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean, obviously?

Mr. Speaker: I can see. Is anybody else going to participate in this debate?

Mr. Lewis: We have about an hour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I'm not putting a time limit on. I recognize the member for Riverdale.

Mr. S. Smith: Much ado about nothing.

Mr. Conway: We have had our Shakespeare for today, Jimmy.

Mr. Renwick: I have just a few remarks I'd like to make on the rent review bill.

Mr. Germa: Talk about Shakespeare.

Mr. Renwick: I have a very minor contribution to make in the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the member for Wentworth—

Mr. Eakins: You made it this afternoon.

Mr. Kerrio: He wasn't making much sense.

Mr. Renwick: —about the rent review bill. I think it is essential from the point of view of this party that we get on with this bill and get it passed. We've got to go through second reading. I anticipate there will be no division on second reading. I think the bill has then got to go into committee. We've given notice in accordance with the rules about the amendments which we propose to move to the bill, and we're prepared to expedite the passage of the bill.

There is, however, one comment that I wish to make, because of the confusion which arose at the end of last week when there was a certain fluttering among the dovecots of the Tories because the House leader was absent. When they had no speakers to rise on this bill at adjournment on Thursday afternoon, they then put up a series of speakers because they obviously didn't know how to cope with a proposal that in some way or other, at some point in time—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: A series—three?

Mr. Renwick: —the eight per cent should be reduced to six per cent. I want you to understand our position very clearly. We will move, as our first amendment in the committee of the whole House on this bill, that the eight per cent be reduced to six per cent. If that attracts the support of our colleagues on the left or, indeed of the government, then of course we should be quite happy.

If by chance it does not attract that kind of unanimous support or the support of the party on the left, we understand, from the press and from what has been said in the House, that the Liberal Party proposes to move an amendment to provide that the rent percentage be tied in some way to the AIB wage guidelines at that time. We're quite prepared to support that amendment, subject to a subamendment which we would move. We would move it to the Liberal amendment unless the Liberal amendment contains that provision. We would then support—as a second best to our own amendment, if it didn't achieve the support which we wanted—an amendment which said that we would go to the AIB guidelines on October 14, 1977, provided the maximum is six per cent. Now on those conditions we're quite prepared to support the Liberal Party's proposed amendment, if they wish to make it that.

Mr. S. Smith: That has the same effect; it has the same effect as your amendment—

Mr. Lewis: It has exactly the same effect, precisely.

Mr. Renwick: Or the Liberal Party can, if they wish, stop playing games over a period of a few months and come with us to a flat six per cent.

Mr. Lewis: That's our campaign slogan by the way—come with us. I want you to know that. Fashioned spontaneously, tonight.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Count us out.

Mr. Renwick: If I could say to my friend the House leader of the Conservative Party, with that peppercornious remark in this debate, I now take my seat.

[9:30]

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, it seems I have been waiting forever to make these wind-up remarks on this very important bill. I think I recall that when I opened the debate with very brief introductory remarks, constituting about 30 seconds in order to save time, I pointed out to the members of this House the urgency of passing this bill. I am a little disappointed in the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) suggesting there was any intention on the part of the government or the government members to delay the passage of the bill.

Mr. Warner: You should have brought it in December.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I think I should point out, Mr. Speaker, and get it on the record, that there have been nine speakers from the New Democratic Party on this bill.

Mr. Sargent: Why all of a sudden the hurry?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Five from the Liberal Party and three from the Conservative Party.

Mr. Davidson: Your strategy was busted, wasn't it?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I think it is unreasonable to suggest, and even arrogant to suggest, that there was any ulterior motive on the part of our members in speaking on this bill. In fact, many more of them wanted to speak but because of our concern for the interest of tenants we have decided to let this bill come to a voice vote tonight.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but one of them was Frank Drea.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The suggestion made by the member for Riverdale that we were trying to delay the passage of this bill is the kind of device that is—

Mr. Warner: You should have brought it in a month ago.

Mr. Lewis: You know that three government speakers on any bill constitutes a filibuster.

Mr. Cassidy: They couldn't get three different speakers on 30 bills.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I think that suggestion from the member for Riverdale smacks of the kind of hypocrisy which we have come to accept from that party.

Mr. Cassidy: You should know about hypocrisy, Sidney.

Mr. Warner: Why don't you resign? It is the only honourable thing you can do at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister keep his remarks as parliamentary as possible, and I consider that was not a very parliamentary remark. Will the hon. minister keep to the principle of the bill.

An hon. member: It will be the first time anybody did.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, if the word hypocrisy is unparliamentary then I'll use the word sanctimonious, which I know has been used by the Leader of the Opposition himself to describe—

Mr. Nixon: How about unctuous?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister continue with the bill.

Mr. Sargent: Tie a can of beer to it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, many of the points which have been raised in the debate will be repeated later in clause-by-clause discussion in committee of the whole, and therefore I am going to restrain myself in commenting on them. It really is tempting to try to destroy some of those suggestions now but we will have an opportunity at some later date.

Mr. Davidson: You are a restraint.

Mr. Conway: Be sure you restrain the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Ferrier: No filibustering now.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: But I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I allowed to go without comment some of the remarks which have been made and directed at me personally by some of the members opposite. Not all of the members adopted that approach, and I think I should single out the two who didn't in my view. I was somewhat warmed by the preliminary remarks of the member for Armourdale (Mr. Givens), who is not here tonight, and may not be here for very much longer, as I understand.

Mr. Warner: You scared him off.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I was warmed by his remarks until he dashed cold water all over everything that I have done, but I think that is par for the course.

Mr. Conway: You are a bit of a cold fish.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: And the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis), who is not here, spoke so reasonably on this particular bill.

Mr. Lewis: He is a very reasonable man.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: In much the same manner as I have been speaking for the past year and a half.

Mr. S. Smith: Does he also say it is a mess?

Mr. Nixon: Sounds like subversion.

Mrs. Campbell: Who says it's hypocrisy?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I think it really is a remarkable thing that he is in that particular caucus. If he is not around here after a certain event I think I might ask him to come and give me some advice, because it is the kind of advice that I have been seeking.

Mr. Nixon: You won't be in the ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting valuable time here. The hon. minister will continue with his remarks.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, aside from those two members, the other speakers who very piously said they were going to approve this bill in principle, and obviously they are going to, spent the rest of their time, at considerable length, in tearing apart everything in the bill.

Mr. Lewis: Well, what is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Nothing wrong of course; that is normal debate, blaming the government for it specifically. It is a government bill, I accept that; despite all the amendments which have been made by other parties. But specifically, of course, the criticisms seem to be directed at me as the minister responsible for the administration of the Act. That goes with the territory too, I am not suggesting it shouldn't; but what I would like is to have that criticism based on fact.

Mr. Conway: You sound like Duplessis.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I don't think it should be based on hearsay; it shouldn't be based on backroom gossip; it shouldn't be based on headlines in the press which may or may not reflect the articles beneath them. I would like to set on the record my own personal position with regard to rent review as I have enunciated it across this province during the past year.

Mr. Warner: You are going to resign.

Mr. Cassidy: You have six minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am a person who believes in the free market and I appreciate the benefits that system has brought to the people of Canada and the people of Ontario. Because of that belief, I am naturally apprehensive about over-regulation, about unwarranted intervention in the marketplace by government. I believe I share that apprehen-

sion with the majority of the members in this Legislature and the majority of the people in this province, and I think they will show that in the very near future.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: But that doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that there doesn't come a time for intervention, and the government must intervene when it is necessary. That time came in 1975 when legislation was introduced by the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Conway: Yes, because you were desperate for votes.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It was needed in 1975 and it is needed in 1977—

Mr. Cassidy: Both election years.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —and according to this bill, it is going to be needed in 1978. Despite the carping criticisms of some of the members of the opposition the legislation has worked.

Mr. S. Smith: Is it not a mess?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It has worked well —and it is appreciated by the vast majority of the tenants in this province; and even by some of the landlords, surprisingly enough.

But what it hasn't done—and I wish the member for Cornwall was here—it has not solved the problem it was designed to meet. It has met the problem but it has not solved it. I think I have heard from almost every member in this House that the problem is the shortage of rental accommodation in this province. Rent review, rent control does not solve that problem, and I think every member in this House, if he was honest, would admit that.

That is what I have been saying, that rent review does not solve the problem. If anything it exacerbates it.

Mr. S. Smith: Neither have any of your other policies solved that problem.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: But that doesn't mean it is not necessary, that doesn't mean it hasn't worked; because what it was designed to do was to phase in—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The interjections are not adding to the calibre of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be an accepted technique of the opposition to take every one of the measures introduced by government or proposed by government and deal with them in isolation from each other. There is nothing wrong with that, except that it doesn't give a full picture.

Mr. Wildman: You've got a lot to learn about opposition techniques.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne, while succinct, outlined the measures this government is bringing in to solve the problem, not just to meet it. Rent review is to meet it and it will do that.

Mr. S. Smith: Well stay here and solve it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Solutions are in the Speech from the Throne and have been introduced in this House by ministers responsible.

Mr. S. Smith: I didn't see anything in the Speech from Throne about an election.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I want to put those measures each in turn, and then put them together and suggest to you, sir, that we are finding the solutions. They will not be overnight solutions, they will not be the push-button solutions the NDP will undoubtedly propose to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: What is going on here?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The first measure—

Mr. Lewis: Are you personally announcing the election?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am speaking in response to the arguments put forward by the members in this debate.

Mr. Lewis: You are a back-bench cabinet minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition does not have the floor, please.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order. What do you call this?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not a point of order. The hon. minister has the floor to continue his remarks.

Mr. Hodgson: Sit down, Stephen.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: For the moment why don't you just say you've cleared the way for June 9 and it will stop all this nonsense?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member subside to his seat, please. The hon. minister.

An hon. member: We'll get Jack Stokes to throw you out.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to know what this is all about. It's too bad he wasn't here for the debate, because I am answering the points raised by his members and others during the debate; and I would like to have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Lewis: I listened to the debate.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The first measure which was announced in this Legislature, and went almost completely unnoticed, was, I think, a great achievement—the merger of AHOP, the federal programme, and the provincial HOME programme.

Mr. Lewis: That wasn't an achievement.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's not much of an achievement? I tried it three years ago on the then minister in Ottawa, Mr. Ron Basford, and was turned down completely. I think it is a great achievement. And it is the kind of thing—

Mr. Warner: You are too modest.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —that the member for London Centre, in his comments, was talking about.

Mr. S. Smith: He is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It takes a great deal of persuasion to convince Ottawa to co-operate with the province in a programme for the people of this province, and that was done. I think my colleague deserves a great deal of praise for it; that's the kind of co-operative federalism we've been looking for.

Mr. S. Smith: Out of order, that is not addressed to the bill in any—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: And I think we can get more of it as we continue to bargain.

Mr. Ferrier: Out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The merger of these two programmes will make it possible for persons of modest income to own their own homes in those urban centres where the AHOP ceilings have been pierced.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on.

Mr. Martel: At $30,000 a year?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They want to know how many units this will result in, that's always the question. Put the figures into a computer and out comes the answer. Well that is not the way it is done in the private sector.

Mr. Ferrier: Back to the principle of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: This is going to affect the private sector considerably.

Mr. Lewis: This doesn't do anything for persons of modest income.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Anyone who wishes to approach this problem with any kind of objectivity Mr. Speaker, cannot but recognize that when persons of modest income have an opportunity to own their own home they would rather do that than rent.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Persons of modest income; in this province in 1977 $8,000 and $9,000 a year is modest income, and these people will be able to purchase under the merged programmes.

Mr. Lewis: No; they just compete for a limited number.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There will be homes built specifically to sell to that market. Those people will move out of accommodation; some of it rented, some of it substandard, but it will free up rental units. How many? I don't know the answer to that, nor does anyone.

Mr. Lewis: About 10.

Mr. Martel: I thought you said it solved the problem.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's part of the solution. There is no single solution. Unfortunately for the NDP, that is not the way things happen. They would like to see it done that way but it won't happen that way.

Mr. Conway: I hear Otto Jelinek is moving.

Mr. Lewis: You are such fundamentalists over there.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Doctrinaire.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, the next step which was taken, also by the Minister of Housing, was the announcement of the rental incentive programme. This has been scorned by the New Democratic Party as giving us only 3,000 new units. That's the goal. The Minister of Housing, quite rightly I think, is being very conservative in his target, saying we will get 3,000 new units out of this incentive programme; mostly in Metro, some in Ottawa.

Mr. Wildman: Get on to the principle of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If we add those 3,000 to the 1,500 units which were built under the federal programme, plus the 1,000 units which were built without any government assistance, it would appear there could be as many as 5,000 new units in the next 18 months in Metro, Ottawa, Thunder Bay—the areas this is designed to assist.

All that will do is add approximately one percentage point to the vacancy rate. One percentage point isn't very much. All we can do is we change it from two to three or one to two.

Mr. Lewis: It's a good thing you are in that portfolio.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I listened to the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) talk about vacancy rates and he came up with a five per cent vacancy rate. That is what he suggests as a reasonable rate that we should be aiming for. I don't know whether he saw the report that was given to the city of Toronto by the organization called the Bureau of Municipal Research and looked at the vacancy rates in Toronto. Starting in 1971—that was the year many of us arrived here looking for rental accommodation, which was very plentiful, there was no shortage whatsoever. We all had good opportunity to get good rental at reasonable rates. The rate in December of 1971, which was a couple of months after many of us arrived here, was 2.4 per cent in the city of Toronto; in Metro it was 3.4. Most of us were looking for places in the city. It has never since 1971 in the city of Toronto been higher than 2.8 per cent and there were ample rental units available with that kind of a vacancy rate. Any talk of five per cent is absolute nonsense.

An hon. member: What about income?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, every hon. member has had an opportunity to debate this bill. The minister is replying. Order, please, the hon. minister is supposed to be replying.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am responding to the points raised by hon. members, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Conway: It's an election speech.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The budget brought forward one incentive which apparently has not been related at all to rental accommodations. I notice that one of my colleagues—at least, in the NDP—on the economic and cultural nationalism select committee is here, and he may recall when we were discussing the possibility of putting barriers in the way of foreign ownership there were many people in the private sector came to us—and I must admit that I didn't listen to them too well—and warned us that if we put any kind of barriers in this kind of purchase there would be a lack of investment of a kind that we were trying quite frankly to stop, which was German investment in apartment units. There's a reason for that: German investors are able, under their own tax laws, to purchase apartments in Ontario and in Canada and, because of their own tax laws, they can either pay a higher price or accept a lower return than a Canadian investor can for exactly the same building.

Mr. Sargent: You are building slums.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The 20 per cent land transfer tax cut that market off and, as a result, nobody in Germany has bought a building since that date. What has happened is that many builders, who built small apartment houses and then intended to sell them to an investor because they were not managers, were stuck with them—

Mr. Martel: We opposed the tax, if you recall.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —and they had no money to go out and build new ones. Whether the member opposed it or not, that has been removed in the budget and adds another incentive to build rental accommodation in Ontario. Put those measures together—

Mr. Martel: We opposed it and so did you.

Mr. Lewis: Can you give us a stitch of evidence on that? Can you give us one concrete example?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no obligation that the minister answer any question on second reading.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I don't mind responding to the Leader of the Opposition on that. As Minister of Housing, shortly after the tax was introduced, I met with apartment owner after apartment owner who said that sales were in progress and were immediately cut off on the imposition of the tax. They needed their money in order to build more apartments.

Mr. Lewis: Give us one example.

Mr. Conway: Just one example.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have said I met with apartment owner after apartment owner, by the dozens, people from Hamilton, people from Kitchener, people from Metro, all of them saying the same thing.

[9:45]

Mr. Conway: Name one.

Mr. Nixon: You and Bill Kelly.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Now you want me to pick out the name of somebody? No, I will not. I don't recall, three years ago—I recall the meetings and they didn't come in the ones. They came in the 10s and the 20s. So they were quite sincere about this.

Mr. Nixon: We warned you, Sydney.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: In any event, if anybody is thinking about this objectively, Mr. Speaker, they must recognize the removal of that tax will provide the kind of roll-over investment that we need to encourage people to build small apartment units in this province. That will happen once the tax—once it is known, at least, in foreign circles, that the tax now has been removed from that kind of investment.

Mr. Wildman: Are you going to advertise?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Now the other aspect of this thing is that everybody's been saying that this is short-term; nobody's giving any thought to the future whatsoever, no programmes are in place. Well again, read the Speech from the Throne. I wish the member for Cornwall was here because he made some suggestions which were identical to suggestions that I made six months ago. We will be proposing to this Legislature and to the people of Ontario a number of policy alternatives; and there is a variety of these, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Conway: The question is, can the government be believed?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Oh, well—

Mr. Conway: We'll watch the Premier's words.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We'll be believed enough so that we're in a position to come back and do it; and we will do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister's remarks are appropriate as long as it's within the ambit of the principle of Bill 28.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Again Mr. Speaker, I simply urge all members, as I have done before, to read that portion of the speech which deals with what our future course of action will be to develop the kind of alternatives that we need; if people accept that this is temporary legislation, and it's not temporary as long as you don't have an expiry date on it. There is no way that you can come back here, except if the legislation is temporary, and say well, we'll come back and we'll rescind the legsilation when the time comes. If you set a date at least you have a target to try to meet, and I think that's exactly what we've done by putting that date on it.

One of the problems that came up during the debate, and it seemed to me speaker after speaker mentioned this, that what you have to do is give the tenant equal status with the landlord in hearings before the board. That is based, of course, on the whole idea of confrontation, the whole idea that this is adversary legislation, that you're pitting the tenant against the landlord. That really reflects a failure to understand the whole purpose of this legislation.

The onus to prove anything in this legislation is entirely on the landlord, regardless of who initiates the appeal. If the tenant brings the appeal, he immediately transfers the onus to the landlord to prove that the rent increase which is being appealed is justified. If the landlord is required to bring a review under the legislation, he must prove to the rent review officer that he is justified in asking for that. And really, it seems to me Mr. Speaker, there has been a conscious attempt to stir up the kind of confrontation which, as I said before, the NDP thrives on. Without that confrontation they really have nothing to offer the people.

Mr. Renwick: That doesn't make it non-adversary.

Mr. Cassidy: You weren't even letting tenants into some of the hearings.

Mr. Conway: Old iron-heels Sydney.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's my hope that we will be able to present to the people of Ontario—

Mr. Cassidy: You've stripped them of the right.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —that series of policy alternatives to enable the government to have in place permanent legislation. I said in a number of speeches, and many of the members opposite have heard this, we can never go back to what it was before. Once you have intervened to this extent, you've established a future permanent programme. But it need not be rent control or rent review, and I'm suggesting that a programme of tenant protection is something that this government can and will bring forward for discussion among the people of Ontario. And as I say, I think the member for Cornwall may be free to give me some advice along those lines, and I'd be glad to ask him.

Mr. Warner: We all are.

Mr. Conway: You need a new parliamentary secretary.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: One of the problems that has come up in this—and I hate to open up old wounds on this, Mr. Speaker, because one of the members responsible happens to be in the House—but I see signs again of "let's take credit". The member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) used that phrase over and over again in his speech.

Mr. Lewis: That's our new election slogan: "Let's take credit."

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Who's going to take credit for this? Who can take credit for this?

Mr. Lewis: We found it tonight.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There's nothing new about that.

Mr. Conway: Darcy's given you a pretty good head start.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There's nothing new about it at all, but I really—

Mr. Lewis: We are sticking with the first one.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I really can't pass up this opportunity to read it into Hansard that crushingly revealing paragraph—

Mr. Nixon: Are you going to permit this reading, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —in the famous caucus memorandum which is co-authored by the member for Ottawa Centre and the member for Durham East (Mr. Moffat). I'm reading very briefly from another document. It reads as follows and I quote: "We must be seen to be initiating the pressure to extend rent review."

Mr. Bain: Not only be the pressure, but be seen to be the pressure.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: "If the Tories eventually agree, as is likely"—their prognostication is somewhat correct—"we then still win credit." Great phrase. You've got to win credit or what's the use of doing anything?

Mr. Nixon: Did you get that in a plain brown envelope?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I continue to read: "If the Tories don't agree, then we stand alone as the party which works for tenants". And, gentlemen, it goes on to say: "If we can make the Liberals make a clear anti-tenant vote along the way, so much the better."

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: On a matter of privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A matter of privilege?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I think it should be put on the record that it is because of the pressure of the NDP that we ever got this protection for tenants in the first place.

Mr. Nixon: That wasn't even a good interjection.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I may continue on the point of order, the NDP is going to claim forever for it.

Mr. Lewis: That document was called the corporate overview, 1976-80.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It is so typical because it doesn't seem that really there is any concern here to help the people; let's get credit for, and never worry about it.

Mr. S. Smith: You never do that.

Mr. Conway: What have you got Darwin Kealey doing, Sydney; is he out taking alms?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There is one other point that I really must dwell upon, because there's been a great deal of speculation—

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There has been a great deal of speculation on one other point and that is the proposed amendment which was announced by the member for Perth in his opening remarks last week.

Mr. Conway: Another sycophant looking for a public job.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Now I know what the New Democratic amendment is, they have made no bones about it. They have said all along that they would move to reduce the guidelines from eight per cent to six per cent and hang the consequences. Never mind what will happen, that will be seen by the tenants of Ontario to be in their interests. Whether it is or not, it will be seen by them.

Mr. Bain: It is, it is.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I accept the fact that that is a very simple thing to try to explain. I happen to have more respect for the intelligence of tenants than that; but okay, that is what the NDP amendment is going to say. But the Liberals have suggested that they will introduce an amendment which does not contain any figure, which ties us to an order in council passed by the federal cabinet, which can be rescinded, changed, altered at any time—

Mr. S. Smith: It is known as the Anti-Inflation Board. The Anti-Inflation Board is mentioned by the Treasurer from time to time, that great phrase AIB.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If they look at the regulation, the regulation is passed by the Governor General in Council, which is the federal cabinet; no matter how they cut it, that is the way it is going to be done.

That is not surprising coming from the Liberals, but what really surprises me is, before we sent the compendium, which showed why we had arrived at eight per cent in our Act—and we gave all the figures—before we had sent the compendium the leader of the Liberal Party said he couldn't see very much wrong with eight per cent.

Mr. Nixon: Let wages be tied to six per cent, you are still going to stick with eight per cent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I suppose we made the mistake of providing them with too much information to prove that eight per cent was in fact logical and was not something that had been pulled out of the air—

Mr. S. Smith: That is right, and it affects people's wages.

Mr. Nixon: You never learn, do you?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —but was arithmetically calculated, based on certain cost components.

Mr. S. Smith: The Treasurer likes the AIB.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Once he had seen that, then we get the amendment to say, you know, "we must try not to be seen as anti-tenant voters, according to the NDP memorandum, we must try to get some of that credit."

Mr. S. Smith: You control wages, you control rents.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That is the amendment they are going to be bringing in. But I don't see much point in providing a compendium if it's not going to be read.

Mr. Nixon: Wait until the reeve of Nepean gets to you.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Almost every speaker, except the member for Perth, suggested that they had seen no information to justify the 8 per cent. I suppose the member for Perth did not share the compendium with his other colleagues; but we sent it to them, we showed them why. I think perhaps we now have to put it into the record, because nobody else has seen it.

Mr. Nixon: He made a knowledgeable and reasonable speech.

Mr. S. Smith: Why did you leave yourself the loophole that you could lower it at any time? What was that about?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Because the figures may change, right? Exactly.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: And you would do it by order in council.

Mr. Conway: Just like Spadina.

Mr. Ruston: Two weeks before the election, lower it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When the figures do change, under our Act we will have to give as much as 120 days advance knowledge of it so that the system can work.

Mr. Ruston: Just before the election.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There are certain timeframes in the legislation, in The Landlord and Tenant Act. At the moment there is no reason to lower that figure, and until you have those figures it seems to me irresponsible to suggest lowering it.

Mr. S. Smith: Like mid-campaign.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I may mention what the figures are, municipal taxes, which on the average in Ontario constitute 25 per cent of operating costs in rental units, have an inflation factor of 13 per cent according to the best information we have been able to obtain.

Mr. S. Smith: Do you expect them to go down, and energy prices to go down?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. During the course of this debate the members of the opposition have asked several questions. I'm sure they expected a reply. Please do courtesy to the minister and allow him to be heard.

Mr. Conway: We didn't expect an election.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maintenance and repairs constitute nine per cent of the cost and will have an inflation factor of approximately 10 per cent based on wage guidelines. Administrative costs, which form nine per cent of the costs, will have in inflation factor of approximately 20 per cent due to some legislative changes in Ottawa and, of course, the continuation of rent review. Fuel costs, which constitute seven per cent of the costs, are expected to rise by 30 per cent. Electricity and water costs are expected to increase by approximately 12 per cent.

Mr. Conway: The road to Damascus.

Mr. Davidson: You implemented them.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: These five factors, none of which have an inflation factor below 10 per cent, constitute approximately 55 per cent of the total operating costs on the average. That doesn't mean some landlords will experience less and others more, but they are the only reliable figures we have at the present time.

Mr. Davidson: The government implemented them.

Mr. Conway: Sydney on the road to Damascus.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the member for Renfrew North stop his yammering?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: So, using the figures we have, using the inflation factors we have and the weighting factors we have, we have given to both opposition parties the figures we have and which they have, to show that the operating costs will rise by approximately 8.65 per cent. It could be less or it could be more, but the eight per cent seems to us —and I see no evidence from anybody to suggest otherwise—to be supported by the facts that we all have available to us now.

Aside from the fact that we have arithmetic figures to show that eight per cent is a reasonable guideline, and it's not a ceiling, it doesn't provide any right to the tenant that he doesn't have now. Six per cent won't give him any more than he now has. He can appeal any rent increase, whether it's one per cent or seven per cent.

Mr. Warner: That makes just about as much sense as we can expect.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's our rationale. Aside from the fact that other provinces have put in higher guidelines, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are both over eight per cent, British Columbia, which has had rent review over 3½ years now, has just recently, effective in three months from now, reduced theirs to seven per cent; seven per cent and not six per cent.

Mr. Lewis: Do you know what the vacancy rates in Victoria are now? Close to 10 per cent, with rent controls.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am told that the Act in British Columbia now effectively applies only to greater Vancouver and this is where it's going to be used most of the time.

Mr. Lewis: That is right and the vacancy rates went up.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I can get back to the proposed Liberal amendment, by tying the guidelines to the action of the federal government over which we have no control—

Mr. Davidson: Oh, you've tied everything else to it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We haven't tied anything to it. If members look at the bill they'll see no reference whatsoever to the federal government or to AIB.

Mr. Nixon: You have surrendered all the wage controls to them.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have an expiry date of December 31, 1978. That's been set by this government and this Legislature. It has nothing to do with the federal government.

Mr. Nixon: What a hypocrite; what a cheap comment.

Mr. S. Smith: The Treasurer loves the AIB. Why don't you listen to him?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I can understand the Liberal Party being willing to give the federal government the right to amend our legislation. That goes with their game.

Mr. S. Smith. Just as you gave them the right to set the wages of this province.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There's nothing in my legislation that says anything about the federal government.

Mr. Roy: You signed us over.

Mr. Nixon: Even the Supreme Court said you were wrong, 9-0.

Mr. Ruston: Nine-zip.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I should point out as clearly as possible, notwithstanding all the other factors, that the effect of lowering the guideline below eight per cent can only result in higher rents in this province. I know that, again, is something that the opposition would rather gloss over. We will be seen to be the champions of the tenant.

Mr. Nixon: You are the glosser.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Perhaps I can have a moment just to explain how that can come about, because it isn't difficult, and I'm sure that most of the members of the opposition will be able to understand this.

At the present time, the major landlords in the province, aside from the one in my riding that the member for Ottawa Centre knows about since it's headed up by one of his former campaign managers, aside from that one, most of the major landlords in this province have accepted eight per cent, and if a tenant wanted to appeal that he had every right to do it. Some of those tenants have, in fact, done that, but that has been the guideline accepted by major landlords. They're not suffering under it, and I would suggest that there is no way that they would suffer under it because they have other investments and they can smooth out any problems they have.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, they are providing rental accommodation at a loss, is that what you are saying?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: However, and we've checked this with them, if the guideline goes to six per cent, it is a figure that they will not be able to offer voluntarily to their tenants and, if they don't, they certainly won't be offering eight per cent, they'll be offering 15 or 16 per cent.

Mr. Good: Let them go to the rent review board.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Then they'll go to rent review and they'll have to justify it, but the average rent increases in this province that have gone to rent review have been over 12 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: That is the way the procedure is supposed to work.

[10:00]

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I'm suggesting to you, and to the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that if you do that the average rent increase may be 11 per cent or it may be only 10 per cent, but it's not going to be eight per cent because they will be able to justify higher costs. If they go to the costs of going to rent review, they are going to apply for more than eight and they are going probably without prejudging—

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: It sounds like you are inviting them.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I haven't invited them.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's a quasi-judicial process. The rent review offices will deal with figures as they are put before them.

Mr. Lewis: That's a terribly irresponsible invitation to increase rents all across the province.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It is no invitation at all.

Mr. Lewis: You have invited landlords to increase rents.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The landlords have been satisfied—

Mr. Lewis: You have no right to. It is a disgrace to the principle of this bill.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I know the facts hurt but that is going to be the effect of this bill.

Mr. Lewis: You have invited it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I hope it won't be the effect of this bill.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: But there is no reason to believe it. Telegrams are starting to pour in now.

Interjections.

Mr. Wildman: Bring us back the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We are talking about the major landlords. We are talking about landlords who account for up to 200,000 units in this province who have not gone to rent review.

Mr. Lewis: You urge them to go.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am not urging them to go. They have sent telegrams. They have given us phone calls. I would regret the fact that they may go because there are 200,000 units.

Mr. Lewis: Why do you change your tune?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There goes the fight for credit again and the fight for credit is on.

Mr. Cassidy: Table those telegrams. Who is trying to intimidate the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Absolutely no—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I think some of the members opposite have received some of them.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have discussed. vacancy rates very briefly. There has been some suggestion that we should have this Act guided by vacancy rates in various localities.

I am sure the hon. members know that if the vacancy rate, say, in Barrie is four per cent, if we decide to free it up while the vacancy rate in Metro is two and we keep rent control here, there is a possibility that a landlord who has units in Metro might also have units in Barrie and he might be tempted to try to make up whatever he feels he is losing in Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: Another invitation to the landlords. You are just unbelievable.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We haven't done it. That won't happen. That is very good of the Leader of the Opposition. It has been proposed by that side of the House, not by this side of the House.

Mr. Lewis: You are running on a platform of rent increase.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Leader of the Opposition come to order and will the minister ignore the interjections.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I don't want to belabour the vacancy rate but perhaps I might explain to some of the members of the House how those vacancy rates are obtained. First of all, they are obtained in only 22 urban centres in all of Canada, eight in Ontario. I am sorry, nine in Ontario. I want to be accurate because we should know what we are talking about here.

Mr. Wildman: What about Sault Ste. Marie?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The vacancy rates in Ontario range from 0.2 in Thunder Bay to 3.1 per cent in some city in Ontario called Ottawa-Hull. When I tried to find for the benefit of my friend from Ottawa Centre what the vacancy rate in Ottawa was, I was told CMHC doesn't keep those figures so you can weight that one out and that means we have eight in Ontario that have any reliability at all. They give you no vacancy rates on kinds of apartments but we know from our own figures that there is a surplus of three-bedroom apartments and a shortage of one bedroom apartments. What good a vacancy rate is in determining whether one should have or should not have rent review I really don't know.

Mr. Ferris: Oh, be serious.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Vacancy rates in a small locality can change dramatically from one day to another, depending on when the survey is taken.

Mr. Foulds: That's why when you get a vacancy in Thunder Bay it goes up one per cent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Sure, exactly.

Mr. Wildman: My colleague says the largest vacancy rate is in your head.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The member for Wilson Heights isn't here. All I can say is that he mentioned the business of providing the tenants with copies and he said we should be doing it. We now have had copy machines in our rent review offices across this province for several months. They are being used by some people but not as much perhaps as people thought they might be.

Mr. Cassidy: You were so grudging with that that it hurt.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They are not being used to the fullest possible extent but in any case they are there.

Mr. Cassidy: You turned off every tenant in the province first.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The suggestion that they are not there indicates again a lack of knowledge about the bill. One of the members opposite—I think it was the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere—suggested we should put the name of the landlord in the lobby and I think that's an excellent suggestion. In fact, it is so good we did it a year and a half ago. It is in The Landlord and Tenant Act. It has been there ever since that member has been in the House. It is a great idea.

Mr. Wildman: But most of them don't follow it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have accepted that one, so he can take that out of his list of objections. We have been told that this programme is administratively complex, and it is. There is no question about it. Rent is not a simple thing. There are a tremendous number of factors that have to be taken into account.

I'd like right now, Mr. Speaker, despite some of the criticism that we heard of the staff, to pay tribute to the staff for making this thing work despite the kinds of provocations and, to some extent, interference they have received from many members in this Legislature. I said before in these remarks that the operation of the rent review programme is quasi-judicial in nature.

Mr. Nixon: What members have interfered? That's irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It should be allowed to operate without people calling the rent review officer in the middle of his deliberations.

Interjection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Let's have some order.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have no objection to any member of this Legislature appearing at a rent review hearing either as an observer or on behalf of the party to the hearing. But there have been cases where people have called rent review officers and rent review board members—

Mr. Renwick: I should hope not.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —while they're deliberating on the evidence that has been given before them, and really I suggest that that should be allowed without pressure.

Mr. Sargent: But it's okay for Eddie Goodman to appear.

Mr. Wildman: Name one.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have stayed faithfully away from those people and allowed them to do their job as they're trained to do it, and I think that's the way it should be.

An hon member: Name one.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There is no point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker suspended the proceedings of the House for 10 minutes.

On resumption:

[10:15]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When the House was suspended for 10 minutes the hon. Leader of the Opposition seemed to be rising on a point of order. If he has a legitimate point of order, I'll hear it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lewis: I must admit to you, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it's a point of order or a point of privilege, but the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations had indicated quite specifically in his remarks that members of this Legislature had interfered in the rent review process which he himself had called a quasi-judicial proceeding. It seems to me that those are very serious accusations to level at the Legislature holus-bolus, involving more than one person—the minister said several members of the Legislature—and I think that if the minister is going to make that kind of charge, he has an obligation to name the individuals who have allegedly interfered. I was surprised and taken aback at the way in which he put that, and that's why I rose.

Mr. Sargent: Withdraw.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I have in any way impugned the integrity of any member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw those comments. There is no question in my mind that there have been calls from members to rent review officers during the course of their deliberations, sir; I think the time for that is at the rent review hearing or after the issuing of an order, but not before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let's make it quite clear. It is a serious allegation for any member of this House to cast aspersions on all members of the House without being more specific, and I think it's very serious for any member to charge another member with interfering with the normal duties of civil servants in the course of their duties. So unless the minister wants to be more specific, I think he should withdraw the allegation and withdraw it unequivocally.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I certainly don't want to name any hon. members without naming all, Mr. Speaker; I'm not in a position to do that, so I withdraw the allegation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. minister may proceed.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: As I was about to say before the Leader of the Opposition rose on that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank you very much for maintaining order during this debate. That ends my winding-up speech. I look forward to the calling of the vote.

Motion agreed to.

Ordered for committee of the whole House.

ESSEX COUNTY FRENCH-LANGUAGE SECONDARY SCHOOL ACT

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 31, An Act to require the Essex County Board of Education to provide a French-Language Secondary School.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's my understanding that the last speaker in the debate was the hon. member for Hamilton West. In the normal progression, if there's any member from the Conservative Party—I'll recognize the hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall be brief. I think the previous speakers—

Mr. Bounsall: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned the debate at the close of the last hearing, but if the member for Scarborough Centre wishes to have the floor—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In the interests of equal time it seems to me that we should rotate the speakers and the natural order of sequence would be a member of the government party. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Lewis: This is a good time.

Mr. Roy: You can have a saw-off and call a member of ours.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The previous speakers have been very eloquent in their support of this legislation; not only their support but indeed their personal feelings which deal upon the background of this legislation. I want to compliment my friend and colleague from Scarborough North, the hon. Minister of Education, for going into such great detail, not only about this bill but indeed about the whole history, good and bad, of the educational opportunities granted and denied to minority groups over more than a century in this province.

I would hope this bill does not result in emotional feelings because it boils down to one thing—there is a law, the law must be obeyed.

Mr. Roy: You are wrong there. There is no law.

Mr. Drea: I find it very difficult to understand—

Mr. Nixon: There is no law yet, that's why we are here.

Mr. Drea: There is a law.

Mr. Nixon: It is permissive.

Mr. Drea: There is a procedure by which the minority in this province has the right to obtain schooling in its own language.

Mr. Nixon: It is permissive and not obligatory. That is what is wrong with it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I say to you, if that law is not obeyed then no one in this Legislature has the right to point the finger at some of those apparitions in Quebec who want to break the law. It is that simple.

Mr. Nixon: You are dreaming.

Mr. Roy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is nothing out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Yes there is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Every member of this Legislature has a right to be heard. You may disagree with him—

Mr. Sargent: He can raise a point of order if he wants to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You may disagree with him, but he has a right to be heard. There is nothing out of order, so there is no point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Stay up on your point of order; stay up there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre may continue uninterrupted.

Mr. Sargent: State your point of order.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is nothing out of order. He has a right to be heard. He even has a right to be wrong, but he has a right to be heard.

Mr. Lewis: Frank, what word did you use? Did you say aberrations?

Mr. Drea: Apparitions, and if it offends sensitivities in here that I called Rene Levesque an apparition then so be it.

Mr. Roy: That is not the point. It is just that you are wrong on the law.

Mr. Drea: I am not wrong on the law.

Mr. Roy: Of course, you don't know any better, that is why.

Mr. Drea: I belong to a minority group in this province—

Mr. Roy: You are not kidding.

Mr. Ruston: One of 125.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I don't think that is a remark that calls for humour.

I am a member of a minority group in this province. In the field of education, as a Roman Catholic who supports the separate schools, if it were not for the majority of people in this province obeying the law then my minority group would not have the educational system that it has today in the separate school system.

Mr. Nixon: Nobody is breaking the law.

Mr. Drea: My children would not have their educational opportunities.

Mr. Nixon: Baloney. Nobody is breaking the law.

Mr. S. Smith: What law are you talking about?

Mr. Drea: To me this is a very fundamental proposition.

Mr. Nixon: Why don't you get it right then?

Mr. Drea: Like the member for Carleton East (Ms. Gigantes) it grieves me somewhat that the Legislature has to come to this confrontation on the issue. I would have hoped that common sense, goodwill and above all the determination in this province that the majority must not only protect the rights of the minority, it must enhance them because that is the way that the minority, and all those in the minorities that will come, blends into a very common culture and into a single province, and without that it is useless to attempt anything toward national unity. It starts at home.

I am very pleased to support this bill. I compliment the Minister of Education on his courage, his integrity and his forthrightness for bringing it before the House at this time.

Mr. Nixon: Of course, you are trying to get into the cabinet.

Mr. Bounsall: I also rise in support of Bill 31. My mind, intellect and sense of justice and fairness are totally committed to the establishment of this French-language secondary school for Windsor and Essex county. I rejoice with the francophones as they near the end of their eight-year torturous struggle but my heart as well o'erflows with sorrow and dismay that there should ever have been required to come before this Legislature a bill so tragically entitled An Act to require the Essex County Board of Education to provide a French-Language Secondary School, a title that would cause, I would think, even the most casual visitor in the gallery today to think, "My God, what must have been going on in Essex county? What must be the history of anger and hatred and heartache and lack of interhuman understanding and tolerance that this would—"

Interjection.

Mr. Bounsall: "—require a bill like this to be debated here?"

I commend the Minister of Education for his opening address when he outlined so thoroughly and accurately, step by step, the history from 1969 to the present day that so clearly indicated why it is so imperative for us, the members of this Legislature, to support the principle of this bill, the provision of a French-language secondary school for the students of Windsor and Essex county.

The wording of the clauses of this bill is stark and uncompromising, brutal almost, but necessary, and leave no doubt as to what our intentions are: "On the day this Act comes into force, the board is deemed to have passed a resolution to constuct a building . . . " It further leaves no doubt that it is to be a new school with the words "within 30 days . . . the board shall . . . select a site . . . that is not . . . the location of an existing school." The minister has now so belatedly—and lamentably, I am sure—judged the depth of feeling and emotions in Essex county for it pounds yet further forward: "Where . . . the board fails to take the action . . . the minister may thereupon cause all such things to be done as are necessary to construct the school."

Mr. Speaker: If I may inquire, has the hon. member further remarks to make? If so, he might adjourn the debate.

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do. I will continue at the next time with the remarks dealing with—rather than having such a stark and uncompromising a bill as we have before us—the alternative which we would have preferred to have seen.

Mr. Bounsall moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with our announcement this afternoon and in conformance with standing order 28(a) I deem a motion to adjourn to have been made, and will call the order of business as announced earlier.

As announced earlier this afternoon, in accordance with standing order 27(g) and provisional standing order 4, due notice was given on two counts of matters to be debated at the close of this evening's session.

I call upon first of all the member for Brantford who has announced that he was dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener). The hon. member for Brantford has five minutes.

[10:30]

LAND SPECULATION TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. Makarchuk: On April 4, 1975 Lynden Hill Farms sold 197.491 acres of land to Lenendorff Services. The sale price was $20,254 per acre and the total sale price was $4 million. The property was purchased and owned by Maxwell J. Webster, a name that is not unknown in Ontario racing circles, or for that matter, in the Tory party. He bought it in May 1972 for $120,000, approximately $1,200 per acre.

Unlike the Ronto situation, there is no argument as to whether the property was owned before or after April 9, 1974, the date that the speculation tax came into effect. What is of concern in this case is did Lynden Hill Farms pay tax, or did they not pay the speculation tax?

Despite questions in the House and on the order paper, the minister is evasive and refuses to answer. In fact, I get the impression —and this is shared by others—that the government is trying to stonewall all inquiries into exemptions granted under the land speculation tax.

Mr. Shore: You've got to be out of your mind.

Mr. Grossman: So, what else is new?

Mr. Makarchuk: It is important to know if this tax was paid, because if Lynden Hill Farms paid tax, then the question arises—why wasn't tax levied against Ronto?

Also of concern is the amount of tax, if any; was it collected and on what basis? The minister should realize that the property appreciated in value because the land was officially annexed by the city of Brantford in October 1974, although the OMB approval was given on July 4, 1974. I should again point out that the sale was in 1975.

The minister should also be aware that the annexation occurred after April 9, 1974, and the tax should have been assessed on the fair market value of the property as of that date. Assuming that the ministry officials did their own audit and did not blindly accept the submisison of some lawyers, they will probably find out that at that time in that area, land was being sold between $6,000 and $10,000 an acre on valuation day. Therefore, it is conceivable that Lynden Hill Farms could owe the province close to $4 million in speculation tax. The exemption to Ronto was $2 million. To this company it's $400,000. A total of $2.4 million. At this time, the city of Brantford has requested the province to fulfil its legislative commit-

ments and pay 15 per cent, or approximately $1.5 million, as its share of the cost to the expansion to the sewage treatment plant. Of course, the city was told that no funding is available, we have restraints, et cetera. It makes you wonder just what the hell is going on in the province.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. member keep his language more parliamentary?

Mr. Makarchuk: It makes you wonder just what's going on in the province. But you find that Tory friends can make $14 million and get away with it; yet the taxpayers in Brantford are supposed to pick up the bill for the sewage treatment plant – the $1.5 million which the province refuses to collect and the province refuses to pay.

Mr. Grossman: Garbage.

Mr. Makarchuk: I should also like to point out to the Treasurer sitting over there that we have a $15 million capital debt. With the sewage treatment plant, that capital debt will be increased by $9 million or $23 million in total in a one-year increase; that's more than 50 per cent.

I question the minister as to just exactly what's going on, whether she has one law for the rich and one law for everybody else. That's the only way I can describe it.

If the Minister of Revenue cannot provide answers regarding the taxes on this matter, then I feel that this should be brought to the attention of the public accounts committee for investigation. There is no way this Parliament or this province can or should tolerate a government that is horribly biased and irresponsible in the way the laws of the province are applied.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister, if she wishes, has five minutes.

An hon. member: She doesn't know anything.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: On April 4, the member for Brantford tabled a question concerning the supposed exemption of Lynden Lynden Hill Farms from land speculation tax; on the sale of certain lands in Brantford. And on April 18, I answered that question fully, by informing the member that while a lien clearance was given, Lynden Hall Farms Limited remained liable for land speculation tax. Frankly, I regret his allegations. However, his remarks this afternoon and again this evening—and his innuendo—indicate that he remains confused—that's the kindest word. I welcome the opportunity to clarify this matter once and for all.

Mr. Swart: About time.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: The member's misunderstanding of this matter centres on two points: first, that the granting of a lien clearance on the sale constitutes an exemption to Lynden Hill Farms from land speculation tax; and, second, that no tax has yet been paid. As I clearly stated in my answer given on April 18, the lien clearance is not an exemption from tax and Lynden Hill Farms remains liable for any tax payable.

Mr. Nixon: Why don't they pay it from profits?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Obstruction.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: For the benefit of the members I shall now elaborate on my answers by explaining the details of how the land speculation tax applies to this case.

In 1975, Lynden Hill Farms sold the property in question for $4 million, as the member has described. The application of the Act requires the determination of the fair market value of the land as of April 9, 1974, in order to determine whether there is a taxable gain. It is Lynden Hill Farms' position that there was no taxable gain during this 11-month period, that is, from April, 1974 to March, 1975.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's nonsense.

Mr. Nixon: Boy, if you buy that!

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: My ministry, however, has questioned the valuation declared by the corporation. Real estate valuation is an extremely complicated matter involving conflicting professional opinions. Also, it is necessary to determine an accurate and defensible value for the ministry in negotiations and possibly in court actions.

Mr. Nixon: You accepted one opinion on Ronto.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Inevitably, this is a time-consuming process and it is quite common for tax assessments involving real estate to take several years. For these reasons, the

question of whether Lynden Hill's sale is taxable remains open.

Meanwhile, the government's position is protected in two ways. First, I would point out that giving a lien clearance for speculation tax purposes is a routine matter. It allows the transaction to go forward and gives the purchaser a clear title to the property. However, I would stress that it does not absolve the vendor from any tax liability that may eventually be established. Taxes assessed against the vendor are a debt due to the Crown and will be collected.

Mr. Nixon: But you don't have a lien on it.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Since Lynden Hill Farms Limited is a corporation, its assets are subject to a statutory lien under The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. Shore: There it is. Listen.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Therefore, any disposal of property by the corporation requires a lien clearance from my ministry under that Act.

Mr. Shore: Right on.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Second, the Crown's financial interest is protected, because when the issue is finally resolved and taxes found to be payable, it will be assessed and will bear interest at nine per cent from the time it should have been paid, that is, 90 days after the sale closed in 1975.

Mr. Nixon: Unless you give Webster an order in council as you did Ronto.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Thus, Mr. Speaker, as you can see, the Crown is properly secured. In closing, I wish to assure all members that my ministry—

Mr. Sargent: Go and tell it to Eddie Goodman.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: —is continuing to review this matter to protect the Crown's interest.

Mr. Sargent: He is looking after us there.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: In particular, we were in contact with the solicitors for Lynden Hill Farms as recently as April 12 last.

Mr. Nixon: Who was that?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Since our negotiations are still in progress, it is not in the best interests of the Crown to refer this matter to the public accounts committee as was suggested earlier this day.

Mr. Sargent: How are you going to stop it?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: This would delay and could prejudice our negotiations as well as unfairly implying that Lynden Hill Farms is improperly evading the payment of tax.

Mr. Speaker: Now the hon. member for Carleton East.

Mr. Warner: You should resign.

Mr. Shore: You probably don't understand it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

The hon. member for Carleton East now has five minutes to explain her objection.

WOMEN IN LABOUR FORCE

Ms. Gigantes: A week ago tonight the Treasurer of Ontario presented the budget of the government for 1977. Among the other questionable elements of that budget was a new description of the Ontario labour force. In budget paper A, section 1, the labour force is divided into two main groups: the primary labour force and the secondary labour force. The primary labour force is defined as including males 25 to 54 years of age. The secondary labour force is defined as everyone else.

Last Thursday I asked the Treasurer if he could provide a rationale for counting all women as part of the secondary labour force. The Treasurer responded as follows: "I can't recall off the top of my head. I'll get the answer for the member."

That was five days ago, Mr. Speaker. In question period today, I asked the Treasurer if he had managed yet to come up with the rationale for counting all women as part of the secondary labour force in Ontario. He replied, "I undertook to get an answer to that question. I haven't and I will."

I find that an unsatisfactory response. If the Treasurer of Ontario can't explain one of the chief analytic definitions of his budget, given five clear days to reflect on the subject, then something is wrong. And I think I know what is wrong.

Let me suggest that the definitions "primary labour force" and "secondary labour force" are not helpful analytic definitions. Anything but. Instead, they serve only to muddle the mind and obscure the truth. The

truth is that the so-called primary labour force has a higher level of employment than other groups. And the so-called secondary labour force is experiencing a low level of employment. The implication of this definition and the way it is used in the budget is that if you belong to a group that has low employment, you are counted as part of the secondary labour force. It is somehow of secondary importance economically and socially if you are out of work.

This is not an acceptable analysis. It is not okay for males aged 15 to 24 to suffer high unemployment. It is not okay for males aged 55 and over to suffer high unemployment. And it is not okay for all women over 15 years of age to suffer high unemployment. The people in these groups are not second rate, either as citizens or as members of the labour force.

The really miserable thing about the Treasurer's definition, the thing that is most discouraging to me as a member of the group called "women over 15 years of age" is that by definition we will always be counted as members of the secondary labour force. We can't have the hope of growing up to join the primary labour force and we will never have the satisfaction of having been in the primary labour force. We can't make it, by definition. It is somehow assumed that we all have daddies or husbands or children to provide us with primary income.

This is true of some women at some times in their lives, but it is not true of most women all their lives. Most women at some time in their lives need jobs. They need jobs because they are single and self-supporting, or they need jobs because they are married and their families need two incomes, or they need jobs because they are single heads of families and are desperate for family income.

If we are to be considered part of the secondary labour force all our lives, then I would suggest that males aged 25 to 54 years who have private sources of income should be disqualified from the primary labour force. The definition of secondary labour force should be extended to its logical conclusion. Males aged 25 to 54 with a private source of income should join the category of the secondary labour force. I'd like to nominate the first person eligible for redefinition, Mr. Speaker. The Treasurer of Ontario. If he'd move on over there'd be one more job available for the rest of us secondary labour force types.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer has five minutes, if he wishes to respond.

[10:45]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the discipline of labour economics, as in so many areas of this field, the terminology is traditional. The term "prime-age labour" was developed to describe men 25 to 50 years of age who are the principal breadwinners and sources of support to their families. Obviously, the opportunities for women to work have expanded rapidly in the last 20 years and more and more of the women in the work force are the sole source of support of themselves and their families. However, I think it is fair to say that the terminology of economics has not kept pace with this development. I have no doubt—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have no doubt that the terminology of primary and secondary labour force will gradually drop from usage and—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Full attention was given to the member for Carleton East. We expect the same courtesy—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and we will come to describe labour force groups more explicitly by age and sex.

Mr. Lewis: You put out the paper which discriminates on that basis—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I declare the motion to adjourn—

Mr. Lewis: You are a hoax. You are a secondary hoax.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition please restrain himself.

I deem the motion to adjourn to have been carried.

The House adjourned at 10:47 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 26, 1977

Budget debate, continued, Mr. Peterson 939

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Handleman, agreed to 961

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, second reading 961

Point of order on allegation of interference, Mr. Lewis 973

Essex County French Language Secondary School Act, Mr. Wells, on second reading 974

Debate re answer to oral question on Land Speculation Tax Exemption, Mr. Makarchuk, Mrs. Scrivener 976

Debate re answer to oral question on Women in Labour Force, Ms. Gigantes, Mr. McKeough 978

Adjournment 979

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
Maeck, L. (Parry Sound PC)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M.; Minister of Revenue (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 24

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, April 28, 1977
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

PHYSICAL FITNESS

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yesterday, in the regional municipality of Waterloo, I announced the establishment of a physical fitness policy for the province and the implementation of 11 new component programmes of that policy.

Because every member of the House has been sent an information package on the fitness policy that gives details of each programme, I would simply like to summarize, for the benefit of the House, the objectives of our initiatives.

As the various programmes commence operation I hope that you will encourage your constituents to take advantage of any financial assistance, counselling or practical information that will be available.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, we are seeking to motivate the people of Ontario toward increased physical activity. Second, we are attempting to broaden the range of opportunities for people to become involved in activities which contribute toward improved fitness. Third, we are hoping to upgrade the competence of community fitness leaders and enhance an understanding of the concept and the benefits of fitness.

Mr. Reid: Is Lorne the before picture?

Hon. Mr. Welch: And fourth, we are seeking to improve the co-ordination of fitness programmes at the community level among various levels of government and volunteer agencies.

Fundamentally, we are offering assistance in such a way that groups at the community level will be encouraged, as much as possible, to initiate and develop their own programmes.

In order to meet these objectives, we have earmarked approximately $1.5 million in the current fiscal year, to be supplemented by Wintario funds for activities consistent with Wintario principles.

I am sure every member of this House will want to support the goals of the fitness policy and the objectives of the programme elements. I would encourage everyone to make his or her constituents aware of the need for increased physical fitness and its benefits.

Mr. B. Newman: Seventeen years it has taken you.

TOWNSHIP OF MALDEN INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, I had delivered to me Judge Macdonald's report of his inquiry in respect to the affairs of the township of Malden. I am today tabling the report. Judge Macdonald's recommendations are as follows:

(a) That the council of the township of Malden dismiss Stanley Jack Langlois from all his municipal appointments on the ground of misconduct.

(b) That the council of the township of Malden forthwith write off against the general-account reserve fund the undebentured capital cost of the Amherstburg, Anderdon and Malden sewage treatment system in a sum recommended by the township auditor, and that the current sewage surcharges on water bills be adjusted downward to an amount sufficient, and sufficient only, to pay the current C1 and operating charges after taking into account any surplus in the operating account from the year 1976, all as advised by the township's auditor.

(c) Members of township councils are required to disclose personal interests in matters beyond that of other ratepayers before council, and to refrain from voting thereon (sections 235 and 236 of The Municipal Act). It is of equal or greater importance, it seems to me, that the clerk of the municipality and other municipal officials acting in an advisory capacity to council, should also be required to make a similar disclosure for the record of such interest so that it can be taken into account by council in acting upon advice received from them. An appropriate penalty should be provided for a failure to do so. They are by inference so prohibited

by their oaths of office (form 21) at the time of taking office.

(d) Councils of rural municipalities ordinarily consist of persons familiar with rural and agricultural problems, and the members of the staffs of such muncipalities generally tend to be more knowledgeable in rural matters. What has occurred in the township of Malden from 1970 to the present day illustrates the conflict and disruption created by the spilling over of an urban area across the boundaries of a rural municipality. Interests and problems of the urban inhabitants are more identified with those of the adjoining urban municipality than with those of the rural municipality in which they find themselves residents. Obviously, the rural municipal councils and officials lack experience in coping with urban problems. I respectfully recommend that consideration be given by the responsible minister or ministers, by legislative amendment if necessary, to the formulation and enforcement of a policy of requiring annexation by an urban municipality of that part of its suburbs which it proposes to extend into a rural municipality as a condition to approval for registration of a new residential plan of subdivision in the area of contemplated extension.

The first two recommendations are matters for the Malden township council to decide, and at this point in time I am content to leave action on these two recommendations to that council.

With regard to recommendation (c), I have asked my staff to review the disclosure and conflict-of-interest provisions relating to municipal officials and to recommend to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), who is responsible for the municipal conflict-of-interest legislation, what action is necessary to eliminate the weakness in the present legislation.

I am particularly intrigued by recommendation (d). The problem of urban overspill into rural townships, and the subsequent costly and divisive annexation hearings, is rapidly becoming one of the most vexatious issues in municipal affairs in this province. I see considerable merit in Judge Macdonald's recommendation, and I and the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) will be considering it very carefully.

In view of the judge's findings, I am sending a copy of the report to the Attorney General in order that he may, in association with the Crown attorney, determine if there are grounds for further action under The Criminal Code. I am also sending copies to the Ministers of Housing and Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener) for their consideration.

Copies are also going to the auditor and the solicitor of the township so that they may consider what recommendations they ought to make to ensure the administrative and procedural practices of the municipality are satisfactory. Judge Macdonald questioned his right to award costs, and I am having my legal advisers research the legislation to determine if, in fact, there is any authority for the judge to make an order as to costs.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. B. Stephenson Mr. Speaker, later this afternoon I shall be introducing The Ministry of Labour Amendment Act, 1977, to serve three purposes.

First, Mr. Speaker, it will abolish the Industry and Labour Board by repealing section 8 of The Ministry of Labour Act, an agency which has in fact been inoperative since the outset of 1969. This agency played an important part in administering both The Minimum Wage Act and The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, but the enactment of The Employment Standards Act in 1968 repealed those statutes and vested the functions that hitherto had been carried out by the Industry and Labour Board in the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the director of employment standards. Accordingly, section 2 of this bill formally abolishes the Industry and Labour Board, the reference to which has become somewhat anachronistic.

Secondly, section 2 introduces a new section 8 into The Ministry of Labour Act. This provision will allow the Minister of Labour to appoint committees or individuals to act as mediators, fact-finders, consultants, or advisers in respect of any industrial relations matter or other problems which come under the jurisdiction of the ministry. There is a complementary power to remunerate and defray the expenses of any persons appointed pursuant to this section.

This power, Mr. Speaker, will fill a gap which presently exists in the legislation administered by the Ministry of Labour. At present, only The Labour Relations Act gives the minister any authority to appoint an impartial individual to assist the parties to a collective bargaining dispute, and that authority is basically restricted to the appointment of a conciliation officer. A mediator who becomes involved at the terminal stage

of negotiations, can only be appointed on the joint agreement of the parties; thus the ministry cannot now act on its own initiative in providing this type of service, nor can it direct mediation or fact finding at times other than during the negotiation of a collective agreement.

Given the importance of industrial relations conflicts and our shared commitment to avoid them, this oversight demands a remedy. However, problems which may be amenable to resolution through mediation or fact finding are not confined only to the purview of The Labour Relations Act. They do arise in respect of other statutes which the ministry administers.

Finally in this regard, I want to note that this new provision will allow the ministry to use and to pay non-civil servants as mediators and fact-finders. There have been, and will continue to be, disputes or problems in which an experienced neutral or neutrals, from outside government, can play a valuable role in achieving a resolution of the matter. Thus, our capability to assist the industrial relations community in Ontario will be strengthened by this amendment. For this reason, the amendment is being made to the broadest statute relevant to this purpose.

Thirdly and finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill creates a new Advisory Council on Occupational Health and Occupational Safety. This is a continuation of the process that began with the enactment of The Employees' Health and Safety Act, Bill 139 in December of 1976. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, Bill 139 gave the Ministry of Labour primary responsibility for regulating occupational health and safety in the province, in that prior to its passage jurisdiction had been divided amongst four ministries. Two of those ministries, Mr. Speaker, Labour and Health, had been assisted by separate advisory councils composed of persons from outside government.

The Ministry of Labour has been ably served by the Labour Safety Council since 1961, and its mandate has been to advise the minister on matters relating to occupational safety. Since 1975, the Ministry of Health has had the benefit of receiving assistance in respect of matters on occupational and environmental health from the Advisory Council of Occupational and Environmental Health. However, now that the responsibility for both occupational safety and occupational health reside within the Ministry of Labour, it would appear advisable to merge these two councils and to give them a mandate to advise the Ministry of Labour regarding both occupational health and safety.

There are several reasons for taking this action now, Mr. Speaker, for not waiting for the introduction of the omnibus health and safety statute. There is substantial support for the idea of merging the two councils. In conducting consultation meetings throughout the province with respect to the proposed omnibus Act, the message has been loud and clear that the two councils should be merged. The members of the two councils have also been consulted and have given strong support to the idea of merger. Further, the two councils have provided important advice, and it is desirable that they continue to perform this function in the most effective form as soon as possible. Therefore, our immediate concern is to launch the new merged council, for which there is broad support, so that the Ministry of Labour can have the benefit of its expert advice as soon as it is realistically possible.

[2:15]

JUNIOR RANGERS

Hon. F. S. Miller: As was announced in the Speech from the Throne and subsequently in the budget just brought down, more job opportunities are being provided by the government for young people this summer.

I am happy to inform the hon. members that, as part of this programme, the Ministry of Natural Resources is expanding its junior ranger programme to accommodate 300 more high school students in our annual junior ranger programme this year.

Prior to the government's announcement of increased opportunities for summer employment, my ministry had selected 1,038 boys and 588 girls to participate this year in this unique outdoor experience at 62 camps throughout Ontario.

The 300 additional students will be selected from among approximately 3,000 applications which have already been received by the ministry. No additional applications, of course, will be needed.

Under the junior ranger programme, these 17-year-olds from across the province will work in a natural resources environment and will be provided with opportunities to learn firsthand about our management programmes from such professionals as foresters, biologists and geologists.

The students will report to their assigned areas on July 5 and will remain there until

August 27. During that period they will each be paid $10 a day, which will total a clear $480 for the eight weeks they are at work. Accommodation, meals and supervision are also provided.

The hon. members may also be interested to know that 30,969 students have participated in the junior ranger programme since its inception 33 years ago. Because of increasing interest by young women, the programme was expanded in 1973 to include girls and since that time 1,200 have benefited from that experience.

This programme has been successful and it has been a beneficial one to Ontario's young people. Hundreds of those who have been junior rangers have gone on into resource-related careers, many of them with my ministry. I am pleased that additional funds have been provided with which to expand the programme by another 300 opportunities this year.

ORAL QUESTIONS

INDUSTRIAL WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of the Environment if he can clear up a matter? What is the policy of the province of Ontario in accepting, at any time, on any terms, highly toxic industrial wastes from other jurisdictions for disposal in this province, apparently at the one particular plant in Mississauga?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The hon. member is referring to an article in this morning's paper. At the St. Lawrence Cement plant in Mississauga we have started an experimental programme there of burning certain types of waste—crankcase oil and certain types of organics, which would include PCBs—and involving Environment Canada, our Ministry and the company. This is being done strictly, as I say, on an experimental basis with the proper monitoring of air emissions as well as the results of the actual treatment.

There is no policy as far as importing these contaminants are concerned. The facility is there, the company does have a certificate of approval but that certificate of approval is conditional upon the company asking the Ministry of the Environment for any specific approval to accept any particular shipment. So that as far as taking a quantity of oil from the United States, the company would have to clear that with my ministry; we would have to have the details of that before it would be permitted.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Apparently the head of the petroleum and chemical unit of the Ministry of the Environment in Iowa—my office was speaking to him this morning—says that Chem-Trol Pollution Services in Lewiston, New York, told them that they had sent toxic industrial wastes with high PCB content to Ontario for disposal on other occasions.

Is that in fact true? It seems odd it would happen without the Legislature or the province being informed.

And why would the minister want the import, why would he permit it, since there is so much difficulty with toxic waste disposal right here from our own province?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible that during this experimental stage, that took place really last year, a small quantity of PCBs may have been shipped to the St. Lawrence plant. Quantities of materials containing PCBs are being shipped continually to Chem-Trol, to their facility in New York, for landfill disposal from Ontario. That's going on regularly, under supervision between the two governments. In order to utilize a new method of destruction, involving St. Lawrence Cement, there are times, in order to get the quantity, the necessary quantity of the particular type of material, it is quite possible that in some instances, during this experimental stage, material came from New York to that particular plant.

But hopefully this experiment will be a success. Certainly the disposal of PCBs in this way, this type of incineration and destruction, is much better than disposal in landfill.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Minister, are there great quantities of polychlorinated biphenyls going the other way, into the United States for high temperature incineration at this time?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: What does the member mean by the other way, from Ontario to New York?

Mr Kerrio: Travelling into the United States for incineration in New York.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, they are. As a matter of fact, more is going from Ontario into the United States than is coming back for destruction here. As I say, this is only an experiment. The last experiment took place some time last year. I suppose that because we are involved with St. Lawrence Cement and Environment Canada, Iowa felt that maybe they could get rid of their shipment in Ontario. But there's been no acceptance

or approval as far as that shipment is concerned.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if this in fact does refer to St. Lawrence Cement or to Tricil. I wasn't here when the initial question was asked.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: St. Lawrence Cement.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister thought of solving the problem in Lambton county by an effort to deal with some of the toxic industrial wastes there in this fashion, rather than causing so much local concern by the dumping in the wells? I gather there is now some eight—I am not just sure what the quantity is, eight million of something already in the wells.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the plant in Mississauga that the hon. member from Mississauga referred to, Tricil, is capable of handling some of the waste that is now going to Lambton, and we are redirecting some of that because of the closure of a Detroit formation well in that area; and because of course we haven't issued certificates in Lambton recently. But there's no reason why St. Lawrence Cement could also not be used as a facility for destruction of that type of waste material.

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be fair to allow one more supplementary. The member for Sarnia, since it's your area that is involved.

Mr. Bullbrook: Isn't it a fact, relative—

Mr. Speaker: This is a final final.

Mr. Bullbrook: A final final. Isn't it a fact that the new Petrosar complex going on stream will initiate a tremendous new burden upon those wells in Lambton county? What arrangement is the minister making with respect to the Petrosar complex?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are suggesting to Petrosar that they accept the responsibility of looking after the disposal of that material.

Mr. Lewis: Incineration, a special process?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: They will have to do it under the approval of my ministry; but there's no reason why that company, with all its wherewithal, can't look after that problem.

SOUTH CAYUGA LAND ASSEMBLY

Mr. Lewis: A question to the Premier, if I may: Has the Premier replied to the letter from the Ombudsman, sent on March 27 last, dealing with the South Cayuga land assembly, with whatever recommendations he made? I think the Premier replied at the time that he would be gathering information and giving him an answer. Has he given him that answer yet?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, so there's no misunderstanding, when the Ombudsman drops me a line I try to reply as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Reid: Yes, otherwise you read about it in the Globe and Mail before you get the letter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I told the Ombudsman that I would have this matter looked into and get a report. I can't tell the hon. member whether, in fact, the office has received the report. I can tell the member that if it has I haven't yet seen it, and as soon as I do, of course, I will be communicating with the Ombudsman.

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps the Premier might let us know when that occurs.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition will be the second to know; the Ombudsman will be the first.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you so much. If not inside, then perhaps outside the chamber you could let us know. Thank you.

BARRIE ANNEXATION PROPOSAL

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to question the Treasurer, if I might, Mr. Speaker. The Treasurer has indicated in his letter to the Ontario Municipal Board that the Simcoe-Georgian area task force report had been accepted as government policy. I wonder if he could clarify for the House which of the two boundaries indicated in that report has been accepted by the government for the city of Barrie's annexation purposes? Has he accepted as government policy the interim urban study area or the much larger urban study area which the city of Barrie has more or less adopted to accommodate the 125,000 people it foresees there?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I haven't, of course, got that letter in front of me, but we haven't accepted either of those lines. I believe my letter indicates an acceptance of the population of 125,000 and leaves the matter of boundaries with the Ontario Municipal Board. I think, as I recall, we say that explicitly.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, since in the letter the Treasurer does indicate that the Simcoe-Georgian area task force report has been adopted as government policy, and makes that statement rather broadly, I wonder if the Treasurer would agree with the recommendation of that task force to plan at this time only to the year 1991, which would indicate planning for about 75,000 people or a little more, as opposed to the government's population projection of 125,000 by the year 2011? The task force does recommend planning for the nearer term, rather than for the longer term.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's incorrect, Mr. Speaker. The task force recommended there be a number of growth centres, four in all, of which Barrie was one, and indicated an optimum population at a point in time of about 125,000 people. We accepted that in principle, and have indicated to Barrie, and indeed I have indicated to the other three municipalities and to the county, we're prepared to support that kind of accelerated growth and do what we can to assist it.

The determination of what boundaries are necessary to accommodate that kind of growth, which hopefully would have been worked out between the parties, was not worked out between the parties, and therefore is before the Ontario Municipal Board. I should also say I have made it clear that if we are to be supportive of that kind of growth, or any kind of growth, our job is greatly facilitated if we are dealing with one municipality rather than with several municipalities and a county.

I have not indicated which boundary is the boundary that is needed, and I think we explicitly left that to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: If I understood the Treasurer it seems to me he said that he did not understand the task force to suggest a near-term plan as opposed to a long-term plan. May I read the paragraph in question and ask his opinion of it? In the task force report, on page 117, it says: "Although the context of the strategy is long term the management focus must be on nearer term horizons. We recommend establishing a time-frame of 15 years, to 1991." It goes on to say: "Forecasting for a period of more than 15 years leaves open too many uncertainties."

[2:30]

In view of the fact that it is rather important how much of this agricultural land needs to be annexed and ultimately urbanized, could the Treasurer make clear at some point whether the government accepts the idea of near-term planning as opposed to the idea of annexing for the longer term?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It should be very clear, even to the hon. member, whether agricultural land is located within an urban boundary or outside an urban boundary, it can go on being agricultural land.

Mr. Kerrio: Not likely.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Hundreds of acres in Brampton.

Mr. Breithaupt: Right downtown.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sure the people of Barrie are as interested as anyone else in preserving agricultural land for as long as that is possible. I have answered the question now three times. We accepted that report in principle. We have not indicated what our preference is—indeed we have none—as to whether the boundaries should be drawn at one concession or another concession. That is something which, as I said, I had hoped would be worked out between the parties involved. It has not been, therefore it is a matter for determination by the Ontario Municipal Board.

GROUP HOME PLACEMENTS

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services at this time. What specific action is he planning to correct the very difficult and almost absurd situation which is faced by Youth Sphere, a group home in Toronto, which is being forced to provide services for a 16-year-old girl without receiving any funds from Metro social services, either for services rendered over the last two months or for services they are now expected to provide under a court order?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As a result of the decision in the Supreme Court of Ontario last week, I had as recently as this morning a meeting with representatives of the municipalities most directly affected by that decision, the representatives of each of the Children's Aid Societies from the jurisdictions affected, area representatives of the family court system of the province of Ontario, and other interested persons from agencies engaged in delivering these services to children. I am please to say the meeting was one of great co-operation. I think that at

this point I can at least inform the House that the spirit of co-operaion from all parties was clearly expressed. Unfortunately, although the meeting lasted through most of the morning, I had to leave before the end of it because of other commitments and other meetings in other parts of the Queen's Park complex. I have not yet had an opportunity to be briefed by my staff on the final half hour of that meeting. All I can say at this point is that I am optimistic that those matters are well in hand. I will advise the House as soon as I have had an opportunity to be brought up to date on the latter part of that meeting.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, since this particular case is one where Metro will not pay for a placement made prior to the decision of Judge Holland, doesn't he feel that a great many people who presently are in group homes are in jeopardy of having their care interrupted by exactly the same process, if other municipalities decide to challenge the payment arrangements? Surely the time has come for the province to issue a guarantee that whatever happens there will be a special fund of some kind to make sure that the care of these children and the financial stability of these homes is not jeopardized by this legal problem?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. May I remind the hon. member that this is a question period and not really a debating period.

Mr. S. Smith: It is also a question-and-answer period. Thank you very much. I hope you remind someone to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I appreciate the opportunity the hon. member has given me now to answer. Although I must say I am not familiar in detail with the specific case to which the member refers, I can assure him on the basis of my discussions with the parties involved, including Toronto, that I am confident those problems will be ironed out very shortly, within the next few days, and that no child in the province of Ontario need have his welfare jeopardized, nor will there be any serious interruption in terms of the programmes in which they presently find themselves.

Mr. Nixon: You sound like your predecessor.

Mr. McClellan: By way of supplementary, how can the minister say he is not familiar with the details of the Youth Sphere case when it was brought to the attention of the minister's office on Friday of last week; and was raised again by the minister to his staff, with his office, on Tuesday of last week; and was raised by myself in the social development estimates on—Tuesday of this week rather—Friday of last week, Tuesday of this week, Tuesday of this week, and again yesterday?

An hon. member: It's getting late.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I can say it, Mr. Speaker, because I happen to be very honest with this House and I am not familiar with the details of that case. I shall make an effort to make myself better acquainted with it.

Mr. McClellan: Well, the minister is responsible.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: The minister in his reply has stated that he believes that none of these placements will be jeopardized; is he aware of the fact that in this particular case, there has already been an effort made, not by Youth Sphere but I understand by probation services, to have this child placed in a woman's hostel? Is that what he believes to be an adequate placement for a child in these circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of that. If the hon. member wishes to provide me with whatever information she has, I can assure you that I will pursue it. I will pursue it with my staff and find out what information they may have received recently that I am not yet aware of.

Mrs. Campbell: I tried.

Mr. Lewis: Is the member aggravated?

Mr. McClellan: May I ask the minister, does he not agree that if his ministry would pay 100 per cent of the costs of maintenance, instead of 50 per cent, and eliminate thereby the incentives for this kind of destructive litigation, then the court would be able to continue to place children—older, more difficult children—under section 21(d) of The Juvenile Delinquents Act; regardless of Judge Holland's decision with respect to section 21(g)? Would he not agree?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, as I have already advised this hon. member, I am very reluctant to agree with him when he invites me to agree to simplistic solutions. I suggest to him that the whole matter of the question of the funding problems attendant upon this were a very important part of the discussion this morning, and are something that will be pursued in the next few days.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add, to the hon. member for St. George who interjected that she had attempted to reach me this morning, that I was aware of that. At the time I was tied up in a meeting with the parties involved, including the chief judge of the family court. As soon as possible I returned her call and her line was busy.

Mr. Lewis: You've got a great voice, but you are no Jim Taylor.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

Mr. Swart: My question is to the Treasurer. In view of his budget, which withholds $108 million from the municipalities, moneys to which they are entitled under the Edmonton commitment of his own government; and in view of the serious unemployment in many municipalities in this province; doesn't he think he should release some of those millions for special funding of local government capital and other work incentive projects, particularly in those municipalities which are hard hit with unemployment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is no. We indicated last September, September 10 as I recall—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to the municipalities what our best estimate was of the amount of money which would be payable in 1977 under the commitment on a cumulative basis. As it has turned out, slightly less than was anticipated was paid out during 1976, and there is a small variation in the amounts, as they have finally been calculated and estimated at this point by the various ministries for 1977. I would not at this point, and I think I have to make this quite clear, go back and suggest changes to a whole host of regulations and legislation, and in effect say to the municipalities I am going to catch up on the errors which we made last September, any more than I would if the commitment now showed that they were $108 million ahead. Members asked, and the municipalities have asked, for long-term planning. That's what we have given them. Sometimes that is going to work in their favour, other times it will work not in their favour; but on a cumulative basis the amount under the commitment is being paid.

Mr. Swart: The Treasurer took that action last fall unilaterally, without consulting the municipalities, and there was no indication to the municipalities at that time that there probably would be this $108 million involved—

Mr. Speaker: The question?

Mr. Swart: I am coming to it, Mr. Speaker, immediately.

Mr. Speaker: A little faster.

Mr. Swart: Because of the serious unemployment, and because the Premier (Mr. Davis) now has a letter from the Metropolitan school board which was sent to him and other MPPs—and I'm sure, because of the Treasurer's concern about unemployment, that he has a copy of it—wouldn't he agree that that letter which makes specific proposals for work programmes, is worthy of consideration for approval and, in fact, a far better method of creating employment than the fast write-offs he has given to corporations, when they are willing to fund a large part of it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The philosophy of this government is quite clear, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's the private sector which is ultimately going to put people back to work in a meaningful way.

Mr. Wildman: Ultimately?

An hon. member: Which millenium?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If we want to go on, recognizing that school board expenditures are going to be paid either by Metropolitan Toronto taxpayers or by us, then inevitably we must have either borrowing or higher taxes. That's the NDP's philosophy; it's not ours.

Mr. Warner: You should resign.

Mr. S. Smith: You don't do much borrowing do you, Darcy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: Believing as he does that the free enterprise system should work and the private sector should look after unemployment, in view of the fact that 600 men are going to lose their jobs with Canadian Pittsburgh in Owen Sound and I need $10 million to prevent them leaving Owen Sound, what is the Treasurer going to do about that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That has nothing to do with this particular question. It is a good question but not related to this one.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is a dandy question.

Mr. Sargent: Does he have an answer for me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: No, the hon. member's question was not a supplementary.

Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Deans: I hope so; I'm going to try anyway. Since the Treasurer seems to indicate that the taxpayers would have to carry at least part of the burden of the programme suggested by the member for Welland-Thorold, who does the Treasurer suspect will carry the burden of cost to provide the incomes for the people who will be maintained unemployed by this government's 5.3 per cent policy?

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear. Who pays that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no question that the burden of unemployment insurance, the burden of assistance under a variety of Act, falls on the taxpayers.

Mr. Deans: Why wouldn't you put it to the other side?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: Don't be so silly about this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: You just don't understand.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What I do understand is that the NDP thinks government spending is a panacea for everything. And it isn't.

Mr. Deans: We think it is better to work than to be on welfare.

Mr. Lewis: You want people to be on welfare.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, get off it! The NDP purely and simply wants more government spending and more bureaucracy.

Mr. Peterson: How could one possibly have more than we've got now?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You don't want jobs.

Mr. S. Smith: The two proponents of big government against each other.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We've had a very good question period up to now; let's continue. I'd like to hear the question—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will across-the-chamber discussions please cease?

Mr. Bullbrook: I didn't think the question period was that good.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the hon. member for Sarnia.

[Applause.]

Mr. Breithaupt: You don't even know what he is going to ask.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's really all I wanted.

Mr. Speaker: In view of that, we'll let you ask a question.

Mr. Bullbrook: They said this is my last supper.

Mr. Yakabuski: The wisest of them all is leaving the ship.

Mr. Bullbrook: There's only one fellow who can tell me it's my last supper.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Bullbrook: And he hasn't told me yet.

ENVIRONMENTAL TAX

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to direct a question to the Attorney General if I may. It has to do with the Treasurer's Bill 53, now loosely known as the can tax Act. I'm wondering whether the Attorney General was asked his opinion of the sections that purport to put a tax on the importation of cans in view of the difference of wording of this legislation and the farm marketing legislation?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: Could I be permitted an aside? That's the finest answer the Attorney General has given or the best opinion rendered to this government since I came here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: From either side of the House.

Interjections.

Mr. Bullbrook: No interjections, unless the Premier is going to tell us the date.

I want to ask a supplementary. Would the Attorney General give us his opinion as to the constitutional ability of the Treasurer to put in effect a tariff under this wording on the importation of cans before we debate this bill or, say, within the next two weeks?

Mr. Nixon: Same answer.

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Well, yes. I assume the hon. member is requesting that we give the Legislature a constitutional opinion with respect to this particular section, and I will endeavour to do so.

An hon. member: We might not rely on it.

Mr. Sweeney: You mean you didn't check before you introduced the bill?

Mr. S. Smith: We value your constitutional opinions tremendously in this party.

LAP-SEAM BOILERS

Mr. G. E. Smith: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Is the minister aware of the situation created by the pressure-vessel inspection branch of his ministry that will phase out the operation of many steam traction engines equipped with lap-seam boilers used for show purposes at numerous steam and agricultural shows throughout the province? What can he do to assure their continued operation?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, I am aware of it. The problem has been brought to my attention by a number of members.

Mr. Breithaupt: Most of them with old boilers.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have met with the organization representing the people who run the shows for non-profit purposes and for demonstration only and we have worked out an accommodation which will permit them to continue under the former testing procedures for this season only. We will, of course, be working out a more permanent testing procedure to provide the ultimate in public safety.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Supplementary: Will the minister assure me that his inspection staff will work closely with the various clubs involved to assure that—

An hon. member: What a dumb question.

Mr. G. E. Smith: —the new inspection regulations will not necessarily provide a hardship but will ensure public safety?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The process of consultation, of working together, has already begun. We hope within the next two days to develop an agreement between our ministry and the clubs as to the procedure which will be used. Our primary concern, of course, is public safety, at the same time recognizing that the very strict requirements of the ministry may place a financial burden on the owners of the boilers, and we're trying to work out a system whereby we can assist them in that respect.

Mr. Moffatt: Supplementary: I'd like to ask the minister if he'll show the same amount of consideration with regard to the stationary engineers who are going to be further unemployed as a result of the inspection of coiled-tube boilers?

Mr. Warner: Right on.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that's a supplementary. We were talking about lap-seam boilers

Mr. Speaker: Sorry. I didn't hear it.

Mr. Cassidy: It is very relevant. You guys never care about jobs.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary? The member for Halton-Burlington with a final supplementary.

Mr. Reed: Is the thing proceeding within the next couple of days; will this matter be finally settled within that time so that these men will know exactly where they stand?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I thought that was my answer. The hon. member says "finally settled." I want to assure him that what we are trying to determine now is an interim solution which will permit the clubs to operate for this season, which ends, I understand, sometime in September. But during that time we want to work out a permanent testing procedure, because we do have to be concerned about public safety. If there's any danger at all, it's going to be far too late after an explosion. We want to try to prevent that.

BECKER'S MILK DISPUTE

Mr. Warner: In view of the Minister of Labour's statement this afternoon, indicating her concern about the well-being of workers

and about bargaining in good faith, will she direct the Becker's Milk Company to the bargaining table, and further direct the company to restore the coverage of OHIP, the dental plan, Blue Cross and life insurance, both to the workers and their families, as soon as possible?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I understand that the union involved in this dispute has, in fact, lodged a charge against the employer before the Labour Relations Board. It's my understanding that the hearings are to be held some time next week. It would be inappropriate for me to do anything at this point until the Labour Relations Board has made its ruling on that dispute.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary: While awaiting the decision from the Labour Relations Board, could the minister direct the company to restore the full benefits to a Mr. William Weddowson, who broke his back prior to the strike, is presently on workmen's compensation, and is enrolled in a manpower retraining programme at a community college? He has had all of his benefits cut off by the company. Would the minister restore those benefits to Mr. Weddowson, please?

Hon. B. Stephenson: With the details of that case, I would most certainly intervene on behalf of that individual employee. He is still receiving his workmen's compensation benefits, I trust?

Mr. Warner: Yes.

AID FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. Reid: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. In view of the fact that his predecessor announced a programme for alternative assistance for senior citizens in institutions sometime last fall and nothing has been heard of the programme since, can the minister tell us when these programmes that were requested from the municipalities will go into effect?

Hon. Mr. Norton: My predecessor, in the fall of last year, did announce such a programme and called for proposals from municipalities across the province. The response was very positive and very successful.

Mr. Reid: Overwhelming.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Almost overwhelming, yes. There was also a request, in late November I believe, from a number of municipalities for an extension of the time. They indicated their intent but at that point had not been able to make their submissions. The last of the proposals were received in early January of this year. They have been under review by the staff of the ministry. I have reviewed them on a preliminary basis with my senior management. The final review is scheduled for this coming Monday morning at a senior management meeting and I would hope that we will be able to announce the decisions of those which have been selected very shortly after that.

Some of them, unfortunately, did not come within the established guidelines that were announced by my predecessor and will, therefore, not qualify for the assistance. However, I might say at this point I am very impressed by some of the imaginative proposals that have been made and I look forward to seeing them implemented.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: I trust that the programme will be announced by the time of Senior Citizens Week in June. Can the minister give us an indication of how much money has been put into the programme? How much, on a global basis, will be available?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I trust the member is aware, the intention of the project was to establish pilot projects in various locations across the province. For this fiscal year, my recollection is—and I don't have these figures in front of me; I hope you won't hold me to them if I come back to correct them at some later date—it is something in excess of $600,000 that will be devoted to these programmes this year.

RICHMOND HILL NURSING HOMES

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have answers to three or four questions asked in the last few days. To start with, on April 25, the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Stong) asked me about nursing homes in Richmond Hill. His question related to the Elmwood Manor Nursing Home and to the Country Place Nursing Home in Richmond Hill. The member, I hope, is aware that all nursing homes in the province are, in fact, privately owned. My ministry does not involve itself in the funding of capital costs for nursing homes, as was suggested by the member. The only involvement in payments to nursing homes relates to coverage for residents eligible for extended health care benefits under The Health Insurance Act.

MEDICAL SERVICES IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the hon. member for Rainy River on April 21 to investigate the position applicable to circumstances in which senior citizens of Ontario entitled to receive free prescription drugs from an Ontario pharmacist under our drug benefit legislation had a prescription filled by a pharmacist outside the province. I must now inform the House that legislation states this ministry will pay for, on behalf of an eligible Ontario resident, drugs purchased from a dispensary which, by definition, is, and I am quoting, "A person or facility in Ontario approved by the minister to dispense drugs."

At this time there is no legislation to allow the drug benefit plan to reimburse patients for drugs purchased outside of the province. The drug benefit programme pays for only those drugs that are listed in the formulary. If we routinely reimbursed eligible persons for drugs purchased outside of Ontario, we would be paying for non-benefit drugs. A person who has to get medical treatment outside of Ontario will be well advised to have his prescription filled by an eligible pharmacy in Ontario if this is at all possible.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I ask the hon. minister how many more answers he has there?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Two.

Mr. Speaker: I think we will stop at those two now and have any supplementaries that flow from them, then we will get back to you next time around. The hon. member for Rainy River I believe, has a supplementary to his original question.

Mr. Reid: Would the minister consider that some of the people, particularly in northwestern Ontario, are sent by their doctors to hospitals in Manitoba or Minnesota, where they require those drugs and do not have time to send to an Ontario pharmacist for them before being institutionalized in that province or that state? Relatively speaking, it would involve very few prescriptions under the Parcost prescribed drugs. Could the minister not make an amendment to allow that?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I could consider that, Mr. Speaker. I think the member realizes, of course, that in cases where people are sent outside of the province, we would cover their hospitalization and medical costs according to our "B" schedule if that service was not available in Ontario. Certainly, if the use of drugs, or the prescription of drugs is combined with having to leave the province for a service not available here—let's say some of the services of the Mayo Clinic—yes, perhaps I'll take that under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre has a supplementary to his original question, I believe.

RICHMOND HILL NURSING HOMES

Mr. Stong: The question I asked the other day did not relate to capital funding, as you have correctly indicated. However, because I indicated that the facilities were available as well as a waiting list, the question became the extendicare funding—so that the beds that are available, the facilities that are available, would be opened up. Is the ministry prepared to assist both nursing homes to allow the people who are waiting to get in a chance to take over the facilities that are already available and the beds that are already available?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I remind the member that in his question on the 25th he said: "I have a question of the Minister of Health. Would the minister consider giving assistance, in terms of licence and funding—" and so on.

There's a rather interesting history to these two homes. First of all, in the case of Elmwood Manor, the building was built in 1972. There were two partners at the time who proceeded to build even though the ministry had informed them that the building would not be licensed as a nursing home. Financial problems apparently occurred between the partners and the ownership of the property was assumed by one of the partners. The building was completed. The owner applied for a nursing home licence which was refused, as he had been told it would be before he had even put a shovel in the ground.

There were many subsequent meetings and discussions with senior officials of the Ministry of Health. Two years ago, in 1975, the home was licensed for 16 nursing home beds and for 16 special care beds. The owner has since applied for additional beds and has been refused. I might add that this matter was reviewed by the Ombudsman in October 1976 and the decision of the ministry was upheld.

In the case of Country Place Nursing Home where they have 100 beds, I hope that the member is aware that there is a second building owned by the owner of this home. This building was erected in 1974 to be replacement for the existing nursing home, which is a much older building. The owner then changed his plans and advised the minister that he would not be moving the residents out of the older building. Now he is asking the minister to licence both homes. As the member knows, there has been a freeze on new nursing home beds since October 1975.

While I'm reviewing that matter, I think, given the rather interesting background of these two cases and given the rather large number of nursing home beds in the region of York as compared to any other region of the province, I could not consider that at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for High Park-Swansea have a further supplementary to this? One final supplementary under this question.

MEDICAL SERVICES IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Ziemba: Yes, it's a supplementary to the previous question, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health answered with regard to the people in the north who might have difficulty refilling their Ontario drug benefit prescriptions every 30 days. Would the minister, as the present regulation requires, consider extending that 30-day limit, thereby saving this province many millions of dollars in dispensing fees?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That's not a supplementary but it's also not surprising. There are cases where, through the office of the director of that branch, permission is extended for that sort of thing if people are leaving the country for three months or six months. Permission is granted to fill more than the 30-day allotment. I think that is looked after now. There is discretion there.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a new question? The hon. member for Cambridge.

KAYSON PLASTICS

Mr. Davidson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Labour relating to the Kayson Plastics division of Polysar Limited in Cambridge. Can the minister advise me how many employees of that plant have had medical examinations carried out to see whether there were any effects caused by the use of Mirex in that plant?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It was my original understanding that they had all been examined—all those who had been in contact with it. But I shall check on that and I'll get the accurate information and report back to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a supplementary?

Mr. Davidson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Given the fact that the occupational health branch first visited that plant on December 15, 1976 and given the fact that as of yesterday afternoon not one employee had had a medical examination, will the minister now, through her ministry, order those examinations carried out under The Industrial Safety Act?

[3:00]

Hon. B. Stephenson: It was my original understanding as well that the relationship between the inspection division of the industrial safety part of the ministry and that plant had been such that the company had been responsible for this. But, as I said, I shall check this and be absolutely positive about it and report back to the House.

CURRICULUM CONNECTIONS

Mr. Singer: A question for the Minister of Education: Does the minister believe it appropriate that his department should share in the funding of a document called Curriculum Connections, which in its spring issue of 1977 contains two letters expressing critical comment about an opinion put forward in this House by the leader of our party—or of any party? Or is it the same kind of thing that the Leader of the Opposition was complaining about wherein the government uses public money and civil servants to embark upon political-type criticisms?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Could I ask the member what the name of the publication is?

Mr. Singer: It is called Curriculum Connections. It is published by the Ontario Association for Curriculum Development in co-operation with the Ministry of Education, the Ontario Educational Communications Authority and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Interjections.

An hon. member: All government bodies.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me say to my friend that I think we probably give a contribution to help the publication of that particular document. We do not control in any way what is published in that document.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If I rose in this House and complained every time a publication like that complained of the policies of the Minister of Education, I would be up here about every day.

Mr. Reid: You would be up daily.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, would the minister not agree that it is time that public money should not be spent in the political field engaged in political criticism or opinion?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Read the letter. Let's hear what it said.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that is an absurd question.

MEDICAL SERVICES IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On April 21 the member for Rainy River asked me a question concerning my ministry's underserviced area programme. The purpose of the underserviced area programme for physicians is to provide and to attract doctors to isolated communities.

A physician who has been approved by our medical selection committee for support under our programme and who establishes practice in northern Ontario in an area designated as underserviced may receive, (a), an incentive grant in the amount of $20,000 payable over a four-year period in quarterly instalments or, (b) a contract with a guaranteed annual net professional income in the amount of $33,000. He may receive an advance of $5,000 payable in equal amounts of $1,000 over the first five months in which he has established practice. This is for the first year only. Said contracts and incentive grants are renewable annually.

If a physician has been accepted by our medical selection committee to establish practice in northern Ontario, the Ministry of Health will request a work visa to allow this physician to practice in an area of northern Ontario designated as underserviced. The ministry will request renewal of the work visa each year if the doctor remains in practice in the designated underserviced area. The purpose of the programme is to provide services in the areas and communities where they are needed.

With the large number of doctors now practising in Ontario, it has become less necessary to recruit physicians from other countries. Those who have been working in the underserviced area programme and who require renewal of work visas to continue are assured of this ministry's support for such renewal as long as they continue working in the communities where they are needed.

Where such physicians ask for landed immigrant status, which would permit them to leave the area of need, we have not to date supported the granting of such status by Canada Manpower and Immigration. Federal regulations would require that such persons return to their countries of origin to apply for such status. However this has not occurred, to our knowledge. Supporting landed status would be inconsistent with the objectives of the underserxiced area programme as well as with our plans to limit numbers of physicians and costs.

The second question that day from the same member concerned dental services in the north and the number of dental vans we plan to put on the road. We have presently four vans and one dental railroad coach in operation in northern Ontario and we plan to add five more vans this year. Does the member want to know where?

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We are going to add them in the following areas; At Vermilion Bay in the Kenora district; in the Thunder Bay area at Beardmore and Macdiarmid; and in the Algoma area at White River or Dubreuiville—that is yet to be decided. In the Timiskaming area, it will be either Charlton or Elk Lake and in eastern Ontario at Wilberforce.

DRG GLOBE ENVELOPES LIMITED

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will allow me a little preamble.

Mr. Speaker: Very brief. If it's necessary to place the question, it's in order.

Mr. Grande: Definitely necessary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Then just proceed with it, please.

Mr. Grande: On April 21 the Minister of Labour—and my question will be to the

Minister of Labour—read in the House a letter which she had sent to me earlier regarding the intolerable working conditions at DRG Globe Envelopes. I thought that by giving the minister the opportunity to make public the answer to my earlier question, she would be careful in giving the correct information. No such luck.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Grande: Let me ask the question.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, please do.

Mr. Grande: Is the minister aware that the workers in that plant don't know anything about the alleged petition that was supposedly signed by 100 per cent of them? Further, is she aware that the workers are not allowed to leave their night shift 15 minutes earlier, even when they have only 15 minutes for lunch, as she stated in her answer? And is she aware that as of December last year, when the initial suggestion was put in the House on December 6, the director of the employment standards branch had given no permission for a lunch break shorter than the half hour required by law?

In view of these unintentional inaccuracies, I'm sure—

Mr. Sargent: I'll take you out to lunch sometime.

An hon. member: What are you doing for lunch, Bette?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a final question?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I have acute indigestion after that one.

Mr. Grande: Will the minister table in this House the alleged petition? And, secondly, will the minister conduct an investigation of the audit by talking to workers this time, and not to management, since management views are clear in the first audit?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Indeed, an audit was carried out. The audit was carried out by the employment standards branch of my ministry. To my knowledge, it was carried out accurately and honestly and reported accurately and honestly.

I am not aware of the allegations, again made by the member for Oakwood. I shall investigate them and I shall most certainly report to this House. But I reported to this House the factual information which I had.

GROUP HOME PLACEMENTS

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services:

Mr. Samis: Wake up, Keith.

Mrs. Campbell: In view of the minister's indication that members of the family court were present at a meeting today, has he taken any steps to discuss the matter of the Holland decision with the Attorney General, in view of the fact that it would appear that orders of the family courts will be honoured in their abuse at this time?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am not sure what the hon. members means by "honoured in their abuse." Is she referring to existing orders?

Mrs. Campbell: I am referring to any orders, such as the one we referred to today.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I have discussed the matter, both with representatives of the Attorney General and with the Attorney General himself. My information at this time is that where payments have begun, existing orders are fine; there is no disagreement over the effect of those. With respect to all of those orders, I am pleased to say that the municipalities have indicated that they will maintain those payments, in order to avoid any disturbance of those placements and those programmes the children are involved in.

I am also pleased with the degree of co-operation indicated with regard to future orders that might be made. I will not have a final response on that until I have had a chance to carry out certain undertakings I have given to those people at the meeting this morning, undertakings which involve further discussion on my part with my colleague. I have to communicate with them again.

I am optimistic that the whole area of concern which the member and I share at this point with regard to the welfare of these children will be resolved within a matter of a few days.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: Has the minister discussed with the Attorney General the order itself, the Holland judgement?

Hon. Mr. Norton: If the member means personally with the Attorney General, I have only very briefly, but with some of the members of his staff, yes. I can advise her that at this point it is the intention that that decision will be appealed.

Mrs. Campbell: If this decision is to be appealed, what is the effect on those orders

pending that appeal decision? Will the minister make some effort to effect a stay until that is accomplished?

An hon. member: You're whispering again.

Some hon. members: Turn the mike on!

Mrs. Campbell: Say yes.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I'm glad that they finally awakened up up there. I can assure the member also that that was one of the purposes of the meeting this morning, to ensure that there would be no disruption during any period that might ensue with respect to the appeal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London North.

Mr. Shore: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: Which side are you on today?

An hon. member: Are you coming back now?

Mr. Reid: Which party are you running for this time?

Mr. Conway: In this corner, Jack Horner.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Could we hear the question?

Mr. Shore: I have a question for the Minister of Culture and Recreation and the minister responsible for the Wintario programme.

Mr. S. Smith: Are you going to send the losing letters too now?

Mr. Speaker: We are wasting time. The hon. member will place his question.

WINTARIO FUNDS

Mr. Shore: Since the Wintario programme at present is based on the principle of sharing, which ordinarily means a dollar-for-a-dollar partnership with a sponsoring organization, in view of the bias and often the inequity that this introduces to groups or communities with fewer financial resources—that is to say, since the criteria are the same for all, those with more will be able to receive more—is it not possible or does it not make sense that a proportion of the funds could be set aside to be used as equalization resources to be applied in situations where potential applicants are ineligible because of lack of resources?

Mr. Singer: That's a very good question. Why don't you put it on the order paper?

Mr. Breithaupt: It's already done.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That's a very good question and quite in keeping with the policy of this caucus.

Mr. Speaker: And now for the answer.

Mr. Reid: He is sitting too close to the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's hear the answer.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I know that the member would understand that there is a degree of equalization built into the criteria already.

With respect to the north and to the east, we have a different sharing principle for those parts of the province, recognizing the need for that, as it affects Indian bands and the whole question of the introduction of labour and materials in lieu of actual cash. As all government programmes are always being reviewed to make sure they are relevant and in keeping with special considerations, I would be glad to take the member's question under further consideration.

[3:15]

Ms. Bryden: Supplementary: I'd like to ask the minister, when is he going to give the Legislature an opportunity to debate the criteria on which the Wintario grants are being handed out and to give the public some opportunity to have some public hearings on this, so that recommendations can be considered?

An hon. member: Tuesday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not really supplementary to the question, and it's been asked before. Is there a very brief answer?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a very brief answer. The estimates of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation come annually before the House or before a committee. They've been before the House twice, which is ample opportunity, and I'd be very happy to have the advice of the member and any other members with respect to this criteria when my estimates are before the House.

Ms. Bryden: That is not before the public.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did you represent the public?

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary from the member for Grey-Bruce? If it's not, we want to get on here.

Mr. Sargent: All right, all right.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

INSTANT LOTTERY

Mr. Sargent: Regarding the lottery, is the minister going to bring in the instant lottery before the election?

Mr. Speaker: That's a new question—a good question, but a new one.

Mr. Sargent: Then answer it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We have no intention of having an instant lottery in Ontario. Absolutely none.

LICENCE FEES

Mr. Bain: I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. The question pertains to the $10 licence fee for automobiles in northern Ontario. Is the minister aware that for many families in northern Ontario the only family vehicle is a half-ton truck, and is he willing to extend the $10 licence fee to half-ton trucks if those vehicles are the only family vehicle or if they're used for farm purposes?

An hon. member: Say yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Of course, a half-ton truck, it's my understanding—and I think I'm right—can be registered as a passenger vehicle. If it is registered as a passenger vehicle, I would think it would qualify for the $10 licence. If it is registered as a commercial vehicle, it would not. And, of course, for the farm community there's a special provision for the registering of any size of truck as a farm truck, which qualifies for a reduced licence as well.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Order, please. There are two people on their feet. The hon. member for Hamilton West.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to rise somewhat briefly on a point of personal privilege, if I might, Mr. Speaker.

On April 15, the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. McCague) read into the record a letter, dated May 11, to the Treasurer from the Minister of Agriculture and Food regarding the Barrie annexation matter, suggesting that this was the communication which I had requested on April 1.

In actual fact, the document which I have referred to in the House, and the one which has been withheld from us by instruction of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, was a staff report of the food land development branch of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, dated August 1975, as he well knows.

Not only have we requested the staff report in the House, Mr. Speaker, we've also written to the minister to request it and hope that this document will be tabled for the use and scrutiny of the House.

Hon. W. Newman: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think it's more aptly called a point of order. Is there an answer to this? All right.

Mr. Bain: Point of order.

Mr. McClellan: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: One moment, please.

Hon. W. Newman: On a point of privilege. I'd just like to point out that the leader of the third party is wrong in saying that I gave instructions to withhold any document at all. It was understood the letter that I, as the minister, wrote to the Treasurer on the matter was the letter that was to be tabled, and that's what was tabled in the House by his parliamenatry assistant.

Mr. Good: Cover-up. Cover-up.

Mr. Kerrio: You should be embarrassed. That wasn't the letter at all, and you know it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't hear. The minister has corrected and his word must be taken. Is there a further point of privilege?

Mr. S. Smith: This is a point of privilege, because in fact I have made the statement in this House just a few minutes ago that there is a document, namely a staff report of the food land development branch of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. That report is what I want, and that report is being withheld from us by instruction of the minister; and I say it again. If he wants to table it, let him do so.

An hon. member: Table it.

Hon. W. Newman: I have made my point very clearly that I did not give any instructions, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member wants to make allegations like that, then let him prove them outside of this House and be a man to do it. Let him stand up and be a man about it.

Mr. Reid: Will you table it?

Mr. Breithaupt: Will you table it?

Mr. S. Smith: Table it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Any hon. member's word must be accepted—

Mr. S. Smith: Why don't you table it? Will you table it or not?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister stated he didn't; therefore his word must be accepted. Do you have a further point of order?

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order: I'm not disputing his word, but will the minister table that document from the food land development branch? Is he in effect saying no, he won't table it?

An hon. member: Yes or no?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is a question which could have been asked more appropriately during the question period. It can be asked again.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order—

An hon. member: What are you hiding?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, we are all out of order who are talking, except the Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith: You have a copy of it, Darcy, will you table it? Your department has it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice under standing order 27(g) that I am dissatisfied with the response to my question by the Minister of Community and Social Services and wish to debate with him at the adjournment today.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker, I too rise on a similar point of order. I wish to give notice that I am dissatisfied with the Minister of Transportation and Communications' answer and I also wish to debate the matter with him this evening.

An hon. member: Obstructionism.

Mr. Deans: I too rise on the same matter to give notice that I am dissatisfied with the answer of the Treasurer to the question I asked and wish to debate it at 10:30 this evening.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here with 4,500 names. I checked, and under the rules of the House I am afraid I can't do it. The petition is directed to the government instead of the Legislature, so if I may I will present it to the House leader to convey it to the Premier. It is with regard to the French-language school in Essex county.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports. Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

CITY OF OTTAWA ACT

Mr. Morrow moved first reading of Bill Pr 28, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. B. Stephenson moved first reading of Bill 62, An Act to amend The Ministry of Labour Act.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE ACT

Mr. Lane moved first reading of Bill Pr 18, An Act respecting The City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITIES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 63, The Regional Municipalities Amendment Act, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of amendments to the regional municipalities Acts to present to the House. Primarily they are measures to streamline the temporary borrowing provisions. We also propose that a simple majority vote be sufficient to authorize the removal of an auditor with cause, and that the 10 regional municipalities be permitted to pay rewards to persons who supply information leading to the conviction of offenders.

DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY OF MUSKOKA AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 64, An Act to amend the District Municipality of Muskoka Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The amendments to this bill duplicate those I have just outlined for the regional municipalities Acts.

COUNTY OF OXFORD AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 65, An Act to amend The County of Oxford Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Again the amendments are the same as for the previous Acts.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All the amendments to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act are similar to those in the proposed regional municipalities amendment bill. There is, however, an additional amendment concerning vote requirements, that a simple majority vote suffice to authorize travelling expenses of Metro councillors and officials and expenses incurred for entertainment.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 67, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Amendments to this Act give the municipalities two further kinds of money bylaws which do not require the assent of the electorate; namely, for acquiring land for housing purposes and for providing money for highways and bridges. We also propose that when partial payment is received for tax arrears, payments shall first be applied to interest or percentage charges, the remaining amount then being applied to the oldest taxes due.

At the request of the municipalities we are broadening the per diem of remuneration for members of council to allow for payment for attending meetings other than council meetings.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 68, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We propose here that before any public utilities be shut off for non-payment, 48 hours' notice be given to the occupant and the owner, if he or she is a different person.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville has a special interest in that piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

[3:30]

CITY OF TIMMINS-PORCUPINE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of Bill 69, An Act to amend The City of Timmins-Porcupine Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This amendment vests in the city of Timmins the right to collect tax arrears in respect of unorganized territory which became part of the city when it was created in 1973.

PENSION BENEFITS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Bain moved first reading of Bill 70, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bain: This bill requires that an employer disclose all current actuarial details

—that is, the investment of a pension fund, how much money is being earned and so on —of a registered pension plan and that this information be disclosed to actual and potential employees of the company in question, that may be now or may be in the future participating in the plan.

GASOLINE AND HEATING OIL UNIFORM PRICING ACT

Mr. Lane moved first reading of Bill 71, An Act to Require a Single Price for Gasoline and Heating Oil sold in Ontario by a Wholesaler.

Motion agreed to.

TOWNSHIP OF DOVER ACT

Mr. Spence moved first reading of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the Township of Dover.

Motion agreed to.

VILLAGE OF PORT McNICOLL ACT

Mr. G. E. Smith moved first reading of Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the Village of Port McNicoll.

Motion agreed to.

CONDOMINIUM AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Wildman moved first reading of Bill 72, An Act to amend The Condominium Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, this bill would give mobile-home owners the opportunity to own and operate their parks by amending The Condominium Act to enable mobile-home parks to be registered as condominium projects. The bill also clarifies the existing law by stating that a designated unit can consist of vacant land. This bill therefore provides for flexibility in the development of mobile-home condominium projects by enabling a developer to choose between designating a mobile home as a unit in itself, or alternatively, designating a vacant lot as a unit upon which a mobile home may be placed.

JOHN A. SCHMALTZ AGENCIES LIMITED ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moved first reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting John A. Schmaltz Agencies Limited.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT

Mr. Eaton, on behalf of Mr. Grossman, moved first reading of Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

PROFESSIONAL FUND-RAISING CORPORATIONS CONTROL ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 73, An Act to control Professional Fund-Raising Corporations.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, to be very brief, the bill will license professional fund-raising companies.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before going on with the orders of the day it's usual on Thursdays to indicate the order of business for the following week.

Before doing that, perhaps we should indicate that this afternoon we'll be doing the private members' ballot business that is orders 52 and 43, and in that order. This evening we have the unanimous consent of the House to go to Bill 28 at 8 o'clock, The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, and to carry on with that bill until third reading stage. Following that we will resume what we had planned for this evening, the budget debate, for the remainder of the evening.

I just wanted to indicate that we have unanimous consent to go to Bill 28 this evening at 8 o'clock, following which we will have budget debate, and then budget debate tomorrow morning.

Next week, on Monday—

Mr. Conway: Dispense.

Mr. Sweeney: Unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is very important. This is the public's business.

Mr. Eaton: Is that what you fellows want?

Hon. Mr. Welch: On Monday afternoon the House will be in committee of supply and we will start the estimates of the Solicitor General. There is no House on Monday evening. Tuesday is legislation day.

Mr. Wildman: What about the rest of the week?

Hon. Mr. Welch: We will continue with the Essex school bill, followed by the Northern Affairs Ministry, followed by the successor rights legislation and perhaps if we have time we will do the Hartt amendment.

There is no House Wednesday but of course we are in committee.

Thursday afternoon is private members' ballot business. There would be no House next Thursday evening, Mr. Speaker, because that is the occasion of your dinner. Then on Friday morning we'll do the budget debate.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PATIENTS' RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Dukszta moved second reading of Bill 33, An Act respecting Certain Rights of Patients receiving Health Care Services in Ontario.

Mr. Dukszta: I want to say before I go into details of my bill how pleasant, how instructive and how exciting it has been to participate in introducing a private member's bill in the Legislative Assembly. As everyone knows, this is a new approach to us in this Parliament. It has followed on a great parliamentary tradition in England where it has led to major changes in legislation.

I remember one case specifically of Mr. Leo Abse, who through a succession of three Parliaments after three elections persisted in introducing a bill to defeat the Labouchere amendment to The Sexual Offences Act and finally succeeded in having it passed. I notice in our own Parliament there has been a leitmotif to all the private members' bills which dealt largely with the right of the individuals in Ontario. I refer to the member for Lakeshore's (Mr. Lawlor) bill, to that of the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) which is going to be discussed after mine, and especially to the pioneer in the rights bill, the member for Parry Sound's (Mr. Maeck) bill. I found some connection between what I am introducing, what I am now debating and what I hope will be passed between the rights bill of patients and the member for Parry Sound's bill which preceded mine, which also dealt, maybe in a more limited fashion, with some rights of the patients in hospitals.

There is the whole concept of lobbying. It was the first time really I have ever done a private member's bill and I lobbied intensively through all the ranks. I found to my great amazement and delight how delightful, instructive, intelligent and warmhearted most members are in giving, I hope, their wholehearted support to my bill.

What I would like to establish here is that my bill be accepted in principle. There are a number of points where it needs to have further consideration and work. I hope when it has passed it will go to the committee on social development for an input from outside and from everyone concerned. I should tell members immediately that there are a couple of things about which I am concerned already and I should mention them.

One of them is a mistake made by me when I said that the age of consent should be 18. It is now a common practice in hospitals that the age of consent is 16. I do not want to change that in essence but I would introduce an amendment during third reading to that effect.

The second one is a little more important. The records pertaining to the patient have to be private, except for a number of exceptions. I missed one exception, which is that the physician is obliged, once he examines a patient and discovers that the patient is incapable of driving or could be dangerous when driving, then he has to report this, according to The Highway Traffic Act. That particular provision I fully approve of and I would introduce an amendment to make sure that this is not abolished.

There is one other point on which I am not clear; that is whether this bill would interfere with open discussion with a number of legal advisers. I am told that it does not interfere with The Public Health Act which requires a physician to report cases of infectious syphilis. So I am not going to introduce that amendment unless I hear to the contrary.

[3:45]

The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to declare and protect certain rights of medical patients in Ontario. There are three parts to the bill. One is the right of access to the patient's own record and the right to privacy of the record. The second part is the right to adequate information about the proposed form of treatment before giving a written consent to the treatment. Third is the right to due process of law for the people with mental disorders as enjoyed in our society by other people.

Part I: First, we'll consider the right to have one's medical records kept confidential. An example often given is that in a hospital, as much as we pay attention to make sure that the records are confidential, quite often

the records actually travel through the system and can be used quite easily by others. That access to confidential records in hospitals is quite general.

I would like, in this bill, to provide for making sure that only when the patient gives particular release that access to the records will be given to someone—except for the obvious administrative procedures which is the counting of heads, sex and the age of the patient, and so on.

The second part is more important. It's the right to one's own chart. At the moment, one can get a chart if one has a friendly physician who will get it for him or if he goes through a lawyer or through a court. For most people, in fact, it has not been possible to get their own charts.

Interestingly enough, one of the things that people have told me is that they have been afraid of what would happen if the charts are open to everyone. In other jurisdictions some of the charts have been open now for some time. In France, I'm not sure whether it applies to hospitals but I know a patient who has had lab tests or x-rays done in that country is given two copies, one for himself or herself and one to take to their doctor, without any undue problems or bother.

One of the more interesting objections has been regarding what will happen to people with a terminal illness and people who have something really unpleasant written about them in the chart. In cases of terminal illness, this bill dovetails with the bill of the member for Parry Sound, because it allows the patient both the access to the information and the decision making about his own future. I'm not sure how to answer this except that you don't have to go and ask for your own chart if you don't want to. But if you do want to, you should be able to have the right to obtain your chart.

Let me give you a practical experience. When I worked in the Queen Street Mental Health Centre I was in charge, during the last year of the benevolent ministry of the member for Brock (Mr. Welch), of an admissions unit in which we were then introducing considerable social psychiatry to the therapeutic community. One of the things which occurred, ultimately, was that patients were discussing and making decisions on their own problems—I should mention that this was a general unit which had just as many people who were acutely disturbed as others.

We decided to open the charts to the patients. At first, there were a lot of objections from the staff who said: "What will happen? We have written such and such, it will complicate our lives." People would say: "It will complicate our lives" meaning the staff's life.

When we did open the charts the effect was that the patient at first did, indeed, get annoyed, because what was written on the chart—which may be more typical of psychiatric charts than of general hospitals—is often tendentious and full of ad hominem remarks—things which are not factual and have nothing to really do with the problem that a patient has. They are interpretations and explorations of the patient's personality in the name of science, but basically just fanciful ideas written by the staff about the patient.

To those points the patient did object, and rightly so, because some of them were really ad hominem arguments. But we did find, when we started working on it, that the staff were not only putting actual information down but had begun to put it in a much more orderly factual fashion. It was no longer a general statement but it said precisely what happened—why the patient was admitted.

For example, if the patient was violent on the street and attacked someone, you wouldn't say that he was a nasty paranoid schizophrenic, you would say that this patient, age such and such, attacked an individual on the street and no one could control him so he had to be brought to the hospital. No one objects, and I am certain they would not object, to a factual statement of this sort. Anyway, this is part of good medical practice. This is part of the problem and you have to deal with it at some stage in the therapeutic process. The patient himself would have to deal with it. I am using this as an example because it's my own experience, but in the same way it applies in general hospitals.

Part II is a more contentious part for many members of the medical profession. This states very specifically that written, informed consent must be obtained before a surgical procedure or before a major medical procedure can take place, for which a consent has been required so far. This section is directly linked to The Public Hospitals Act which requires that before certain procedures can take place, written consent must be obtained.

I do not want, nor does the bill provide for, the extension of the informed consent form to cover ordinary visits to the family doctor to ask about a cold. It only applies to those circumstances in which a written consent has been required before and will be required now.

What the bill proposes and what I feel very strongly about is that quite often not enough information is given to an individual who is facing a major illness, a major surgical procedure. I want to make sure that it is there.

The bill provides for five points. On the written consent form which, as I mentioned to you, is signed by both physician and patient, you have to specify the nature of the patient's medical problem. You must also specify the advisability of treatment of the medical problem; the objective sought by the treatment; the nature of the risks inherent in any treatment; and the alternative forms of treatment.

It has to be done in colloquial language so that people can understand what the physician is saying. Once given this information, I think the patient can reasonably come to an informed decision on the problem—whether he wants to participate in this thing, whether he wants the operation. He enters a significant relationship with the physician on the basis of some equal information, not as before when, in effect, only the physician had the information. It equalizes the relation between patient and physician. For me, that is probably the most important part.

One objection is, will the patient, in possession of this information, not want to take the required or necessary treatment. If that happens, and I don't believe it will, then it's the patient's decision. The physician then has to decide whether that patient is competent to make that type of decision. But, basically, it is the decision of the individual as to whether he will go ahead and have the operation or the treatment. It is not my responsibility as a physician to act like a parent; the patient must decide for himself.

I repeat, it is for the patient to make this decision; it is for the patient to start dealing with the physician on a peer basis, for the patient to be treated in fact as a reasonable human being. It is his body, after all, which is being repaired or helped.

Another point is that when two people sign the documents and the kind of treatment is specified, it is, in effect, a contractual relationship which binds both parties but it also protects both patient and physician. There will be less litigation because of the clarity of what is proposed.

One of the concerns expressed has been what happens to an unconscious patient. An unconscious patient obviously can't sign a consent. I should tell the House that now, in practice, an unconscious patient does not sign a consent. It is assumed an unconscious patient wants treatment and the treatment proceeds, if no parent or relative objects, so that would not be changed.

As to the other objection, I've been doing so much lobbying that I've collected a number of statements of what people said. They said it will take so much of doctors' time there won't be any time left for actually treating patients. My answer to this is that it is an essential part of good clinical practice that a relationship occurs between a patient and a physician in which an exchange of information is essential, and that part of the possible recovery and treatment is already in that exchange of information and it is time extremely well spent. It's part of good clinical practice. It shouldn't cost any more. If it does involve a little more time, then I say, if it's for the sake of better clinical practice, let's do it.

Another objection was that he would say, well, the patient can always ask—Mr. Speaker, how much have I got?

Mr. Acting Speaker: You have approximately five minutes.

Mr. Dukszta: Five minutes? Thank you.

The last point I would make on that section is that of the physicians whom I've talked to—and some of them have been quite sympathetic to the bill—those who are less sympathetic have said that the practice is already going on and the doctors can be trusted to do this. Under no condition would I ever say that most of our physicians are incompetent; far from it. We have a very good group of people who are providing excellent service. If they are already doing some of this practice, there should be no objection from organized medicine to codifying that particular practice and putting it in the law.

I actually refer specifically to the president of the OMA, who has said something like this and implied that this is already good medical practice. If it is, then good, let's codify it, let's make sure, let's extend it. There should be no objection from him about doing it.

Part III provides for due process of law in the case of psychiatric patients. What happens now is that if an individual is diagnosed as being dangerous to himself or to others because of a mental disorder, a physician or a psychiatrist is obligated to fill out a Form 1 of The Mental Health Act to admit him to

a psychiatric facility, and the form is in force today.

Let me tell you how the process works, Mr. Speaker. Let me speak from personal experience. As a psychiatrist I have dealt often with individuals whom I considered dangerous to themselves or to others. Let me tell the House, it's an entirely subjective judgement. There really is no science about this. It's me and my conscience that says that I can't let that man out because he's dangerous to himself or to others. I have done that and I have written the forms and I have always been bothered by the fact that it's only on my say—on the discretionary power of one individual.

One physician or one psychiatrist can put away an individual for 30 days, deprive him or her of their liberties, with only one recourse—two, really, but one is never used, which is The Habeas Corpus Act. The second recourse is an appeal board, which usually takes some time to convene and by that time the patient often is already out of hospital.

I believe this type of approach to a patient does not extend the full privileges of our law that we extend to people who are accused of a crime. The patient with a mental disorder is treated differently, has no recourse to law. If I committed a crime it would be different. I would get a lawyer and all the due process of law comes into effect. I would be fully protected; the mental patient is not.

My bill would provide for protection for that patient. The protection would be twofold:

1. A certificate filled out by a physician or a psychiatrist will last four days, in sequence. It doesn't mean that after four days the patient will be automatically discharged. It means that after four days the patient will have to be re-assessed as to whether he is still dangerous to himself or to others. The sequence of the Form 1s would last no more than one month, while at the moment it lasts up to two years. At the end of one month a physician from outside would have to be brought in.

2. A copy—that's the most important part, I think, of this section—of the Form 1 would have to be sent to the Attorney General's office so that the Attorney General in turn appoints an advocate on behalf of a patient if the patient is unable to find one himself or herself. The advocate looks into the situation and checks.

[4:00]

Recent studies have shown that up to 70 per cent of all Form 1s filled in when admitting the patients to the hospital actually have been incorrectly filled in. It has been much easier to do it this way; it's just a clinical thing. I remember that in hospital, if you had a patient for 30 days, you took your time. I think the psychiatrist in charge of a patient's treatment and helping the patient to recover should be always on his toes, both as regards civil liberties and the treatment. And part of the Act will introduce what I call the due process of law into it.

In summary, there are three points to this bill. One is the patient's right to his own chart and to privacy. The second point is informed consent. I want a patient—and the Act would provide this—to be a full partner in the therapeutic process on the basis of equality. The third point is the one that will introduce the due process of law for psychiatrical patients.

Let me just add a few more sentences: It is only a proposal, a principle which I would like to have accepted, to move the civil rights part of Ontario towards—do I have 15 more seconds?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Your time has expired. Would you conclude briefly?

Mr. Dukszta: Let me say this is only the principle; I would like to refer it to the social development committee. I hope it's approved in principle; we can then work on the details. I would ask everyone to support it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In the 10 minutes available to me, Mr. Speaker, I will try to outline a couple of concerns I have about the proposal from my hon. friend. May I say, having come into the House at the same time, at the same election, as the member for Parkdale, that I too am most appreciative of the changes in recent months negotiated by our colleagues, the House leaders, in enhancing the position of the private member in this House. I think it is a significant improvement in the rules of order and in the traditions of this assembly.

I want to put forward a couple of concerns and, if I may, I will deal with the sections of the bill exactly as printed and as spoken to by the member for Parkdale. I am pleased to see that the member has recognized, in section 3(4), that there is a problem in what he proposes in the bill as drafted with regard to the age of consent. It was in February 1974 that the age of consent for surgical procedures was changed

from 18 years to 16 years, the reasons for which are very familiar to the member and to the rest of us who where here at that time. That does cause us a problem.

So far as the first section of the bill is concerned, that section dealing with the right to a confidential record, there are two parts that give me a great deal of concern. They are section 3(2)(d) and section 3(3), which have to do with the availability of the records to the family, in the case of the first part, where he is deceased, and in section 3(3), where he or she is mentally or physically disabled.

The reason they concern me is that they are so open to abuse, I suggest to the hon. member. His proposal really does not provide for a review mechanism to inquire of the nature of the reasons for wanting those records. One can imagine any number of potential horror stories in insurance cases, in providing supervision of income annuities and so forth; and I would be concerned about how those sections might be applied.

Time is short and it doesn't really allow me to talk about everything I would want to, except to say that one other thing concerns me—and, having been a teacher, in looking at this, I try to analogize medical records to school records. I know that not everything in a school record, to start with, is confidential. In fact, everything that could probably be referred to as confidential, in the traditional sense of the doctor-patient relationship, might not even be in the clinical record. So that concerns me, in that it perhaps wouldn't achieve what the hon. member—and all of us, I think—are after.

The third thing is, and the member touched on this, the question of concern about how the physicians would react to it. I was very interested in his remarks about what happened at Queen Street Mental Health Centre when he was there and they started this. I must express a concern that with this kind of a legal mechanism, some practitioners would be too cryptic, would not fill in the records as completely as possible for fear of the repercussions. I just leave that concern with you.

On the question of concern to treatment, I am informed by staff whom I questioned about this that at the present time a written consent is not required in all cases. What concerns me again in this instance is the effect of the word "comprehensible"—although the member didn't use the word "comprehensible" during his remarks—he used the word "colloquial." There again I'm concerned about the subjectivity of those terms. What do they mean? Does it leave both physician and patient wondering as to what are their legal obligations? What are the expectations that are made on them? Are we encouraging the development of the kind of patient-physician relationship that exists in the United States where so many cases are now ending up in the courts.

I must tell you of an experience, just as an aside to that. When I visited relatives in Los Angeles in September, my cousin showed me a bill from her son's physician. It was for about $180 for one examination and tests, and I then proceeded to tell her that under OHIP, the great plan brought in by this government, my total annual premiums are $192 as a single person, but that's another aside.

One of the reasons leading to these high bills which my cousin's son had been incurring was the fact that that particular physician practising in the state of California in the city of Los Angeles pays $47,000 a year insurance premiums for malpractice insurance. So I must express some concern with the vagueness of this term, that it could be part of an unnecessary move towards more of that kind of thing in Canada.

I recognize that one of the reasons we don't have it in Canada is that we don't have—what do the lawyers call it in the United States, contingency fees?—where they take a certain percentage if they win, and if they lose they don't charge you anything. I recognize that that's a factor as well. But I think certainly there are others.

Now we come to part III and it is because of my concerns about part III that I oppose the bill. I think the member and I share the concern that no person should be spending any more time in any of our psychiatric facilities than is necessary for that person's condition.

He pointed out—and if he hadn't, I was going to— that in every instance it's a judgement call. He, of course, has an advantage on me in that he is a professional in this area. I'm nothing but a layman. But even as a layman, I understand that this is one of those cases where I have to rely on the judgement of a professional person whose science is one that can never be codified, can never be carved in stone under a certain number of headings or points and left at that as being the final say on that.

The member knows, I hope, that shortly after I came into the Ministry of Health, because of interests I've had for many years, one of the very first things I did was to visit

Whitby. I want to emphasize too, it was a surprise visit. The only person who knew I was coming was the administrator and he was under strict orders that he was not to tell the staff, he was not to tell the patients, he was not to let the local press know—this was not a visit to attract attention. I wanted to learn.

Because of what I saw at Whitby, what I heard from the administrator, the staff, the patients, because of some experience I've had in my own family and with some constituents over the years, one of the very first things I did in this ministry was to order a complete review of The Mental Health Act, which is presently getting under way through the Council of Health.

One of the more important aspects of that review, in addition to getting their advice as to how mental health service should be delivered in this province, will be to get some indication from them after they have talked to such groups as the Civil Liberties Association, the Association of Psychiatrists, the Ontario Medical Association, the nurses' association, and so forth, would be their advice on administration procedures.

The member used the 70 per cent figure before to indicate that 70 per cent of the Form 1s were being filled out incorrectly. I think where he got that figure was from a statement I made where I indicated that 70 per cent of the people who are at present being admitted on Form 1s are either being released within the 30-day period or are becoming voluntary patients within the 30-day period. I don't have the figures with me but I would be glad to provide a breakdown by day.

Mr. Dukszta: May I raise a point of order here? I was referring to a study by Mr. Perrin, not to the figures of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Let me come to that study. That study, of course, is now two and a half or three years old, I believe, and is not current.

Mr. Dukszta: Excuse me, it was released only two months ago.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I know it was released only a couple of months ago but it is not current. The figures were obtained, I think, in 1974 or early 1975. So it really isn't current. It is not up to date at all.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member can find an appropriate time to end his remarks.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with the general intent of parts I and II and will undertake to do more on that within the ministry. Because of the fact that part II really deals with a subject already committed to the public forum through the Council of Health, I will oppose the bill.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I, like my predecessors, want to open by saying how very much a pleasure it is for a lowly backbencher like myself to participate in this unique new business that the House leaders have arrived at, if for no other reason than that it provides but one small opportunity for some of us to get out from underneath the wretched oppression of party politics, which some members across the floor, lately of this side, have found increasingly difficult to contend with.

The precedent was well set not so very long ago by my very good and hon. friend from Parry Sound in, quite seriously, an extremely interesting and I think historic debate in which I was very pleased to take a silent part.

Mr. Bullbrook: He has never taken a silent part in any session of this Legislature yet.

Hon. B. Stephenson: In anything. Not in anything.

Mr. Conway: I must say, Mr. Speaker, I find today some small measure of irony because I wonder if the Premier is not going to apply that right-to-die legislation to this 30th Parliament.

Mr. Sweeney: It won't be natural, though.

Mr. Conway: The member for Parkdale made reference to the lobbying that he has proceeded with, and I think to very considerable effect. I must say he is very adept in that. The only thing I was disappointed about was that we didn't get a dinner at the Harbour Castle, but perhaps lobbying procedures and private members' hours will proceed apace.

As to the bill, I think it is a timely and laudable initiative not only for the patient, but I think—and I know the member for York Mills (B. Stephenson) will agree with me in this—most assuredly for the physician as well. As recent litigation is beginning to indicate in this jurisdiction, we are heading into a series of difficulties that I think must be addressed by the legislative bodies throughout the land.

The fact is that the patient and the physician must be put I think on a more equal

status—not essentially or absolutely an equal status, because I do not believe from my own point of view that is possible, but I certainly believe we must move in the direction of equalizing the position of patient and physician in this particular area. I think it is extremely timely because as we all know this business of the health care delivery system in Ontario, as elsewhere, is of growing cost, complexity and controversy.

Part I, to speak very briefly to that, is something that I can support in principle. Not unlike the previous speaker from Don Mills, I have a certain reservation about the access and availability of records. I think that to be sure there is a prospect there for abuse, and I would be very concerned about what might happen under certain conditions. But surely that is a prospect and that is a condition that we face in our society at all levels.

[4:15]

Unlike members opposite, I for one believe firmly in the concept and the principle of freedom of information. I think to the extent possible, we can begin in this particular regard by implementing something of that approach in an area that is very essential to all our citizens in Ontario. I like the member for Parkdale's notion again of at least attempting to equalize the information as available to and between a physician and a patient.

Again unlike the member for Don Mills, who had some problems with part III, my difficulty comes very seriously in part II. I must say before getting specific in part II that as one member I certainly applaud the initiative. I think it is extremely important. I think it is something very worthy of a debate at a very early time and I am glad to have this opportunity this afternoon to participate in this. The general direction, the general drift and certainly I think the general intention of the member for Parkdale's Bill 33 is something with which I have a very strong community of interest and support.

That being said, I want to go on record as opposing very strongly the suggested implementation in part II. I think that while it is an avenue of approach, its imperfections certainly make it undesirable. For example, sections 7(1)(b), (c) and (d) talk about the advisability of the treatment of the medical problem, the objective sought to be achieved by treatment relating to the consent that is offered, and the nature of the risks inherent in the chosen treatment. It seems to me, again like the member for Don Mills as a lay person, that those are matters of very great complexity that could only be made aware and available to the patient involved in such volume and complexity as to make the sought-for informed consent quite impossible, quite impractical and quite unattainable.

It seems to me if, in what I understand to be some of the obvious complexities, one is going to explain the nature of all the risks involved in some very complex disc problem that one might have in his or her back, the consequences of certain drugs and a variety of other such things, I can't imagine anything less than a 50-page document being involved —or at least a 25-page document. I think the member for Parkdale has been made aware of some of these concerns, but it seems to me that anything of that order will simply make impossible the whole business of the informed consent that is sought after. That at least is the determination that I would make.

In my area, I might say, this whole business is a matter of ongoing concern and significance. I stand here today partly as a spokesman for that concern, because we have had a great debate in my particular area, as I know the member for York Mills realizes, on this whole question of patient rights. But I just cannot see, with all deference to the hon. member for Parkdale, how section 7 and part II in general are at all practical or at all possible. I think they will eliminate, by virtue of the volume and complexity of those outlines that are expressed, the very informed consent that is deemed so essential.

It seems to me that a solution, and it is probably not as specific or heroic as the various aspects of section 7, part II, would be a greater emphasis on the basic education of our consuming public in this regard. It seems to me that the emphasis, if really placed there, might be more practical and might be more possible.

To a lesser degree I suppose, part III presents at least some further problems for me in the suggestions contained in section 10. I can certainly share what the member for Parkdale has said about the difficulties as they exist at present—the fact that there is an undue delay, that there is a judgement that no one person may like to take responsibility for. But I suppose it's going to be the judgement, if not of one, of a certain and reasonably limited group of people, and I'm not so sure that that will be any better in that particular regard.

My feeling on the suggestions held in section 10 really turns on the fact that again it would be bureaucratically difficult, perhaps impossible to secure the kind of counsel and

to process the sort of applications in the manner suggested that the hon. member might see as a solution. My only comment with respect to an alternative would be to make very clear to the present review committee that they simply must be more speedy in their deliberations and they must be more efficient in sorting out the problems that really we all can admit reside at present in the situation today.

In summary then, as a member of this assembly I want to commend very strongly the member for Parkdale for his laudable and timely initiative in this regard. While I cannot support some of the administrative procedures that he outlines, I share with him entirely the fact that we should take this to a committee where we could discuss and we could amend and we could perhaps evolve a series of other recommendations.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Conway: I do think it is a number one priority in the health field today. I want again to say that as a member I support the general principle, and will be happy to do so when the vote arrives.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I too am very pleased to be able to have the opportunity to take part in this debate, which I think is still somewhat historic. I guess we're dealing with the fourth of what might be called the private members' freedom bills that have been introduced, and I think it is more than a coincidence that all of the private members' bills to date have dealt with some matter to do with the rights of the individual.

I want to speak in support of the principle of Bill 33. To me, this bill establishes some fundamental reforms that are long overdue. With respect to part I of the bill, the right to one's own record, I think myself that virtually everybody in this House agrees with the wisdom of those provisions and I don't intend to dwell on them.

With respect to part II, the right to know, the right to information with respect to he patient's medical condition, it seems to me that this bill in part II establishes the principle of the patient's responsibility for his own health care. It establishes the principle that good health is not something that is done to you by somebody else, but is something that each and everyone has his own responsibility for ensuring, is something that cannot happen in an authoritarian relationship and is something that cannot happen in the condition of ignorance.

The kind of mystery and mystique that unfortunately surrounds the provision of medical care is, as the member for Parkdale suggested, clinically harmful. We need to demystify and demythologize medical treatment, not for iconoclastic reasons but for clinical reasons, for reasons of good and adequate health care.

The kind of aura of priesthood that surrounds the medical profession and tends to dominate the doctor-patient relationship is a major barrier to the development of a rational, responsible, health care system and rational, responsible, intelligent health care attitudes. Ordinary people have the intelligence and the capacity and the right and the responsibility to understand the details of their own medical treatment and can assume responsibility for their own health care.

I represent a riding in which most of my constituents, I think it's fair to say, do not speak English. The majority do not speak English. The majority are unable to converse adequately with doctors in medical terms. For most of my constituents, medical treatment is something that is conducted in a foreign language, in English. It's mysterious, it's obscure, it's often terriying, and it's mainly unintelligible.

I would hope, expressing a particular concern as the representative for the riding of Bellwoods, that this legislation would serve to force some changes in that situation—at the very least to force the provision of adequate translation services so that my constituents and the constituents of other new Canadian communities are able to receive medical service in a language, as the bill says, which is understandable.

Before I deal with part III, I want to make a qualification with respect to one detail of part II. I do recognize that there are circumstances where detailed knowledge of one's medical condition and of treatment realities could be emotionally very damaging. The rights to knowledge guaranteed under section 7 must, it seems to me, be established; but so, too, must the right to waive medical information be accorded to patients if that should be their wish. Should the bill pass, as I hope it does, and reach committee, I would move an amendment which would permit a patient to waive this right without prejudice to the safeguard that no external pressure in the form of denial of service would be permitted. But the rights in part I and part II would be confirmed under this bill, as amended, for those who wish to assume that right and for those who wish to assume a new kind of responsibility for their own health care.

With respect to part III, anyone who has worked in the mental health services field knows that this reform is long overdue. I had a case brought to my constituency office about two weeks ago of a young man who was a psychiatric social worker whose brother was an out-patient of the Clarke Institute here in Toronto. The brother who was the out-patient was unhappy with the degree of medication that he was being subjected to as part of his treatment and began to miss his out-patient clinic days. He went to the Clarke Institute to complain about the regimen of drug therapy that he was on; and he was involuntarily admitted, against his will and against the will of his family, including the brother who was a psychiatric social worker.

Whether or not that young man should have been involuntarily admitted was not the issue. The issue in dispute was the opportunity for an independent and speedy review, and under the present legislation that simply is not available. There was no recourse for him but to wait out the period of his involuntary incarceration. His member of the Legislature was powerless. The Ombudsman for the province of Ontario was powerless. Legal counsel was powerless. There was no avenue to determine whether an injustice had been committed in that situation or not.

This bill remedies that situation, because what we are talking about with respect to the powers of involuntary admission under The Mental Health Act is a kind of preventive detention, about locking people up, about a kind of imprisonment. We shouldn't be under any illusions with respect to that; we're talking about the ultimate denial of freedom on the suspicion of a potentiality to be harmful to oneself or to others.

[4:30]

Society demands the right by tradition, based on experience, to protect itself. But this kind of terrible power that society demands has got to be hedged in, in law, by safeguards that seek to protect the rights of the individual at every single step of the way in the process—protect him from what is the ultimate injustice and this is exactly what this bill does. It strikes a proper balance between society's need for protection and the individual's civil liberties by guaranteeing the right to counsel, by requiring an immediate outside review by the Attorney General, by limiting the right of involuntary detention without review to four days, by establishing a new stringency in the process of obtaining a certificate of renewal, a process which would now require frequent reassessment at specified intervals to maintain involuntary detention.

Finally, it provides the opportunity for independent outside review by an independent outside psychiatrist. All in all, Mr. Speaker, this is a measure of reform which is long overdue in this province. I think that despite some concerns about details, we in this House can all support it in principle and when we get into committee, move to develop the kind of bill that each of us knows is utterly essential in Ontario at this time. Thank you very much.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate briefly in this interesting private member's bill, the aims and objectives of which are, I think, entirely laudable.

I do have some very real concern, not about the principle per se but about the methodology of achieving that principle through this enactment. The bill, in the first place I think, is too large and too comprehensive. I think it would be better separated into three specific enactments in order to provide the proper approach to each of these problems.

My concern with part I is specifically that there has been no definition of record in terms of the right of the patient to achieve information. The record for an individual patient may be in many places and I believe that this bill addresses specifically the hospital record. The hospital record is an important part of a patient record; it is not always the most important part and frequently is much less important than the record which is kept in the offices of specific physicians or consultants whom the patient has seen. Those pieces of information are not necessarily a part of the hospital patient record.

I agree, and I think all physicians agree, that the patient has the right to full information regarding his or her specific health problem or state of health. It is, I think, the responsibility of the conscientious physician to ensure that the patient is fully informed. But simply to give the patient documents is not the way to inform the individual fully of the purport of many of those documents. Laboratory records are not necessarily entirely understandable, sometimes even to physicians let alone to patients who have not had the benefit of several years of medical education.

I have some very real concern about the apparent lack of protection of the individual who is perhaps incompetent or is unmarried

and under the age of 18. It would seem to me much more appropriate to be a little more stringent about the person to whom such records could be delivered. I would have real concern that siblings or others within the family might, for somewhat nefarious purposes, attempt to gain control of these records or information from them.

Part II of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is the area which really provides concern for me. There is no doubt in my mind that every individual patient who is required to have any kind of treatment should be fully informed of the reason for the treatment, the kind of treatment which is to be provided, the possible consequences of that treatment and the hopeful objectives of that treatment. This is precisely, I think, what most responsible physicians have been attempting to provide verbally to their patients for many centuries. There is, however, a problem—and I will agree with many of the speakers who have arisen before me—that the mystique of medicine has inhibited the development of an acknowledgement within the individual patient of the right to information of this sort. Many individual citizens who are patients do not know or do not feel that they have the right to ask for a second opinion, to ask for a careful scrutiny of a consultation note, to ask for a personal examination of the x-ray record or something of that sort. There is nothing in law, nor is there really anything in practice that inhibits the exercise of that freedom on the part of the individual patient.

But the method set out in part II to provide information, particularly for an individual who is presenting himself or herself for a surgical procedure, I think is totally unworkable and does not, in fact, take into account the individual variations of human beings, which must be accommodated when one is attempting to provide meaningful information.

I have seen one copy of one form used by a patient information service in the United States that attempts to provide this kind of informed consent. It is for a fairly routine surgical procedure. The length of the document is more than 40 pages. It is written in reasonably sensible English so that most people could understand it, but it has one very grave omission—one thing that I think would have to be added to every single printed form. This document would have to contain a printed form for each and every surgical procedure. If you were going in to take out a gall bladder and found some other complication and had not informed the patient or given the patient the document about that other potential complication, then perhaps you might be in difficulties with the patient and his lawyer after the surgical procedure. But one of the things that is omitted from all of these is the eventuality that accompanies every surgical procedure and many medical procedures. That is the eventuality that the patient might die as a result of it.

I think it would be entirely inappropriate in most instances to say to a patient facing, usually with some degree of tremulousness, a surgical procedure, that there is a real risk that he is going to die and to have it down in black and white. I just don't think that's a fair way to deal with human beings.

I think it is much fairer to leave it to the personal physician of that individual, knowing that individual very well, to select very carefully the words to be used in terms of providing the information verbally, fit those terms of that information in a way that the personal physician very well knows would be appropriate for that individual, and provide all the information apparently necessary in any of these instances. I really think we can do this without having it written down on pieces of paper which, I think, will probably simply complicate and disturb the lives of more patients who are likely to be candidates for both surgical and medical treatment.

I am fully in support of the concept of complete information to patients before they undertake or undergo any kind of medical or surgical procedure, but I think it has to be done properly, attempting to fit the information and the presentation of that information to the individual patient as one does in all instances in attempting to treat human beings.

My concerns about part III have already been mentioned specifically by the Minister of Health. This section of The Mental Health Act is under review; it is due for review. But I would point out one thing, that with the sequence of events set out in the Act as proposed by the hon. member for Parkdale, I would think we would have to direct all the graduates of medical schools to the specialty of psychiatry for at least 10 or 12 years to produce the kinds of numbers that would be necessary to have these certificates renewed at the interval suggested.

I think it is much more appropriate to leave this to the review committee that is at present actively pursuing this Act. I'm sure the hon. Minister of Health will refer this section of the hon. member's proposed Act to that committee where I think it can be very usefully employed.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the principle of Bill 33 presented by the member for Parkdale, but I have approached it with the same reservations as expressed by my colleague from Renfrew North. With respect to parts I and II, I express and reiterate the same type of reservations expressed by my colleague from Renfrew North. I would like to devote my series of observations to part III of the bill with respect to the due process for involuntary patients.

There is no mistake about it that an involuntary patient is a person who is subjected to loss of freedom at the will of another individual. We must concern ourselves with the concerns of the doctor, the patient and the complainant in many respects—the complainant perhaps being the wife of an alcoholic, whose life is intolerable at home so she seeks some remedy for her situation and goes to her doctor and, with concern, gets her husband compulsory help.

In this respect, I draw the attention of the House to a study by two independent lawyers of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association who, after their study of this situation, found that at least 70 per cent of 200 certificates of commitment to Ontario mental hospitals were unlawful. Under The Mental Health Act as it stands now, a person can be confined against his will in a mental hospital for up to 30 days on the authority of such a certificate signed by only one duly-qualified medical practitioner. They found that of the 200 cases they studied, 70 per cent were unlawful. They approached the Ministry of Health with respect to the situation.

Despite the fact that The Mental Health Act is now under review, it is with that concern and with the knowledge of how slowly government moves that I support this particular section of this Act. I turned to some of the pages of our Criminal Code for guidance in this area with respect to this Act and what it's recommending. It recommends that there be a hearing in the adversary arena. It seems to me that in so far as a person is deprived of his freedom under this Act for the periods as set out in Bill 33, we must take it out of the realm of one individual person and take it into an adversary situation so that a patient who will lose his freedom pursuant to the sections of this Act can be properly represented and have his side considered as well.

Although this Bill 33 provides for referral of an application under section 8 within four days to the Attorney General, it is my respectful submission to this House that that should be tightened up even more so. The existing offices of a justice of the peace should be used within four days so that the legal sanction of that office as an officer of the court can be used.

So in this sense I support this bill in principle and will support it in principle, hoping that it can be revised in committee to make it stronger, with more use of the adversary system to protect the interests of the individual who is subject to this bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have about a minute and a half if the hon. member for Peterborough would like to avail herself of the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, I would, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped to have slightly more than a minute and a half.

I would like to speak very briefly to the section of the bill that I think is particularly important for women patients in this province. That is the section that suggests that information on both sides should be, as it were, equalized; that doctors and patients should go into a procedure on equal terms.

I think women have particularly suffered from the patriarchal nature of psychiatric treatment all around the world. I would say it is not just confined to Ontario. Women make up a larger percentage of psychiatric patients than men. It is strange that we have more men in jails and more women in psychiatric hospitals, which I think says something about socialization.

It seems to me that it's extremely important that women are aware of the grounds on which they are being given shock therapy, tranquilizers, anti-depressants and drug therapy, and that they are not just being drugged and shocked into an acceptance of the problems that have brought them to the psychiatrist.

[4:45]

A paper dealing recently with the adult sex roles and mental illness, which suggested that there are so many more women than men in psychiatric hospitals, summarized that there are ample grounds for assuming that women find their position in society to be more frustrating and less rewarding than do men, and that this may be a relatively recent development. Let us then, at this point, postulate that because of the difficulties associated with the feminine role in modern western society, more women than men become mentally ill.

It seems to me that if those facts are correct—and the many studies suggest they

are—that it is not enough for women to accept the explanation, "We are doing this because it's best for you, dear." Most know, for instance, that if they are given shock therapy for their depression they may, when they get home, find that temporary amnesia has set it; they cannot remember where their children's diapers are kept. This happened to a friend of mine who was given shock therapy with no information about possible side effects. Informed consent must be equal on both sides.

I'm sorry I don't have more time to speak to the other sections of the bill, Mr. Speaker. I just wish to go on record as being in favour of the principle of it. I'd like to say, in closing, I hope that when this bill comes to committee, as I hope we'll allow, we would take care to deal with the member for Parry Sound's bill at the same time. It seems to me that the groups who would wish to speak to that bill would be the same as those who'd wish to speak to this bill. We could usefully have both discussions going on together.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no remaining time for item five.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT

Mrs. Campbell moved second reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my understanding that the only speaker for the Liberal Party is the hon. member for St. George. Normally, she has 20 minutes to lead off. If there is unanimous consent from the House to allow her more than 20 minutes, I'd like to hear that from the House. I would like some guidance so that we won't get into a problem later on.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, how much time would that allow the other speakers if her time is extended?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Normally the sponsor gets 20 minutes, each subsequent speaker gets 10 minutes, until the time has expired, which would be at 5:50, I believe. Each speaker will have the floor for no more than 10 minutes, after Mrs. Campbell has had her 20 minutes.

Mr. Williams: And no less than 10 minutes, I presume?

Mr. Cunningham: We would agree that you have less.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Ten minutes.

Mr. Williams: Then I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Normally, one member can't speak any more than once on a bill. If there is time remaining at the end, do we have unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for St. George to speak again?

Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for St. George, up to 20 minutes.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I proceed I, too, would like to state that I feel that this private members' hour has definitely given to members of this Legislature the opportunity to place before the House, with the possibility of a vote, those matters which are of deep concern. However, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that great as our House leaders are, I really do think that the matter flows from the Morrow committee and not really at the initiation of the House leaders.

However, in speaking to this bill I would like to say something of my political passions over the years—of my participation in the democratic process. In order, I would say first, my passion for my country, one and indivisible; and two, my passion for the form of parliamentary democracy which we have in this country. It may not work perfectly and I suppose we could all concede that, but nevertheless it is one of the great forms of government available to mankind. I feel very strongly that unless those of us who care very greatly for it are prepared to concede the demos of the democracy, we will see it disappearing even more rapidly than it appears to be at this point in time.

Once we get to belief in the form of parliamentary democracy, then we must surely have a very strong belief in the rights and the dignities of the individual within our democracy. I can recall some years ago, as a member of the now-defunct board of control of the city of Toronto, when we had before us a group of young people who were designated—inaccurately, I believe, even in those days—as hippies and diggers. I can recall that they used every method open to them to seek audience with the board of control. They followed every legal procedure, but there were those on that board of control who felt that there should be some special

provisions before they would be enabled to address that august body.

I can remember stating at that time my very firm belief that democracy is a plant of very tender flower, and that if we can take a position that people don't have full dignity and full rights, because we don't like the way they function in society, then we have no democracy.

In approaching this particular bill, if I may I would like to read the proposed preamble to set the tone for what I am saying: "And whereas it is the public policy in Ontario that every person is free and equal in dignity and rights without regard to race, creed, colour, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, nationality, ancestry, or place of origin."

The government of this country has taken the position that it has no concern as a government with how people conduct their private lives. And while there may be those who disagree with what anyone does in their private lives, we are for the most part protected by the philosophy, and indeed by the law, of this country.

We have seen cases recently where those who are not heterosexual have been released from their employment by reason of the fact that they are homosexuals. There has to be a right to a person to employment. There has to be a right of some job security for those who do not follow the pursuits of what one deems to be the majority in either this province or this country.

One has to meet with some of those young people coming out of the adolescent period of their lives who are disturbed or bothered by their emotions and by what they see as their own differences. I had the occasion once to talk to a young boy who was over the age of 18 and who at least once had attempted suicide because of what he discovered in himself and because of what he saw society looking at in him. It was a very sad and a very painful interview but, as a result of that, I learned so much of human concerns and human problems.

I have a very strong feeling that liberalism must stand four-square for the rights of people to conduct their lives as they see fit so long, of course, as they do not contravene any legislation, and that, of course, applies to every single one of us.

It seems sad to me that it is necessary to debate this bill at this point in our history. I am aware that The Human Rights Code is undergoing a careful reconsideration. Having attended various commission hearings held in Toronto, I am aware too that there are those who have difficulty with the terminology of this bill. But I would hope that in discussing its principle no one would be concerned to the point of opposing the bill on the basis of the fact that perhaps they feel that the legal definition should be somewhat different.

[5:00]

I used the term "sexual orientation" because it has a wide acceptance throughout this continent. We have seen those members of the Parliament of this country seeking to introduce similar legislation. Of course, I did not use the term "homosexual" because I felt that it might preclude those who were not male in origin. This is the reason for this terminology. I would certainly ask those who find difficulty with that particular expression to be prepared to accept the bill in principle, subject of course if necessary to further discussion as to what the appropriate language ought to be.

But I am not, Mr. Speaker, debating this on the basis of technicality. I am debating it on the basis of the right of human beings to full dignity and to full equality in this great democracy. If we turn our backs then I know that we have, to at least some extent, not only denigrated one group, but by some proportion denigrated the whole of our society. It is for this very reason that throughout my career I have fought for equal rights and equal opportunities for women, because their denigration is a denigration of the whole of our society. It is for this reason that I have fought against racial prejudice wherever I found it, because again that is a denigration of our society.

It was interesting that last night at a tenants' meeting in my area, a meeting to which I was invited, I was led into a discussion of this bill. A lady was there who had been a lawyer in Germany and she was speaking to the problems of a democratic society and her problems of being accepted here because of her origin. What I am proposing today is simply a symbol, and anyone involved understands that because there are still no teeth in The Human Rights Code.

You know and I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are not supposed to discriminate by reasons of race—yet there certainly is lots of evidence that that is still existing—or creed, or colour, or certainly sex or marital status. Yet we find it prevalent in our society. It is just that it is so difficult of proof. And in this case it will be no different. What it does, it seems to me, is to raise the level of our

perception in our society and to express the very real meaning of our acceptance of parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this bill, entitled An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, is ill-timed, ill-conceived and illogical.

Mr. Dukszta: Of course.

Mr. Williams: I take this position for the following reasons: Firstly, presentation of the bill has to be ill-timed. As all members of this House are aware, The Ontario Human Rights Commission, as acknowledged by the member for St. George, has been engaged in a major public review of The Ontario Human Rights Code for more than a year. The past experiences of the commission are being assessed. The results of this research are being combined with a careful examination of the existing and proposed human rights legislation of other Canadian provinces and of the government of Canada, as well as the laws of other countries.

Whether we, as legislators, will agree with the recommendations of the commission in total or in part is at this time beside the point. The fact of the matter is that the commission will be publishing its findings and recommendations this spring. Accordingly, it is obviously inappropriate for the Legislature today to be dealing prematurely in a piecemeal fashion with proposals for changing the existing Human Rights Code on the eve of the commission handing down its report.

Mr. Conway: And on the eve of other things.

Mr. Williams: One could say that this precipitous action by the member for St. George unfairly usurps the review process being engaged in by the commission. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, this bill has to be ill-conceived if one is being asked to identify and accept "sexual preference" as a further basic cornerstone of The Ontario Human Rights Code. The code proclaims that as a matter of public policy every person is free and equal in dignity and rights without regard to race, creed, colour, sex, marital status, nationality, ancestry or place of origin. These eight basic tenets upon which the Act is founded have one thing in common. They describe the basic condition of man without which man cannot exist as an entity.

On the other hand, sexual preference is a term that does not fall into this fundamentalist definition. Sexual preference does not pertain to a basic condition of man but rather, I suggest, relates to the human activity or social behaviour of man.

In the event that the commission were to recommend that the codification of The Ontario Human Rights Code should be so broadened such as to not only protect the basic condition of man from discriminatory practices but as well to prevent discrimination against every form and act of social behaviour, then the present strengths of the Act might well be discredited by the total presumptiousness it would assume in purporting to become a state-imposed version of religious and moral philosophy.

I suggest that we cannot legislate morality or social behaviour, nor was this the intent or purpose of The Ontario Human Rights Code. The Act was designed to protect from discrimination the fundamental condition of man over which he basically has no control.

The basic conditions of race, creed, colour, sex, marital status, nationality, ancestry or place of origin are not related in any way to his daily activities or personal preferences whether they be sexual or otherwise.

Thirdly, the whole tenor of the proposal has to be illogical in that such a law would not only condone homosexual activity, it would be dictating that any form of sexual preference, whether it be heterosexual, homosexual or otherwise, must be equally accepted by society as a legitimate and normal behaviour.

Mr. Samis: You and Brian deserve each other.

Mr. Williams: The interesting aspect of the movement by the homosexual community to gain such social acceptance is its shift of emphasis on its plight, from being a minority group of people with abnormal sexual beliefs and behaviour to being a normal but misunderstood and discriminated-against minority group being denied its civil rights.

Their persistence in this regard has had some limited success in quieting those who would challenge their right to assume a mantle of sexual normalcy. The fact that society as a whole recognizes abnormality in homosexual behaviour does not mean that the homosexual is deprived of his civil rights, as suggested by the homosexual community. That argument evaporated with the amendments to the Canadian Criminal Code in 1969, which removed prohibitions against homosexual acts between consenting adults in private.

However, without either malice or pity for the homosexual, one must ultimately reflect

upon the medical and moral aspects of this type of sexual preference or behaviour. In order to assess the validity of their argument and the appropriateness of this bill, the issue is put in clear perspective from a medical point of view in an editorial printed in the April 1973 edition of the highly-respected American Journal of Psychotherapy. The editorial states in part as follows:

"It would appear to be a distortion of reality to deny that homosexual behaviour, when there are heterosexual partners readily available, constitutes a gross distortion of basic drives that are applicable to all animals in whom there is a differentiation between males and females for reproductive purposes.

"The basic purpose of sexual differentiation, even limiting the phenomenon to mammals, is for the propagation of a species. This does not mean that humans must reproduce to be normal, since reproduction can lead to overproduction which would be harmful to the species"—

Mr. Wildman: I think that argument is specious.

Mr. Williams: —"a problem we are experiencing during the current period of demographic over-concentration.

"However, distortions of basic instinctive animal drives upon which the survival of the species could theoretically depend, cannot be considered in the same light as psychodynamic and psychophysiological disruptions such as frigidity, premature or retarded ejaculation and the like. Overt, compulsively repeated homosexual acts, when heterosexual partners are freely available, constitute a distortion or deviation from basic instinctual drives. These acts in themselves are documentations of the label of illness, even if the individual functions well vocationally and socially in other ways.

"We cannot agree, then, with the ideas expressed by some that many homosexuals function in a way that cannot be considered an illness, nor do we countenance that almost frivolously expressed view that homosexuality in itself merely represents a variant sexual preference, with the implication that it is abnormal only because society has traditionally disapproved of it.

"The so-called scientific backing accumulated by the spokesmen for the various Gay Liberation groups that implies homosexuality is a variation of normalcy is, for the most part, poorly conceived both conceptually and methodologically."

With regard to the moral issue, I am not aware any of the great religions of the world give credence to the belief that homosexual behaviour is a newly emerging, acceptable and normal social behaviour designed for our "modern times." Nor can the argument for normalcy be made on the broad grounds of natural law and social function.

Suffice to say at this time that I am opposed to this bill, which if enacted would in essence be an accommodation by the state for those in our community who seek a new morality for our society.

Mr. Conway: That's Herbert Spencer upside down.

Mr. Williams: The common good would not be served by this type of legislative action.

[5:15]

Ms. Sandeman: I think, Mr. Speaker, the remarks we've just heard demonstrate better than anything any of us could say the extraordinarily complex nature of prejudice, bigotry, discrimination and fear which makes the private member's bill of my colleague from St. George necessary at this time.

Mr. Mancini: That's an unfair statement.

Ms. Sandeman: I don't intend to answer the remarks of the member for Oriole. I believe he made very much the same speech the last time that the member for St. George introduced her private member's bill on the same subject. But I do feel that in some sense further debate on this subject is unnecessary, because it should be self-evident that we must protect people's civil rights. The previous speaker has made it clear to me that it is not yet self-evident and that we must do, symbolically and by token, what we can to protect the rights of everyone.

The question as to the prematurity of this discussion, which the member for Oriole touched on, I think is a red herring. It is never premature to try to protect the civil rights of any group in our society. We don't have to wait for commissions to complete their work, for legislative procedures to grind on their slow way. In fact, I think in a sense we have to call the bluff of another legislative assembly—the Canadian Parliament—which, I understand, through the minister responsible for human rights at the federal level, is reluctant to include sexual orientation or sexual preference as part of the federal human rights legislation because the minister said:

"I have seen no sign from any provinces that they wish to include this in their legis-

lation. We'd like to see this being done across the country and this would give us some sense that the people of Canada wish to include this extra clause in the legislation."

I would like to say that we have a chance today to call the bluff of the federal Liberals, to give them a lead, to say to them clearly that the people of Ontario wish to include—

Mr. Conway: Give the federal Liberals a good kick.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes—wish to include the term "sexual orientation" in our human rights legislation because we are aware that contrary to the previous remarks, sexuality is part of a person's make-up. Just as our intellectual nature and our emotional nature are grounds on which I hope we would not discriminate, so should sexuality not be grounds for discrimination.

It seems to me there have been movements across the country to favour the inclusion of sexual orientation in human rights codes. The New Democratic Party in Ontario, Alberta and Saskatchewan has come out strongly in favour of including sexual orientation in both federal and provincial rights codes. The Windsor, Toronto and Ottawa city councils have already prohibited discrimination against city employees in hiring practices on the grounds of sexual orientation. The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour has addressed itself to the question of discrimination by labour bodies. It seems to me it's high time this Legislature gave a legislative lead in this area.

There has already been one landmark case in British Columbia, which, although it doesn't include sexual orientation as such in its human rights code, did rule in favour of —I can't find the gentleman's name—an action against the Vancouver Sun, which was discriminating against a homosexual group in that province. The ruling, I think, of the BC rights commission is something that perhaps we should take into account as some kind of counter-argument to the remarks of the member for Oriole. I won't read all of it, but I think it is an important ruling. It comes from a Human Rights Commission, and it reads in part this way:

"By recognizing that homosexuals exist, society is simply acknowledging that there are, in fact, people who do have what is, for them at least, a quite natural ability to relate sexually and emotionally to others of the same sex. By accepting this fact, society is having regard to the preponderance of evidence and professional opinion that exists to the effect that homosexuality is not an illness and not a mental disorder and that it is a predominant and permanent characteristic of a significant portion of our population, perhaps as much as 10 per cent thereof."

The ruling concludes by saying:

"So it is that we can safely conclude that the acceptable standard of decency which we wish our society to maintain is in no way threatened or challenged by our taking, as a society, a tolerant and mature approach to those homosexuals who are not breaking the law and who seek only the right to live normally in society without fear of persecution or discrimination."

It seems to me that although we know that human rights codes—and The Ontario Human Rights Code is no exception—traditionally have no teeth in them, we must make this symbolic gesture. We might then be able to prevent the kind of discrimination which we saw at York University last year, when York University refused to rent double rooms to unmarried persons of the same sex, although they accepted that a young man and woman could rent a double room with a double bed. There seemed to be some discrimination shown because they wouldn't rent the same room to two young women.

As an aside, I would like to say that social mores have certainly changed since I was at university 25 years or so ago. In those days my university would cheerfully have rented the room to myself and a female friend, but they would never ever have rented the room to myself and a young male friend. It seems to me that we should have reached the stage in 1977 where we say to people, "If you and friend of whatever sex wish to rent this double room, you may."

Mr. Bullbrook: You were born too soon.

Ms. Sandeman: I know. That's our tragedy.

Mr. Conway: Who says the Attorney General doesn't have influence!

Ms. Sandeman: If we find that people at universities or whatever are discriminating against the renting of accommodation on grounds such as these, then we certainly need the amendment that has been introduced today.

It seems to me we still might find that the CBC ban on public service announcements for gay groups would have a possibility of continuing, although I assume that—

Mr. Bullbrook: Does that really exist?

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, it does. The CBC refused to accept public service announcements from homosexual groups. That was in Halifax, I believe; not necessarily right across the country. I hope the section of the code that addresses itself to denying services or facilities in any place to which the public is customarily admitted would cover that kind of discrimination.

Discrimination is so often happening in small ways—important to the victims of it; not obvious to the rest of us—but in very insidious ways based on prejudice and ignorance, which the symbolic action of including this in The Human Rights Code would go some long way to correcting.

Mr. Sweeney: Thank you for the opportunity to speak, Mr. Speaker, despite the statement you made at the beginning.

My feelings are very similar to those of my colleague from St. George when she referred to the anguish—I guess that is the only word I can think of—of listening to, speaking to, trying to understand and trying to be of assistance to young persons who find themselves to be homosexuals. This is something that in my experience, as a teacher of many years, having worked in many different ways, that people deliberately come to; they simply find it's there.

I agree with my colleague from St. George that such people are very vulnerable in our society today. For that reason, I applaud her courage in introducing this bill. And it does take courage to introduce a bill like this in our society today.

But—and, unfortunately, there's always a "but"—there is another group of people in our society which is equally, if not more, vulnerable. That is our children and adolescents. While I can completely agree with the member for St. George that among adults such legislation is needed in our society, I have one grave reservation. I would not be prepared to support this, or any similar legislation, if it gives equal access to homosexuals dealing with children.

For example, I would be one of those who, as a parent and as a teacher, would have to feel that equal access should not be given to those teaching in our schools. My reason is that my experience, both as a parent and as a teacher, shows me that young people, particularly adolescents, are going through the emotional stress of trying to find out who they really are and what their own orientation is. They do not need to be put into the additional stressful situation of coming into contact with an adult model that presents to them a form of behaviour quite inconsistent with the norm. I believe we have to appreciate that homosexuals in our society face many problems. If there is any way we can prevent some of our young people from becoming homosexuals, we should do so.

We also have to recognize that homosexuals, because of the very nature of their concern, do not usually have children of their own. Therefore, it is only the children of others that they are able to influence. For that reason, and because there is nothing in this bill—and I haven't heard anyone speak to the point that would put that particular limitation in—I must say I will have to disagree with the bill, although I very clearly understand the impetus behind it. I say that our children and our adolescents have to take precedence in this matter.

Mr. Grossman: I rise to speak on this matter, as I did on a previous occasion. I think it's only appropriate to begin as I did on that earlier occasion—with part of the preamble to The Human Rights Code, which has been read earlier. It is public policy in Ontario that every person is "free and equal in dignity and rights, without regard to race, creed, colour, sex, marital status, nationality, ancestry or place of origin." That is the appropriate place to begin, it seems to me, because that's really what the debate today should be all about; that is—free and equal in dignity and rights. I think it is wrong, improper and irrelevant for any portion of the debate today, or any portion of any member's consideration with regard to this debate today, to be centred upon his or her personal feelings with regard to the subject matter at hand or those who would be directly affected by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Conway: Thanks for telling us the member for Oriole is irrelevant.

[5:30]

Mr. Grossman: The point at hand is whether each person in this province is entitled to some certain basic rights, regardless of what his personal situation might be. It no more requires one to put a stamp of approval on the subject matter at hand than to say that one by voting for any piece of legislation is putting an equivalent type of stamp of approval on a particular piece of protection that's being provided by The Human Rights Code.

What this bill is doing is saying, "Look, not only don't we care what you do privately, but we are willing to ensure that you will not be discriminated against because of what you happen to do privately." That's far from

approving it for those who seem to feel that supporting this legislation indicates approval or for those who want to mix this into their consideration of this legislation. It's not a stamp of approval. To those who want to continue to deal with this in terms of whether it is a sickness or a problem or however their minds want to deal with it, I say that's academic. Let them call it what they want but let them not permit people to discriminate against persons because of that sickness, infirmity, proclivity, or whatever it is they want to call it.

I don't want to get into a debate, nor do I think it's relevant to get into a debate, with regard to how one ought to define that certain pattern of behaviour. The question is should one be denied housing? Should one be denied employment because of that personal situation? That's the simple test. Is one not entitled to simple human rights in the very words of the title of the code? Isn't one entitled to that very basic protection?

I haven't heard anything today that says one should be denied the right to be employed like anyone else, or to be housed like anyone else. Unless one is prepared to say that, then one ought to be supporting this legislation.

I was shocked this afternoon when I wanted to look back at my earlier remarks on this subject, which were made on May 6, 1976, and I took out the index of debates and proceedings of the second and third sessions of the 30th Legislature. I looked up the index and where do you think this debate is indexed. Unbelievably, it is indexed under "Deviant Persons." "Deviant Persons" that's where one will find what everyone said in this debate last year.

Mr. Conway: Beware of the index

Mr. Grossman: I think it is highly improper. I think it indicates, however inadvertently this may have occurred, the subconscious way in which certain persons are quite liable to treat persons about whom we are talking today, and indicates the very need for this legislation. That's precisely why they have to have their rights protected under The Human Rights Code.

Imagine this documents, this book—an official book, the debates and proceedings—in which this debate last year was categorized under "Deviant Persons." I can't understand it, but I say that in itself speaks volumes, speaks directly to the subject and says exactly and more precisely than any of us could that certain persons in our society need protection in order to be able to walk around with dignity.

Let me say that the problem of this legislation inviting or appearing to invite persons to enter educational institutions in particular or allow it or whatever, in order to kind of propagate, sell or whatever, homosexuality gives me a lot of trouble. I am able and willing to support this legislation on the presumption and the hope that if it is passed, and it is with this presumption that the member for St. George will refer this matter to committee so that the committee may deal with that problem at that time.

It is important in the face of the snide remarks one hears in the halls of Queen's Park and in the halls of schools and in the halls of any place of assembly and on the streets and in schoolyards—everywhere from law courts to I don't know where, but you hear them everywhere—to realize it should be the case that dignity and self-respect are what a democracy is all about. Regardless of what type of private behaviour one is protecting, one must provide that protection. Let us have no more overt, never mind covert—we can only control overt activities—let us not have any more overt activities such as a description of deviant persons in books and annals of this assembly.

Mr. di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I rise in favour of Bill 16, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, if for no other reason than the reasons given by the member for Oriole. He is not irrelevant as the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick said, but it is his expression of prejudice and expression of a discriminating mentality that is dangerous in our society and that we should eliminate.

In discussing the actual content of the bill, we must not lose sight of the fact that we are not giving any special right to homosexuals. Rather, we are giving them the same fundamental right heterosexuals have, not to be harassed or dismissed on the basis of their sexual preference. Most heterosexuals could not even conceive of such a reason being based against them, yet it is a fact of life for many homosexuals. Discrimination in this respect, denying homosexuals the opportunities available to others, is as destructive and threatening to a free society as any other form of discrimination.

On discrimination itself there are those in this House and elsewhere who might try to justify discrimination against homosexuals, and the member for Oriole gave us an example before. One of the most frequent arguments used against homosexuals is that they are

harmful to society. Not knowing much about the subject before Bill 16 was introduced, I spent some time reading material on homosexuality, and I found also the concept of deviance mentioned before by the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick. I might suggest to those members speaking against the restoration of this basic right to non-discrimination in employment to do the same—to read a little.

With respect to deviance in general I found that the term, though used in a pejorative way, is in fact neutral. The authors I read suggested that deviance merely characterized a difference in direction between one group or individual and the majority. There is no question, therefore, that homosexuals are, in one sense, deviant.

They are estimated to form no more than 10 per cent of the population. Bill 16, if passed, will strengthen the social fabric in Ontario and put this Legislature on record as saying that the rights of all minorities are protected—not only those who are more visible, due to colour or religion, but those in the less visible minorities.

Professor Baz, a professor of sociology, suggests in his book a means by which we should judge deviance, and I quote: "Both deviance and conformity must be examined and judged according to the social cost that they exact and the contribution that they make to society." Let us in this Legislature strike that balance by recognizing that the real problem of discrimination in employment is not the orientation of the homosexual employee, but rather intolerance and prejudice. Let us put the case of John Damien and other wrongfully dismissed homosexuals in a proper perspective. Let's guarantee the right of gay people to follow the opportunities and protections everyone else has and expects.

On the topic of the homosexuals themselves, there are some who would argue that these are not quite as bad as they say. Some would also argue that homosexuals have the same rights as anyone else; but that is not the case. In 1974, the Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University compiled the results of an 11-page survey sent out to over 3,000 homosexuals in the United States. All of the results were statistically significant. To demonstrate the great feeling of repression and alienation in the homsexual community, let us look at a few of the questions asked and the responses.

One of the questions was, "Would there be problems at work if people found out that you were a homosexual?" Seventy-six per cent of the respondents said there would be problems; almost half of these said the problems would be quite serious.

Another question was, "How do you think most people feel about homosexuals?" Sixty-seven per cent of those answering said they felt most people were disgusted by, repelled by, or simply disliked homosexuals.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it must be like to live with constant fear, the fear of losing one's job, of being exposed or of losing one's self-respect? I would submit this is not a fair burden for the homosexual to bear.

As for the actual extent of the problem, the respondents were asked, in the same survey if they had ever lost a job because of their sexual orientation. Sixteen per cent of those answering said yes. If these figures are the same for Ontario—and I doubt they are substantially different—this is a disgrace. Even one tenth of one per cent would be too many losing their jobs for being homosexual.

Thus far, I have dealt with two questions: those of the homosexual's problems and of deviance in general. The third thing I would like to turn to is our role as legislators in this whole debate. Researchers for the Institute for Sex Research in Indiana concluded their study by noting that, "Research on racial minorities has shown that one of the more effective ways to make society's reaction less negative is to change the institution that sustains discrimination. When this is done, a change in industrial attitudes often follows."

Bill 16 addresses one of the primary targets for change: discrimination in employment. Until we, as legislators, make a firm commitment to the right to employment, this discrimination will continue.

Once again, summing up, I would urge all members present to support Bill 16 and end discrimination against homosexuals in employment.

[5:45]

Mr. Speaker: I understand the member for St. George had four or five minutes left which she might wish to use.

Mrs. Campbell: Some things have been said in the course of this debate that bother me somewhat, Mr. Speaker. The member for St Andrew-St. Patrick spoke of whether or not this bill provided for the proselytizing in the schools. If the Attorney General were in this House, I think he would recall a period in 1973, when three candidates for the riding of St. George were asked by the gay community whether we would permit the pro-

selytizing of homosexuality in the schools. As I recall it, the Attorney General at that point said he wasn't very much aware of the situation and therefore had no opinion. The present member for St. George said no, as indeed did the member of the triumvirate on that occasion representing the NDP.

There is nothing in this bill that talks about proselytizing and there certainly is no such intent. As far as I am concerned, the whole matter of sex education in the schools has to be very much improved before anyone should go into proselytize at all. I understand the concerns, and they are honest concerns, of those who feel that the young in our community possibly could become influenced by homosexuals. But there is simply no evidence at all that this exists in our society, that children are any more influenced by homosexuals than they are by heterosexuals who indicate behaviour that probably no one in this House would accept.

I find it difficult, having regard to my career of concern for children, that anyone would suggest or think I would be promoting something that could harm children. We have rapists at large in our community and we don't worry about whether or not they are in the schools. But I suppose there is a very good reason for that. We have never felt rapists should have anything other than the full protection of the law of evidence and of everything else. I become somewhat angered when I find we so placidly accept that situation and then find all sorts of ways to defeat the very simple purpose, which is to give equality and dignity to a group in the community.

Sufficient members having objected by rising, a vote was not taken on Bill 33.

Mr. Cassidy: Shame. It is a shame, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. So are the interjections.

Mr. Renwick: It is parliamentary, though.

Sufficient members having objected by rising, a vote was not taken on Bill 16.

Mr. MacDonald: What are you people doing? Destroying the private members' hour?

Mr. Cassidy: You are making a mockery of it.

Mr. MacDonald: You won't even allow a free vote. It's disgraceful.

Mr. Wildman: We are back to where we were under the old rules.

Mr. Lawlor: Still the old superiority complex.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill 28, An Act to amend the Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975 (2nd session).

The House recessed at 5:58 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 28, 1977

Physical fitness, statement by Mr. Welch 985

Township of Malden inquiry, statement by Mr. McKeough 985

Ministry of Labour Amendment Bill, statement by B. Stephenson 986

Junior Rangers, statement by Mr. F. S. Miller 987

Industrial waste disposal, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Bullbrook 988

South Cayuga land assembly, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 989

Barrie annexation proposal, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. S. Smith 989

Group home placements, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. McClellan, Mrs. Campbell 990

Capital works projects, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Swart, Mr. Deans 992

Environmental tax, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Bullbrook 993

Lap-seam boilers, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. G. E. Smith, Mr. Reed 994

Becker's Milk dispute, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Warner 994

Aid for senior citizens, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Reid 995

Richmond Hill nursing homes, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Stong 995

Medical services in northern Ontario, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Reid 996

Richmond Hill nursing homes, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Stong 996

Medical services in northern Ontario, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Ziemba 997

Kayson Plastics, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Davidson 997

Curriculum Connections, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Singer 997

Medical services in northern Ontario, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Reid 998

DRG Globe Envelopes Limited, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Grande 998

Group home placements, questions of Mr. Norton: Mrs. Campbell 999

Wintario funds, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Shore, Ms. Bryden 1000

Instant lottery, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Sargent 1001

Licence fees, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Bain 1001

On point of privilege re tabling of document, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. W. Newman 1001

Notices of dissatisfaction with answers to oral questions, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Bain, Mr. Deans 1002

Petition re French-language school in Essex county, Mr. Ruston 1002

City of Ottawa Act, Mr. Morrow, first reading 1002

Ministry of Labour Amendment Act, B. Stephenson, first reading 1002

City of Sault Ste. Marie Act, Mr. Lane, first reading 1002

Regional Municipalities Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1002

District Municipality of Muskoka Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1003

County of Oxford Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1003

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1003

Municipal Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1003
Public Utilities Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1003
City of Timmins-Porcupine Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 1003
Pension Benefits Amendment Act, Mr. Bain, first reading 1003
Gasoline and Heating Oil Uniform Pricing Act, Mr. Lane, first reading 1004
Township of Dover Act, Mr. Spence, first reading 1004
Village of Port McNicoll Act, Mr. G. E. Smith, first reading 1004
Condominium Amendment Act, Mr. Wildman, first reading 1004
John A. Schmaltz Agencies Limited Act, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading 1004
City of Toronto Act, Mr. Grossman, first reading 1004
Professional Fund-Raising Corporations Control Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 1004
Legislative schedule, Mr. Welch 1004
Private members' business re Patients' Rights Act, on second reading, Mr. Dukszta, Mr. Timbrell, Mr. Conway, Mr. McClellan, B. Stephenson, Mr. Stong, Ms. Sandeman 1005
Private members' business re Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, on second reading, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Williams, Ms. Sandeman, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Grossman, Mr. di Santo 1016
Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, in committee 1024
Recess 1024

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A.; Minister of the Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K., Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Acting Speaker (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Deputy Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)

Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)

Ontario

No. 25

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Thursday, April 28, 1977
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by The Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1977

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT
(continued)

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Any comments, questions or amendments to any section?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I had handed to me some 45 minutes ago, over the signature of the government House leader, a letter that says as follows:

"I am authorized to indicate that the government views protection for Ontario tenants, as embodied in the rent control legislation to be considered tonight by the committee of the whole House, as a matter of extreme importance to the government programme.

"Any failure to pass this legislation before May 1 by the Legislature, or any passage of an amendment lowering the guideline, would be an expression of a serious lack of confidence in the economic and social programme of the government, which the government would take very seriously indeed.

"The lowering of the guideline to six per cent from eight per cent would almost certainly cause many more landlord appeals, which would result in higher rents being paid by many, due to rising costs which could be shown during the appeal process. Incentives to further rental construction would be severely limited at a time when further rental construction is both needed and helpful to job creation in Ontario."

Mr. Chairman, my point of order is this. Not 24 hours ago we were asked by the government to agree to suspend the normal rules and to move to bills in order that passage could be obtained for this legislation, and we agreed.

Mr. Sweeney: It is what they call a double-cross.

Mr. Deans: We understood it was important to the tenants and the landlords of the province that, prior to May 1, there be legislation in force that would clearly set out the limits within which they should operate. What I do feel, sir, is that it would have been honourable, to say the least, had the government placed before us in addition to its request, its intention to consider the matter one of confidence.

Mr. Conway: Without honour—without honour.

Mr. Deans: I want to say to you, sir, that this party, having put before the government, on numerous occasions over a number of weeks, its intention to move to six per cent from eight per cent, doesn't intend to be intimidated by the government's views. We don't intend to allow this to interfere with what we consider to be the proper legislative processes, which allows the members of the—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Point of order?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: What is your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Point of order?

Mr. Deans: —Legislature to hear the debate on the matter and to come to conclusions at that time. We consider the government's motion and intention to be frivolous.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I feel some obligation—notwithstanding the fact that I haven't heard the point of order—to put on the record the events that have happened since yesterday. It is obvious, for reasons shared by all the members of this House, that it is necessary to put this particular legislation in place before the end of the month —before May 1.

Mr. Lewis: It is necessary for your silliness, your political silliness—

Hon. Mr. Welch: The point is that we were carrying on in the spirit—

Mr. Warner: It is transparent.

Mr. Lewis: Goodness—grown men and women.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —of consultation. There was, in fact, consultation as to whether or

not we could proceed with this particular legislation this evening. To suggest some other procedure should have been followed is beyond my comprehension, because that's exactly what we've been doing ever since the election of October 1975—in the spirit of consultation.

Mr. Davidson: Who wrote the letter?

Mr. Warner: It is your letter.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The question came up at noon hour today. The House leaders meet every Thursday at noon. The question was raised at that particular time as to the attitude and I indicated the matter was being reviewed and was being considered. At 4:30 this afternoon I indicated to the leaders I would like an opportunity to meet with them, and at 6 I suggested we could discuss it at 7 o'clock.

To suggest to the House that there hasn't been reporting and consultation in this matter is, I think, a very unfortunate impression to leave; notwithstanding the fact that I still don't know just exactly what point of order I am speaking to. I don't see the point of order.

Mr. Warner: Shame.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The bill has been referred to the committee for consideration. It is in proper form. I suggest we go ahead with debate on the clause by clause.

Mr. Breithaupt: Before that matter happened, Mr. Chairman, I did not have the full opportunity to hear the comments that went back and forth across the floor. However, I understand, having been somewhat involved with the situation, that my friend the member for Wentworth commented upon the efficacy of having—

[Applause.]

Mr. Lewis: Can we touch your garments? You should cross the floor.

Mr. Givens: The Messiah has come!

Mr. Good: It's the first time the Premier has been here for three days.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Kitchener has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition did touch my garments.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, could we have these two people seated, please?

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: As I said before I was so rudely interrupted, the efficacy of this letter has been discussed across the floor. It is clear that on consent, discussed by the House leaders and by various members of the caucuses, it was agreed that the House would go into committee of the whole to deal with this bill, and that was done some moments before 6 o'clock this evening. Whether a certain letter has been received, with contents that may or may not influence the results of government decisions after the committee deals with a certain bill in a certain way, is I should think of no particular consequence at this point in that we have agreed to go ahead with dealing with a certain bill.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, I too have received a certain letter.

Mr. Reid: "Dear Jim," it says.

Mr. Breithaupt: I was even apprised of certain other comments made, and I viewed various copies of the letter that the press had on hand when I happened to be approached a few moments before 8 o'clock.

Mr. Nixon: Dictated by Lester Davis.

Mr. Breithaupt: The end result, of course, is that we have received a certain letter which advises us as to attitudes which may or may not be taken as the debate on a certain bill proceeds. We have received the letter and we shall deal with the bill as we think best.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. We are considering Bill 28. Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section? If so, to which section?

Mr. Lewis: It has a very insidious effect on the speech habits over here.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Breaugh moves that section 1 of Bill 28 be amended by changing the number "eight," where it appears in subsection 1, to the number "six."

Mr. Breaugh: In discussing the bill, we have dealt with this bill in principle and covered the majority of the problems that deal with the rent review legislation in the province of Ontario. The amendment we are proposing now deals with the very crux of

the matter. In the second year of a programme designed by the federal government, to which this rent review programme is closely attached if not inseparably identified, there is this problem of everything else in the public and private sector being controlled at this level.

Without embracing a programme we do not like, we simply want to recognize very simply the numbers that are involved, because they are the important things. We are not given to long diatribes about what programmes we ought to attach ourselves to or what the federal government is doing. We want to address ourselves very directly to the concept of eight per cent or six per cent, and so our amendment is worded directly in that way.

We believe that if people have had their wages controlled to a six per cent level, and if other aspects of the economy that are controlled in that manner supposedly are controlled at that level, very simply the rents ought also to be set at that level.

As members of this House, we had presented to us this afternoon, and they were presented previously, a series of numbers that might indicate a higher level would be justified.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Last week, not this afternoon.

Mr. Breaugh: Oddly enough, it is a level which the government proposes in this particular legislation.

I want to point out to the members of this House that those numbers are, I think, presented in isolation; they do not reflect similar findings or similar studies done in other jurisdictions. Whatever numbers game anyone would care to play, the plain fact for tenants is very simply that you can't control their wages at one level and their rents at another. If you are entering into the kind of controlled economy that we are purporting to live in these days, then we ask for, at least, a measure of fairness.

We are going to propose—as we said in discussing this bill in principle—a number of items, a number of amendments that are substantive. We do not intend to spend a good deal of the House's time this evening dealing with whether we have used the proper wording or whether we have got the right "t" crossed. We want to deal substantively with the rent review programme in essence. We want to set a realistic figure in this particular subsection of six per cent; in other jurisdictions, like British Columbia or Quebec, it has been set at a lower level than this government proposes.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There is no guideline in Quebec.

Mr. Breaugh: One small irony that you might want to take note of is that in preparing its cost estimates—the ones that were distributed to the members of the House this afternoon—the government almost doubled the amount allowed for administrative costs, almost doubled the amount it previously gave its own rent review officers; in the rent review officers' manual they indicate that five per cent is a sufficient amount of allocation for administrative costs. Yet you find in the material distributed this afternoon, that it has jumped to nine per cent.

Mr. Conway: Sorcerers.

Mr. Warner: Shame.

Mr. Breaugh: We find that to be an inconsistent position for the government to take. We also find the numbers—the justification, for the eight per cent—to be insufficient; that does not stand up. I suppose that one could argue that next winter will be a very cold winter.

Mr. Grossman: For you it sure will.

Mr. Breaugh: But that's hardly fact just yet and hardly the basis for it. What we are proposing with our amendments is a rent review process that works and works well, that allows those people who want to go through the rent review process to have a full hearing; not to do it several times during the year, but to do it once; to clean up some of the obvious problems that have been found in the rent review legislation that now exists.

We think, Mr. Chairman, that a very basic premises for that is the guideline that is set. What we are saying is that it is a guideline, not a finite number; that the guideline ought to be a base number with which there is no argument from either side. That poses, in our view, that the guideline ought to set at the lower limit. That way we can handle a rent review process that is fair, that allows actual cost pass-throughs to be passed through; there is very little opposition in any quarter as to that being an agreeable and acceptable concept in rent review legislation. If there are actual costs—not projections, not magic numbers pulled out of a hat—they will be handled by the review process; which as I understand it is the reason we adopted a reviewing process, to have a fair hearing, to hear both sides of the argu-

ment, to look at the facts; to accept, if something is realistic and can be clearly established, that it be passed through.

In my experiences with rent review in the province of Ontario, everyone accepts that notion. What we are proposing in this specific amendment is the guideline.

What should it be? It is our estimation that six per cent is slightly high but it is a fair one. According to our calculations on what the guidelines should be, you could actually say that it could be 5.38 per cent, it could go that low; and you might take your projection up to 5.92 per cent. But, certainly, if you adopted a six per cent guideline that would be fair and adequate as a basis for rent review legislation in the province of Ontario. If costs actually go over that amount, you have the rent review process.

After all, we have the process in place and the government is not discarding the review concept. What we are saying is that since you have a base guideline that is there, that's acceptable to all concerned and realistic, then past that point you go to a review process where you analyse actual costs, where both sides have an opportunity to present their case; and that the review process itself is fair and workable.

We will propose four other amendments this evening, amendments that we think will clarify the reviewing process itself, will make it more fair both for landlords and tenants, and will account for anything that might be above the six per cent number.

[8:15]

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I want to put to you that if we are accepting, in the province of Ontario, that you have first and foremost a guideline presented, it ought to be a base guideline, and six per cent is a fair and equitable number to use and that is precisely what we have put. It's not jumping in bed with anything else, or complicating the issue with a long unsubstantiated set of numbers, but saying very straight that you want a base guideline and that above that guideline you deal with it in an effective review mechanism, which we are also proposing and certainly support, and that actual cost pass-throughs are certainly acceptable on both sides of the question but that you need an effective review mechanism to make that work.

That's what we support. We will support that continuously throughout this particular debate. Our amendments will be addressed specifically to make that an effective mechanism and the argument now is very straight and very simple: That your guideline number should be a base number, that it should be a realistic one and should not be inflated. In every other jurisdiction we have looked in, specifically in terms of British Columbia where a rather serious study was done, six per cent is a reasonable base guideline. If you go above that, you run through the review process and that is fair and we accept and support that notion.

But I want to put to the House very clearly that we do not support any jacking around with this particular scheme, any manipulation of numbers, any very complicated thing, because it is a very simple issue. It is a very simple issue of establishing a base guideline of six per cent, which is a fair base guideline, and above that you use the review process as the entire legislation is designed to do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer).

Mr. Shore: Where is the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson), a specialist in housing?

Mr. Breithaupt: He is off doing good works.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order. Order, please.

Perhaps before I recognize the hon. member, does the minister wish to respond to the—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes I do, if I may. I listened with some interest to the hon. member both during second reading and again tonight and I heard him refer to other jurisdictions that he has looked at. I don't know of a single jurisdiction that has a six per cent guideline. Perhaps he would enlighten us. He has a chance to speak again on this.

The jurisdictions to the west of us have 10 and nine; the jurisdiction to the east of us has no guideline, it's a completely tenant-initiated programme. The tenant can appeal any increase, as under ours. We have given you figures and the hon. member has confused, again, what we are telling our rent review officers in the bulletins—the five per cent that it refers to is not an inflation factor. It's not an inflation factor. The factor we have given you is 20 for administrative costs, as an inflation factor not a portion of rent. I think he should learn to read figures, Mr. Chairman. But again—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —the member said that everything in the private and the public sector is six per cent. Well municipal taxes are going up 13.

Ms. Gigantes: Congratulations.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Maintenance and repairs, 10. And I could go on and on. There isn't a single one that's under 10 per cent.

Mr. Warner: You are responsible.

Mr. Davidson: Your government is doing it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Now, the hon. member is suggesting that he has taken six per cent because—

Mr. Martel: Except wages.

Mr. Shore: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere would do better in public accounts if he kept quiet.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: He has picked out of the anti-inflation guidelines a figure of six per cent, which relates to wages, and he wants to make this programme, which is a cost-through programme, rental according to income. It never has been that. It's not intended to be that and the government will oppose this amendment with every force that we have.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Perth has the floor.

Interjections.

Mr. Grossman: Think it over, Hughie.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In the churches, on the streets, in the schools.

Some hon. members: That's scarey!

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister has completed his remarks.

Mr. Breithaupt: We had hoped so, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. member: We oppose them.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Perth will continue uninterrupted.

Mr. Edighoffer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I have given, I believe, sufficient notice to the Chair, to the minister and to the opposition critic that I wish to place an amendment as well. I wondered if I could have a little guidance from the Chair whether I should wait and place that after this first amendment has been dealt with, or should I place it as a subamendment?

Mr. Chairman: Is it an amendment or an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. Breithaupt: It is an amendment.

Mrs. Campbell: It is a different amendment.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: You may place it now, but if it doesn't have the effect of amending the original amendment, we will have to deal with them individually.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, if I might speak to that particular item, it would be our view that the amendment which we are placing is to some extent dealing, of course, with the particular, same situation. We would ask the concurrence of the Chair to deal with the first amendment and then to deal with the second amendment, so that we would have the approach that has been used in this House a number of times to otherwise avoid the passage of a section once the first amendment might have been rejected.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I might speak on that point, Mr. Chairman, we would agree entirely with the member for Kitchener that that's the procedure we would like to see followed.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Is there any further discussion on the amendment proposed by the member for Oshawa?

Mr. Edighoffer: I would just like to say very briefly that, of course, we realize what this amendment will do in effect. We in this caucus have decided there is another method that would be much more satisfactory to amending this legislation. Therefore, we in this party would not be able to support the amendment which simply replaces the figure "six" for the figure "eight."

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to use—

(Applause.)

Mr. Breithaupt: They really have to be better trained than that.

Mr. Lewis: That's the problem when there's no cultist tendencies in the party. But I am pleased to rise on the last night of this Parliament to participate in this debate—

Mr. Breithaupt: Don't presume too much. You may be here for a long time yet.

Mr. Lewis: This evening, but not much beyond.

Mr. Breithaupt: Perhaps tomorrow? Or for several other days?

Mr. Bain: That depends on the Premier.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, further to the reference at the outset to the letter from the government House leader, which places this debate in a particular context, frankly it appears to us as simply silly.

Mr. Chairman: You must deal specifically with the amendment proposed by the member for Oshawa.

Mr. Lewis: I am doing that; and I'm saying, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I'm listening very carefully.

Mr. Lewis: You always do, sir.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We shared information all through this Parliament.

Mr. Lewis: If you need a rationale it can't be this flimsy, my friend. It's got to be better than that.

Mr. Chairman: That's not at issue.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order. That's not at issue. We're dealing specifically with the amendment proposed by the member for Oshawa which would change Oshawa, section 1 of Bill 28.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which one are you smiling at?

Mr. Lewis: I think everyone views this whole procedure as government by shenanigans. However, I will address myself to the section.

We have moved the amendment to bring the rate of increase to six per cent as an extension of the position that we have put on behalf of those who are tenants in Ontario, we felt legitimately, for a considerable period of time; while still and always feeling that the position of the developer and owner is protected: (a) by virtue of the six per cent being fair and (b) by virtue of the review process to which every owner and every tenant is entitled to turn.

What is emerging here during the course of the—

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: Pardon? The same is true of eight per cent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You don't understand—

Mr. Chairman: I will recognize the Premier next if he wants to engage in the debate.

Mr. Breithaupt: If he can get the Chairman's eye.

Mr. Lewis: Please, Mr. Chairman. be more deferential towards the Premier. Me, you can abuse.

May I say to the House that what is emerging here tonight, in the debate which is taking place on the motion put by my colleague from Oshawa, is obviously that some of us would wish the six per cent to be instituted immediately—that is, effective on August 1 next, I guess—and some would wish to have it effective 10 weeks after that, on October 14 next. That's essentially what it's about, and this clause speaks to the validity of the six per cent being applied now.

I say to the minister that we have not in any sense been entirely ensnared by the question of the AIB and the guidelines. There may be a rationale for tying it to a figure under which most of Ontario now works and receives wages, which will be in the range of six per cent if you fall in the AIB programme. But there are separate and independent arguments and rationale which we want to put to the House in the strongest possible spirit. The figures which were presented to the Legislature by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations say that the inflation factor for landlords amounts to 8.65 per cent, the net impact on the rent increase is 8.65 per cent.

He says that the total operating costs represent 55 per cent of all costs. The net impact on the rent would be 8.65 per cent and that presumably is why he has chosen eight per cent at this point in time; and in the process he estimates cost attributions related to municipal taxes, maintenance and repairs, administrative costs, fuel costs, electricity and water costs, and he adds them all together and says they represent 55 per cent of total operating costs. Then he introduces a number of inflation factors and comes out at the other end with a figure

of 8.65 per cent as the net impact on rent increases.

We take serious exception to two of his specific designations. For administrative costs, he says that they assume nine per cent now of the proportion of rent and he will apply an inflation factor of 20 per cent. We point out that regularly at his own rent review hearings, the portion of rent allowed by virtue of administrative costs is five per cent. That's all that it's allowed. That's what happens at rent review hearings. Surely you know that. Already you have inflated the original figure almost double, and therefore your inflation factor is completely without foundation.

So this is what we have done. We have cut it in half. We are allowing an inflation factor of 10 per cent because you have doubled the legitimate percentage proportion of administrative costs.

Now the second point: You have put in for fuel costs an inflation factor of some 30 per cent. You have done it on the basis of alleged volume over the winter months. You have done it on the basis of increases in oil and natural gas, which are really quite astronomical for a government which digs its heels in so firmly against increases. For people who say they will allow no increases, the government has computed 20 per cent in for the next year. It can't have it both ways. If Jim Taylor is going to get up in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, and beat his breast about standing firm against the west and Ottawa, there is a slight inconsistency in assuming a 20 per cent capitulation off the bat. What's wrong with you? What's wrong with you?

Mr. Chairman, that trifle aside, that gap in logic aside, I say with respect to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations that the 30 per cent is ridiculous. Even in terms of a cold winter next year approximating this one—and God knows this one was the coldest in how long? I think 340 recorded years or something—as a matter of fact it pre-dates the Tories, which says something.

Mr. Conway: But only just.

Mr. Breithaupt: They haven't been in power that long surely.

Mr. Lewis: May I say that even including major increases—we are not going to vary it by much—we are suggesting to you an inflation factor of 20 per cent rather than 30 per cent as being far more realistic. That would make slight alterations in the net impact on rent which you have calculated at 8.65.

But let me tell you, Mr. Minister, where we really take issue with you. When you have added up all these designated areas of cost attribution, you say that represents total operating costs approximating 55 per cent. Fifty-five per cent of total operating costs are covered by municipal taxes, maintenance and repairs, administrative costs, fuel costs, electricity and water costs.

Let me read to you from the report on rents done in British Columbia, which you never did, where they examined—

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second now. They examined 198 rental projects. Let me read you the finding of the report: "The average apartment building uses 46.2 per cent of its revenue to pay for its operating expenses, inclusive of municipal taxes."

[8:30]

Mr. Shore: Because the rents are higher.

Mr. Lewis: "The remaining 53.8 per cent represents the owner's return and includes the money used to pay off the mortgages." In other words—

Mr. Shore: In other words, the rents are higher.

Mr. Lewis: —in BC it's 46 per cent, but in Ontario you calculate 55 per cent.

Mr. Shore: What about the heating out there?

Mr. Lewis: Just a moment.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for London North please try to restrain himself.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, he was far more effective from this side than he is from that side.

I want to make the other point. If you reject the 46 per cent figure, we then went to the CMHC today and we asked them, how much do you tabulate for operating costs as a percentage of total cost for private or public projects in the province of Ontario? You know what they said? An upper limit of 45 per cent and a lower limit of 42 per cent. How is it that the only study on record shows 46 per cent, and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation says 42 per cent to 45 per cent, including a whole range of private and public projects in Ontario, and you designate 55 per cent? I'll tell you why; because you're inflating your figures in order to justify an illegitimate level, that's what it's all about.

Let me say through the Chair, respectfully to the minister, that if you take the figures which are acceptable to CMHC and are obviously authenticated by other studies, and you apply them to the figures you've used for proportion of rent to a realistic inflation factor, you know what you come out with? My colleague from Oshawa said it, you come out with a net impact on rent increases of 5.3 per cent or 5.9 per cent, somewhere in that area; in other words the six per cent covering it quite adequately.

That's why, in every sense, on the basis of I think legitimate analysis and legitimate information, we feel it should be six per cent now. I suspect, Mr. Premier, through the Chair, we're not going to receive support for this in the House tonight. The government, when it is defeated, will probably be defeated on a motion which says we should delay the six per cent by 10 weeks. We're not people to cavil, we want to point out to the minister opposite that there is a rationale now in the province of Ontario to go to six per cent, to give the tenants that protection.

May I say, Mr. Minister, that your observation about what the landlords will do are not generously welcomed on this side of the House. The landlords have the right to go to rent review, yes, and believe me if they weren't satisfied with eight per cent now they'd be going. And if they can justify more than six per cent they still have the right to go, no one denies that. You shouldn't be inviting them to turn on the tenants of Ontario if we reduce it to six per cent tonight, and that's what you're doing.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Come on.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Shame.

Mr. Lewis: There's no need for that, it's in the legislation.

Mr. Nixon: You're giving them an argument that pre-judges the decision. You certainly are.

Mr. Lewis: That's right, you are prejudging. As a matter of fact, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk makes a good point, because you're almost signalling to your rent review officers what you want found when cases come before them, and that prejudices the legislation.

Mr. S. Smith: Exactly.

Mr. Nixon: They will be quoting you.

Mr. Lewis: But it was pointed out in an interjection by the leader of the Liberal Party the other day that you've allowed, in your own legislation, the right to revise downwards the eight per cent. Sure; you've allowed it in this legislation. Why would you do that? Is it the hobgoblin of Sidney Handleman's mind? No. Is it perhaps the strategy of the government? Yes.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's not that small.

Mr. Lewis: What we would like to do is do it for you. As a matter of fact, we'd like to do it in advance of the epic event that is coming rather than have it done at some future occasion. It's fairly straightforward. The six per cent is legitimized now and there's no reason in the world why it shouldn't be sustained now.

For all those reasons, for making rent review work—and we are going to provide some amendments—we would like this House to accept the six per cent at this moment and to conduct the debate in good faith on the basis of the figures before us, as I think we've tried to indicate to you, and based on the information we have. For heaven's sake, it's not a major departure to set a level which can be justified and useful for the tenants of Ontario in allowing avenues of review.

If I may add as an addendum as I sit down, Mr. Chairman, to turn the difference between eight per cent and six per cent into a matter of confidence, frankly, is ludicrous and unworthy of a debate of this importance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Ruston: He's coming out of the bullpen. John Hiller is coming in now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, Mr. Hiller had not a bad record, if memory serves me correctly. You would know that.

Mr. Ruston: He was in my club.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am doing my very best not to be provoked—

Mr. Breithaupt: Or provocative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —or provocative. But out of deference to you—

Mr. Chairman: So am I.

Mr. Nixon: What else is new? He wants you to get a new line.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the night will really determine—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, no! Such sweet innocence.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't, I don't. I live in hope that sweet reason will prevail, but I somehow doubt it when I look over here.

Mr. Nixon: Support our amendment then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I've given up in terms of the opposition with respect to sweet reason.

I want to say very simply, Mr. Chairman, that I honestly don't know what the night will hold for all of us. But you, sir, have been—and may still be, depending on what happens—an excellent chairman.

Mr. Reid: That was a bit of a Freudian slip, there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean, Freudian? Nothing Freudian about it.

Mr. Lewis: That was as bad as that Camille Laurin.

Mr. Sweeney: It's strictly "Davonian."

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. It might be intentional; who knows?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. We are dealing with Mr. Breaugh's motion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, we are, Mr. Chairman. I sense that in the Leader of the Opposition's observations, he addressed all of his remarks specifically to that amendment, including his last observations. And I am sure you will allow me the same brief latitude and opportunity to express my own. I was interested in the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that certain shenanigans were being performed in this Legislature tonight.

Mr. Deans: Absolutely right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the Leader of the Opposition and the NDP House leader that what we're seeing here tonight is opposition by opportunism. It's as simple as that. They know it, and I know it.

Mr. Reid: It's election by opportunism.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They're just using this as a political opportunity—

Mr. Lewis: I am wounded. Call me a socialist, but not an opportunist.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would have to say to the Leader of the Opposition—we know each other very well—a socialist he is; a political opportunist, on occasion, he is. He knows that, and I know that.

Mr. Reid: Not as much as the Premier is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, shame, shame.

Mr. Lewis: What a flimsy pretext this is!

Mr. Deans: Any excuse.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Any excuse for what?

Mr. Deans: Any excuse for an election.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I think that it would be an opportune time to come back to the amendment we are dealing specifically with.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think you are quite right. I mean, when the NDP House leader interjects, "Any excuse," heavens above, he has been trying to pass motions of no confidence since we resumed.

Mr. Deans: That's because I have no confidence in you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's fine; then don't say we're looking for an excuse. You're the people who want an election and it's going to be brought about because of you, and you know it.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You've said so; you've said so.

Mr. Reid: You underestimate the intelligence of the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, your own leader said it in Exeter last night.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I've discussed with the Speaker that there may be some problems tonight—

Mr. Reid: That's why he's not here.

Mr. Chairman: —and it is the prerogative of the chairman of the committee of the whole to suspend proceedings if he finds it necessary.

Mr. Nixon: You did that last night.

Mr. Chairman: I hope it won't be necessary.

We're dealing specifically with Mr. Breaugh's amendment to section 1 of Bill 28, and I'm not going to listen to anything other than direct reference to that amendment.

An hon. member: Why didn't you say that before?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that was unfair.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I certainly will respect your observations and—

Mr. Nixon: That is a ruling.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —a ruling—and assume that it will apply during the course of the balance of the evening.

Mr. Breithaupt: We fervently hope so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the member for Oshawa's proposed amendment, which I gather the Liberal Party of this province is not going to support—and I think they show very excellent judgment that far—that far—

Mr. Worton: That's correct.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's called being damned with fair praise.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Can I point out to the members of this House, Mr. Chairman—and I really don't expect that they will be persuaded—that there are two or three very basic considerations, and the Leader of the Opposition, in his very simplistic way of dealing with figures, ignores of course some of the relevant concerns that any government must have. Those concerns are very simply having a system that works, a system that protects the legitimate concerns of the tenants of this province, understands the needs for further construction and development of rental accommodation, the need to create more job opportunities—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —which, Mr. Chairman, I say with respect, that amendment will totally inhibit and that is the concern of this government. You people—

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You people talk about concern for the tenants. You're prejudicing the tenants with this amendment. It's as simple as that, you are.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You know, the legislation was very carefully drafted. It gave the flexibility and does give the flexibility to adjust.

Mr. Shore: Right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's something that is important in terms of the longer term interests of the tenants of this province which you people across the House are totally ignoring.

You have no understanding of how the system works. You have no appreciation of what you're doing, potentially, to the tenants of Ontario; and we are not, as a government, going to allow it to happen, it's as simple as that.

And you know, Mr. Chairman, I hope I'm on the subject—

Mr. Reid: You'll never sell that line.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, you wait. You wait.

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: You will never sell it. You brought it in only against your will.

Mr. Shore: It sells itself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, another matter that I think is very relevant—you know, it's not just a philosophical consideration, it's a very practical one—

Mr. Sargent: Your main thrust is for capital development.

Mr. Shore: Another socialist.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the only long-term solution to this total problem is the creation of far more rental accommodation.

Interjections.

An hon. member: We're disappointed in you.

An hon. member: What have you been doing for 34 years?

An hon. member: You're dead right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right, that's right. It's the only solution, and very simply, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Reid: Who was in power when the shortage was created?

Mr. Breithaupt: What have you done for six years?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This amendment would totally inhibit, totally inhibit, that potential.

Mr. Chairman, we're all concerned in this House about employment. We're concerned about job opportunities, and I say with respect to the members opposite this will further inhibit employment in the province of Ontario; and don't say to us in one breath, more employment, and then try to pass this kind of amendment.

Interjections.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now you are getting political.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we're taking this debate on this bill seriously. We have stated it is a matter of confidence as far as this government it concerned. I'm disappointed that the members opposite would reduce this kind of debate to this kind of discussion we've had here tonight, because they're completely missing the point.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sargent: Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I would say to the member for Grey-Bruce I'm delighted to hear his observations at some point down the road.

Mr. Sargeant: You are disappointed—with 300,000 people out of work?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the member for Grey-Bruce there are more people unemployed than any of us can tolerate. I would say to him, when he votes against this amendment, it will be because he knows—he knows—that it is going to make the problem more difficult rather than finding a solution, no question about it.

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) admired him.

[8:45]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members opposite in conclusion, they may not think this is serious but this government does. We stand by the bill that has been presented after very careful consideration by the minister responsible—we are doing it for the short-term and long-term interests of the tenants of this province. We want to see more accomomdation built. We want to see more employment. That is why we are going to vote against that amendment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth now has the floor.

Mr. Deans: Thank you very much. I hadn't asked for it before.

Mr. Chairman: You took it, though.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, the Premier makes reference to the fact that we are dealing with this legislation. I want to deal with this legislation and nothing else. I want first of all to say I would have assumed that the legislation, having been properly researched, would have presented accurate statistics to the Legislature to deal with the cost inflationary factors.

We have found in our review of what was presented to the Legislature that it is wanting in a number of different areas. We have found in reviewing the legislation and the proposed eight per cent level that the eight per cent reflects not only the legitimate inflation factors but a level of inflation far in excess of that which any reasonable person could expect in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Norton: You are ignoring the facts.

Mr. Deans: The Premier speaks of the need to have further rental accommodation built. This government under this Premier has been in office now for about seven years. I want to say that if there is a problem in rental construction it can be blamed only on this government of Bill Davis.

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: I want to say further to the House that if the Premier doesn't accept the responsibility during his term of office, then if he wishes he can pass it on to Conservative governments that preceded him. But whatever is wrong in the construction industry in the province of Ontario as it applies to rental accommodation must be faced by this Conservative government because this Conservative government and Conservative governments that preceded it have had ample opportunity to resolve the difficulties.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Give us a chance.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not after 34 years, not another chance.

Mr. Deans: This government, through its Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, has suggested to the Legislature that eight per cent is an adequate figure. We have, after very careful consideration and research, determined that eight per cent is completely out of line with those figures used by other agencies for the purposes of computing cost attribution.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Which ones?

Mr. Deans: We have determined that the government has built in inflationary factors that are not realistic in accordance with the system in operation in the province of Ontario today.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Which other agencies are you talking about?

Mr. Deans: We have suggested to the government that if it were to use, as my leader has said and as the member for Oshawa has said, the statistics and the studies that are on record, it would have come to a realization that it couldn't justify more than 45 per cent to 50 per cent as being attributed to municipal taxes, maintenance and repairs, administrative costs, fuel costs and electricity and water costs.

We are suggesting to the government that if it wants to sell its eight per cent then it has to be able to produce not only some kind of pie in the sky view based on an attempt to provide additional revenue for the developer in the province of Ontario and the apartment owner in the province of Ontario, but has to present to the Legislature statistics based on the common usage by most people operating in the apartment industry. That is what the government has not done.

We suggest, for example, the government puts the position that it has to allow a 30 per cent inflation factor in fuel costs because we might have an extremely cold winter in the coming year. I want to tell the House that if the government is going to base fuel costs on last winter, which was by any standard exceptional—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That is the cost we are talking about.

Mr. Deans: —if the government is going to base it on that for the recovery of costs in 1977 and 1978—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: 1977.

Mr. Deans: —then I suggest that is totally wrong.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's 1977 costs, my friend.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You don't understand rent review, how it works.

Mr. Deans: No, that is totally wrong.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It was this winter. Do you know what year we are in? Let's find out what year we are in before you talk.

Mr. Deans: I know; 1977-78 we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You think we're working against next year.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No, we are talking about 1977.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The minister will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Deans: I also want to suggest to the minister that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which is very much in the field —and the minister knows this—and even Ontario Housing Corporation, which is very much in the field, does not allow 55 per cent for the combination of administrative and operating costs. Ontario Housing Corporation doesn't allow that high a level, and if it doesn't, and this is a government agency of the province of Ontario, how then can that calculation be made for the purposes of the private sector?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Fifty-five per cent of what?

Mr. Deans: I want to suggest, further, that since there is a very clear avenue for landlords to come before the board and to explain and to prove any cost above what is reasonable, we are not depriving one single person of recovering any legitimate costs if we set the level at six per cent.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Oh, yes you are.

Mr. Deans: Not one single person.

Interjection.

Mr. Deans: But because it is both costly and difficult for the average tenant to appeal a two per cent increase because he has to take time off work, because he has to go before the board, because he has to prepare a case against evidence that he is not sure of—

Mr. Grossman: The same as for landlords.

Mr. Deans: —the average tenant is less likely to appeal the two per cent than is the average corporate landlord.

Mr. Grossman: I'm not sure of that.

Mr. Deans: So what you do is you take the lowest legitimate cost and you establish that as your base, in order to protect tenants against loss of wages—

Mr. Grossman: Then you get a lot of appeals.

Mr. Deans: —and to protect tenants against the very difficult time that they have, normally never having to appear before any tribunal of any kind, from the fear of—

Mr. Grossman: And they end up with more appeals and red tape under your amendment.

Mr. Deans: —showing up and not being able to present their case adequately. On the other hand, you say to the landlord, "If you have costs, costs that are legitimate, costs that can be proven, costs that show a rent increase above the level of six per cent, you are perfectly entitled and expected to bring your case before the board and the board should and can approve it."

Mr. Grossman: And the tenants will have to go to an appeal and prepare his case, taking the day off work.

Mr. Deans: I say to you that any landlord who believes he can get 12 per cent will go before the board regardless of whether the level we establish is eight per cent or six per cent.

Mr. Grossman: Go for four per cent, it sounds better.

Mr. Deans: Any tenant who thinks that eight per cent might be more reasonable is not likely to go for the level of six per cent, but certainly would not go for an appeal for a lower level if the level was set at eight per cent.

Mr. Grossman: Tenants will like that.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick stop his mumbling?

Mr. Nixon: Speak up, speak up.

Mr. Deans: I want to tell the Premier that the basis upon which you intend to fight your election is phoney.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, only with respect to the current amendment that is before us, as you are aware—

Mr. Shore: Where is the housing critic and finance critic?

Mr. Breithaupt: —there are to be placed before the House two amendments dealing particularly with this area and I would like direction from the Chair as to whether in the opinion of the Chair the second amendment should also be put so that, in effect, both matters could be discussed satisfactorily on all sides of the House. If the Chair would agree to that, the member for Perth could put his amendment and speak to it as well and then the general discussion on both of the areas under discussion could proceed.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Chairman: You asked for direction. It seemed to be a consensus that the committee should deal with them as individual motions and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, if I may, a consensus would surely reflect the view of the majority. We have no objection.

Mr. Chairman: We have only one amendment before the committee at the present time, so there is only one to be discussed.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, not only would we support this, we would support it for another reason. We want to divide the House, obviously, on these amendments, on both of them, and, given the time tonight—the other amendments can be stacked; these are central, these are the crucial votes—I think if the House had a sense of both amendments we could debate them in conjunction, since this is taking longer, and no one would be the loser. Then they can be voted on one after the other at some appropriate moment.

Mr. Chairman: It's a reversal of the former consensus that we seemed to have arrived at. We only have one motion. If it is the consensus that we deal with both of them at once, I would suggest that the hon. member for Perth put his amendment.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I'll be glad to put it. I thought the original intent was to do it separately.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Edighoffer moves that subsection 1 of section 5 of the Act, as set out in section 1(1) of the bill, be amended by striking out in the sixth and seventh line "by more than eight per cent"; and by adding after "for residential premises" in the sixth line the words, "by the lesser of eight per cent or the rate of increase for compensation allowed under the basic protection factor and national productivity factor, as outlined in Part 4 of The Anti-Inflation Act Guidelines Canada.

Mr. Edighoffer: In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have it on the record that this party takes this Legislature very seriously. I feel that with this amendment we are trying to make minority government work.

Mr. O'Neil: There goes the Premier.

Mr. Good: You don't want it to work.

Interjections.

Mr. Edighoffer: When discussing this legislation previously, I presented a number of reasons concerning this amendment. But I'd like, briefly, to make just a few more comments in support of this amendment.

I'd like first of all to remind the government that when this legislation was introduced into the Legislature in 1975, the then Minister of Housing, who had responsibility for this legislation, stated, and it's very brief: "It should also be viewed in the context of the federal government's anti-inflation measures, which it is designed to complement."

Hon. Mr. Norton: Understand the relationship; it is not one to one.

An hon. member: That's in your own words.

An hon. member: Then the flip flop.

Mr. Edighoffer: And of course during the Throne Speech, similar comments were made to the effect that this legislation should be tied to the anti-inflation guidelines.

Mr. Shore: How does the finance critic feel about this?

Mr. Nixon: You were over here then Marvin, don't worry.

Mr. Edighoffer: It has been said in this debate that if wages are geared to guidelines, accommodation rates should be geared to guidelines. However, the system allows landlords and tenants an appeal to include pass-through costs. I'd also like to remind the members of the House that during the second reading the first speaker for the New Democratic Party, the member for Oshawa, concluded his remarks by saying, "We think, too, that the maximum rent increase permitted without appeal to the rent review process should be reduced from eight to six per cent to make it consistent with the anti-inflation board programme."

Mr. Nixon: That's why they are voting for our amendment.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Chairman, this Legislature signed an agreement with the Anti-Inflation Board to apply the national guidelines to the provincial public sector, and the province agreed that the national guidelines would also apply to a great number of bodies in the province, bodies which provide what are generally considered to be public services. I would certainly urge, and ask, all members of the Legislature to support this amendment which I feel is the proper way to extend the legislation for rent review until December 31, 1978.

[9:00]

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, certainly I have no wish either to engage in political debate with any of the speakers who have spoken. I just want to respond to the Leader of the Opposition briefly.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's surely the best place for politics.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, we're aware of the BC study. It may come as a surprise to him that Karl Jaffray writes to us once in a while and tells us what's going on. As a result of that study the former BC government adopted a guideline of 10.6 per cent for the first year. The succeeding government accepted that guideline, 10.6 per cent, for the second year. Now, in the third year of rent review in British Columbia—

Mr. Lewis: It's down to seven per cent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —they've gone to seven per cent, on the basis of the fact that the vacancy rate everywhere except in greater Vancouver is well above five per cent. There's no reason for them to stick to anything less.

Mr. Wildman: We discussed vacancy rates.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's the only guideline under 10 per cent in the western provinces.

I might also mention that, yes, we're aware of the CMHC guideline which they use in determining rent increases for limited-dividend housing. The average rent increase for limited-dividend housing in the face of the CMHC figures has been roughly 15 per cent, which in our rent review process has generally been reduced to an average of about 12 per cent.

So we're reducing rents following the formula mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. I want him to know that our figures —and I don't know what the BC figures were based on; I don't know what CMHC's figures are based on but we've done 125,000 detailed reviews of rental figures in this province before our rent review boards and I think that our figures, based on that kind of a study, are somewhat reliable.

Without speaking in great detail to the amendment put forward by the member for Perth, I might ask him before we get into discussion of it if he might just make a slight technical correction. I heard from the member for London Centre yesterday about the great

research they have, I wonder if he would name the Act properly in his amendment. Give us the real Act so that if this amendment should carry, at least it will be technically correct. Legally, the title of the document he's referring to is the Anti-Inflation Guidelines. I wonder if he might make that change so we can discuss the amendment with some meaning.

Mr. Kerrio: We can still discuss it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Anything to oblige.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Chairman, since you have made the ruling that we can deal with this issue at once, I'd like to move an amendment to Mr. Edighoffer's amendment.

I move that the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following phrase; "understanding that the specified rate of increase on October 14, 1977 will be six per cent."

Mr. Good: Oh, you're trying to do what you couldn't do in your original motion.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Could I have a copy of the amendment?

Mr. Breaugh: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Breaugh: If I could just speak very briefly to that?

Mr. Nixon: Point of order. Perhaps he could read the amendment to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Would you allow the Chair to read the amendment to the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: How about delivering copies?

Mr. Breaugh: Right there. You should not be the one to argue about who—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Breaugh moves that Mr. Edighoffer's amendment be amended by adding thereto the following phrase, "understanding that the specified rate of increase at October 14, 1977 will be six per cent."

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, with respect to that subamendment, might I suggest that—

Mr. Nixon: Point of order.

Mr. Breithaupt: Might I suggest that the matter, on a point of order, is already before the House in the original amendment which has been put by the official opposition.

Mr. MacDonald: No, it is not.

Mr. Nixon: Let's let the Chairman decide.

Mr. Breithaupt: As a result, I would presume, only from my hearing of the amendment—I have not seen it as yet—that the Chair should seriously consider whether the matter is already before the House.

Mr. Nixon: Of course it is.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The first motion of six per cent which is embodied in the amendment clearly takes place on August 1. This subamendment to the Liberal amendment clearly applies to October 14, 1977. They are quite different, therefore, in nature. One speaks of an event 10 weeks later.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The Chair would rule that Mr. Breaugh's amendment to the amendment is in order.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, it was very clear in the Liberal Party's initial statements on the principle of the bill that that's what they intended. It's been further reinforced that that's the way they want to go. We are very simply saying let us be extremely clear about what's there. I would express great reservations that should the unforeseen happen and an election be called and we are faced with a different form of a government, that we should be extremely clear in this legislation this evening exactly what we mean. The subamendment is before the House very simply to be explicit about what you mean, not to confuse it with anything else that might be prevalent in the motion. I understand the intent of the motion is very specifically this, it would accomplish the same thing, I am simply asking the members of the House to be specific about the exact number and when it takes effect. I think that is a fair thing to do. I think the amendment that Mr. Edighoffer proposed intends to do that. There isn't any great disagreement on that and I would ask their support in this subamendment.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: I shall be brief in my remarks. The economy of this country and this province is clearly in trouble. People are suffering. We in the Liberal Party believe that the Anti-Inflation Board was and

is a reasonable way to attempt to cope with the ravages of inflation, even though we recognize that in limiting the wages of working people, hardship has been created. We believe that when you limit the wages of working people you limit their rent increases at exactly the same level.

The Premier apparently wants an election. He can and is entitled to use any excuse he chooses to call an election. He has that right. He can even use the excuse, as he mentioned the other day, that I criticize him from time to time.

Mr. Breithaupt: He doesn't like that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order—

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: That is not a point of order.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: He thinks that he will get a majority, and he certainly wants a majority. He'll use whatever excuse he can to call the election.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would return to the debate on the amendment.

Mr. S. Smith: The Premier says in simple words, regarding the cost of shelter, that in the province of Ontario he cannot give tenants protection to counter the level at which their wages are being controlled by the Anti-Inflation Board. We say very simply that we can give that protection and that we must give that protection.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak to the amendment. I ask the member for Perth if he would please check the technicality, because in the event this amendment should carry—and there appears to be some indication from our friends over on the NDP benches that it might—I would hope that at least it would be an amendment that could be administered. That's all; we're not asking for too much.

Mr. Nixon: The whole thing was a mess to begin with.

Mr. Breithaupt: You'd be the last person we'd want to administer it.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that in the heat of the debate here tonight we not pass gibberish.

Mr. Reid: You should join the colleague next to you.

Mr. Conway: I thought you said you would resign if rent control was continued.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Let's please make it clear; let's use the proper names so that when it goes to the courts, if it does, the courts would be able to relate to sound law. We are not asking too much. I would hope that the member for Perth is out checking this and will make that correction. It isn't too much to make.

Interjection.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I wonder if I could speak to the substance of the amendment. I hope that the member for Perth, when he comes in after checking with Ottawa or wherever he gets his advice, will make that change.

Mr. Conway: I thought you were quitting.

Mr. Reid: In your case there is no person to phone in Ottawa.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We received some preliminary notice of the amendment a few days ago. It has since been changed, but we did receive notice in accordance with the two-hour rule that we all agreed to, and we've had some legal research done on it. The amendment relates to a section of the Anti-Inflation Guidelines called Part IV of the Anti-Inflation Guidelines. We have taken that and we have studied it. It indicates that if the Liberal amendment carries, whether or not the subamendment is attached to it, we're talking in terms of a three-component factor. Those components are spelled out very clearly. As we all know, there is a basic protection factor in the guidelines. Everybody knows what that is.

Mr. Nixon: Four per cent.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There's a national productivity factor, and that's a flat two per cent based on historic facts—and those are known.

Mr. Nixon: Two per cent. That's up to six.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The one that is not known is the third factor. It is determined by Statistics Canada on the basis of information given to them. It will not be known until November 15. We have an amendment which takes effect on October 14 which will incorporate a factor which is not known until November 15.

Hon. Mr. Norton: You have to give three months' notice.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Under the rest of our Act, which I think everybody in this House knows, landlords must give to a tenant 90 days' notice of a rent increase, 60 days' notice to a rent review officer of his intention to apply for rent review. How on earth can that work when you don't know your figure until November 15, a month after it takes effect?

I simply ask the members of this House, when they're voting on this amendment, to recognize what they're doing. They're putting gibberish into the law.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He's right.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Premier's interjection that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations is right, with great respect, he's not. There is a factor which must be calculated, which is precisely why those of us of the New Democratic Party affixed a subamendment to the proposition that it should be understood to be at six per cent. We know that if the factor shows some marginal alteration, it is still worthy of support because it will come in under eight per cent and, therefore, will be beneficial to the tenants.

I want to point out to you that the inflation factor which is to be computed as your third component was, from October 1975 to 1976, 6.2 per cent; November 1975 to 1976, 5.6 per cent; December 1975 to 1976, 5.8 per cent. In other words, it is coming in now on the basis of a figure approximating six per cent—it might come in slightly below, it might come in slightly above. That's why we have placed the six per cent. That's why we hope the Liberals will seriously consider supporting our subamendment because it will be absolutely clear.

I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, nobody in this party likes to tie anything to the disreputable and shabby nature of so much of the Anti-Inflation Board's guidelines. I want you to know that. It bothers us to have that relationship, so we're looking at what it means.

Mr. Nixon: That sounds like Joe Morris talking.

Mr. Lewis: And what it means, Mr. Chairman, is a level of rent for the tenants of Ontario of something in the vicinity of six per cent. By our subamendment it would clearly be six per cent and that's what we put to the minister. It's completely uncomplicated.

Mr. Deans: And it's simple to appeal.

Mr. Lewis: There's nothing difficult about it. It's entirely supportable and that's why it should be supported, because—

An hon. member: Back in 1975 you supported the government.

Mr. Lewis: —it can be independently authenticated as well as tied. It's as simple as that.

Hon. Mr. Norton: And it's deceptively simplistic.

Mr. MacDonald: It's not gibberish, it's precise.

Interjections.

Mrs. Campbell: In rising to speak to our amendment, I would just like to say that I find it sad that we are called upon to debate a very important piece of legislation in the kind of spirit which is prevailing, due, Mr. Chairman, to the administrative incompetency of this government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's provocative.

Interjections.

Mr. Sweeney: It was intended to be.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member will continue without interruption.

[9:15]

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, the government has, in fact, tied this bill in its extension, and indeed in its initial introduction, to the AIB which this government has supported. To me, it is improper that we should not tie this increase to the AIB guidelines for the reasons given by my leader. The people in this province, and certainly in the major cities, have been suffering as it is. One of the reasons I am prepared to support our amendment, rather than that of

the NDP, is simply on a matter of very stark reality for the tenants, and certainly those in the city of Toronto. Many of those tenants have had increases of eight per cent for whatever reason the landlord has in not wishing to proceed to the rent review board.

Mr. Nixon: The minister asked them not to.

Mrs. Campbell: Whether the minister asked them or not, they had their reasons; they may not have wanted to go through the problems of disclosing all their figures. I don't care what the reason is; it is a fact that many have not proceeded and have stayed within the eight per cent. For this reason, I believe that the tenants in this stage of the legislation are better protected because it has been my experience that there have been increases of more than eight per cent, some of them I believe improper—but that is a matter for the courts. I have witnessed some increases, and I believe that the tenants by and large are protected by the eight per cent at this point in time.

I believe that until the guidelines are changed and the effective change is made, landlords are in a very good position to argue the fact that the cost of labour is going to be at a higher rate than their permitted increases. However, to me, that changes significantly when the guideline effect changes; and I would believe that at that point in time the landlords in all likelihood would not pressure for the review. They may, but at least I feel, having talked extensively with tenants in my riding, that they are prepared to accept the eight per cent at this point rather than risk going through to rent review at this time.

I may say that I was questioned very closely by tenants last evening as to our position and why I wasn't adopting the simple solution put forward by the NDP. I made that explanation and they believed, in the final analysis, that we are right. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe we have to always bear in mind not only what seems to me on occasion to be political expediency but the practicality of the situation. After all, the people we are concerned about in this bill, as I see it, are the tenants.

Mr. Shore: Right on.

Interjection.

Mr. Reid: Changing parties again, Marv?

Mrs. Campbell: I am pleased to be here debating the extension of this legislation because there is no doubt in the minds of the people I represent that my bill, brought in some 18 months before the government saw fit to effect it—

Mr. Nixon: It was the cornerstone.

Mrs. Campbell: —was a cornerstone for this legislation.

Mr. Nixon: It was a better bill than yours. Margaret Campbell was the mother of rent review.

Mrs. Campbell: I believe it is because of that that they are accepting our amendment so strongly.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Muskoka.

Mr. Nixon: He must be in trouble up there. Looking for another promotion.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I may be in trouble up there, but you haven't even got a candidate up there, Mr. Chairman, I don't enter into debates around here too often—

Mr. Nixon: Why don't you go out and close a few hospitals?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You guys wish your seats were as safe.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't enter into debates around here too often, but I've been sitting here—

Mr. Nixon: You ought to know, you've got a front row seat.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's because I basically want to add to the quality of the debate, and silence sometimes is the best way to do so.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I've been sitting here listening to figures coming out of the NDP in a steady stream.

Mr. Nixon: Now we're going to get philosophy.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I've been listening to gobbledygook coming out of the Liberals in a steady stream, and I'm reminded of the old saw that figures don't lie but liars figure.

Mr. Ruston: You did a lot of lying and figuring on the hospitals.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: How about doing a regression analysis on that?

Mr. Reid: Like your figures on the hospitals?

Hon. F. S. Miller: There's one thing about the NDP amendment tonight: I can understand it. I can't understand the Liberal amendments; I suspect very few other people in the province could.

Mr. Ruston: That's why they took you out of the Health ministry.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Muskoka is speaking.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's easy to appear to be on the tenants' side by going for a lower figure. It's easy to say that six per cent protects the tenants' interest and, therefore, "We're on their side"—

Mr. Reid: Did you ever hear the Treasurer talk about the AIB?

Hon. F. S. Miller: —"and the dirty old PCs are on the other side," the landlords' side, by asking for eight per cent; but that's not true. I am tired—

Mr. Ruston: So is your government.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —I am tired of the NDP always pretending to be on the side of the average guy when in fact this party has been for many years. This is the party that's caused the wealth in this province, that's given us 34 years of solid, sound, good government and economic progress.

Mr. Bain: The workers in this province did it, not the Tories.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's not just geography, it's the fact that we have created the stability that caused people to be willing to invest here and therefore gave this—

Mr. Reid: What about the unemployment figures?

Mr. Breithaupt: You haven't created any housing.

Mr. Nixon: That stability is a great phrase. Pearson really parlayed that into something. You should grab hold of that one.

An hon. member: They don't like it because they know it's true.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: This government is willing to make tough decisions, and eight per cent right now—

Mr. Reid: This isn't your style, Frank; sit down.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Will the hon. member for Rainy River desist from the interjections.

Mr. Nixon: Looks like the leadership campaign has started.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Eight per cent is in the interests of the tenants because it will cut out thousands of appeals, it will stimulate more rental housing, it will cause competition in the marketplace and in the long run it will re-elect us.

Mr. Nixon: What was that all about?

Mr. Reid: What was that all about?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Kitchener-Waterloo has the floor.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, given that this is An Act to amend the Residential Premises Rent Review Act, perhaps we could, just for a minute, refer back to the original Act.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Oh, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, that's out of order.

Mr. Sweeney: It was very clear, very clear—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. You will have to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Sweeney: It was very clear that when we all spoke to that Act, we indicated that we wanted to bring down—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member has a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have spoken at great length and we've gone around the Act a great deal, but I think we should be really speaking to the amendment and the NDP subamendment and nothing else.

Mr. Nixon: You said it was a mess.

Mr. Cunningham: What was that over there?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order please; order. The Chair agrees that we should be directing

comment to the subamendment. I thought perhaps the preamble was going to lead into it, but would he kindly direct his remarks to that immediately?

Mr. Sweeney: It is fully my intention to do so. The entire thrust of the original amendment and this amendment is to create in this province a social contract between landlords and tenants. We said then, and I wish to repeat today, that a social contract can only work if both sides—both sides, Mr. Chairman—feel that they are being treated with some fairness, with some justice.

Just as we said then, we have to say again today, that can only be done if both sides understand the source of the other's request; the tenants understanding the source of the landlord's request, the landlord understanding the source of the tenants' reaction to that request. That's the social contract.

Hon. Mr. Norton: You don't understand the original Act.

Mr. Sweeney: May I cite two recent examples of that very principle and as they apply to this amendment to this bill. Within the last three months—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Would you direct your comments to this specific amendment?

Mr. Sweeney: I am, Mr. Chairman. Within the last three months, there was a request from a landlord in my riding for a 65 per cent rental increase. The problem was that the land transfer tax got him caught in mortgage arrangements. That went through all the various machinations that are available in this province now. It was substantially reduced, as you might well expect, because the tenants had something to stand on. They were able to stand up and challenge a landlord who was clearly out of line in making his request.

Hon. B. Stephenson: But it won't happen with your amendment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With your amendment they won't have anything.

An hon. member: You're standing in quicksand with yours.

Mr. Sweeney: The second example was a lady who phoned me just a few days ago and indicated that her landlord was asking for a 33 per cent increase—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Would the hon. member specifically direct his comments to the amendment? Would he continue his debate, but speak directly to the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. Sweeney: I am, Mr. Chairman. I am speaking directly to it.

Mr. Hodgson: No, you're not, you haven't even mentioned it.

Mr. Sweeney: That 33 per cent increase turned out to be an increase from $75 to $100 for a two-bedroom apartment in good condition. The lady clearly recognized, after discussing it with us, that the request was not out of line.

The point I am trying to make is that you can throw around figures any way you want. Earlier today, the minister handed us a piece of paper with some figures on it. Those figures have been disputed. Just a few minutes ago the Leader of the Opposition reacted to those figures. He said, for example—and this is in the record—that the administrative cost should have an inflation factor of 10 instead of 20. All right. For the sake of discussion, let's accept that. He also said that for the fuel cost the inflation factor should be 20 instead of 30. He then went on to say that if we accept that, then we come up with a figure which I believe was 5.2 or 5.8 or 5.9 per cent, but they settled for 6.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, using the Leader of the Opposition's own figures, we would change the third column, under administration, from 1.8 to 1.9; we would change the third column, under fuel cost, from 2.1 to 1.4. If you add them up, you come to 7.05—you don't come to 5.2 or 5.8. I'm just trying to make one clear point. The members on that side are picking figures right out of the air to support their position; the members here are picking figures out of the air to support their position.

Interjections.

[9:30]

Mr. Sweeney: This party is standing foursquare and very—

Mr. Shore: You just killed the argument right there.

Mr. Sweeney: —clearly on figures that can be documented, figures that will be specified and figures that are tied in directly with a man's income; and it's a man's income by which he pays his rent. Whatever that income is going to be, that is what his rent should be—not figures that you pick out of

the air, not figures that you pick out of the air.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I want to address some remarks—

Mr. Conway: Here's the next chairman of the liquor board.

Mr. Grossman: —to the two per cent solution as attempted by the opposition in order to bail themselves out of a difficult situation.

Mr. Bullbrook: Stand up.

Mr. Grossman: What they're trying to do across the floor with this amendment, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: That is actually not bad—not bad—not bad at all.

Mr. Grossman: What they're trying to do is identify another group that they can play to—

Mr. Bain: At least we are not playing to Bay Street.

Mr. Grossman: —by offering them some money back, offering to underbid the government.

Mr. Deans: That is not true.

Mr. Grossman: What do they do? Firstly, they stand up and attempt to criticize the use of figures by the minister responsible, and they argue and argue that their interpretation of the figures should work as though there were some magic to these AIB figures.

Mr. Sweeney: That is where the money comes from.

Mr. Nixon: The Treasurer thinks they are good.

Mr. Grossman: In point of fact, the proof of the eight per cent figure is in the number of cases that ended up before the rent review board. How many landlords could live with the eight per cent and how many tenants could live with whatever rents they were charged under there? The point of the situation and the fact of the situation is that it worked fairly well. A lot of landlords decided that they would live with eight per cent or less. A lot of them did. Those that did not found, as the member for Wentworth has said, that they often got 12 per cent.

Mr. Deans: That's right.

Mr. Grossman: But the fact is that, after the first six or eight months of the programme, things had settled down pretty well, so that the numbers of cases that were before the rent review officers had substantially decreased. It was evidence that the system was adjusting well to eight per cent. Everyone by that stage had lived comfortably with eight per cent.

Mr. Sweeney: And keep their wages at eight per cent too.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They went up by 9.8 per cent last year.

Mr. Grossman: What's occurring now is an attempt to go to the old two per cent solution: "Let's see if we can underbid the government." What I find interesting are the attempts this evening, especially of the official opposition, to attempt to tie the six per cent figure to the AIB guidelines.

Mr. Deans: No, no.

Mr. Grossman: What's interesting is that it's the same six per cent figure they were using immediately after the September 1975 election. You remember that one.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Grossman: It was six per cent then; now they're still at six per cent and groping in the last little while to juggle the figures used by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to justify the same six per cent figure they used a year and a half ago.

Mr. Deans: His figures are wrong.

Mr. Grossman: It's about time someone started to treat the tenants of this province with a little bit of respect and acknowledge that they ought not to be used and bargained away for election purposes.

Mr. Breithaupt: Then our amendment will carry.

Mr. S. Smith: Why did you need the paragraph letting you lower it at any time?

Mr. Grossman: I happen to represent a riding that has almost 50 per cent of its citizens living as tenants in apartments, rooming houses or duplexes.

An hon. member: And they are being poorly represented.

Mr. S. Smith: They won't vote for you next time.

Mr. Nixon: The other half are in Doctors Hospital.

Mr. Grossman: It would be very comfortable for me to play the game that's so easy for the opposition—

Mr. Wildman: You have been doing that for years.

Mr. Grossman: —which is to underbid the latest offer, to bribe them with their own money, and pretend that I can go to them and offer them a better deal than the NDP and the Liberals. Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared—

Mr. S. Smith: To close hospitals to save money.

Mr. Grossman: —to treat tenants as mature enough not to be bribed by a two per cent solution—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on. Don't be condescending. Don't be patronizing.

Mr. Grossman: —not to be influenced by the short-term remedy that's politically expedient but not in their long-term interests.

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on. Not in their long-term interests.

Mr. Grossman: A word about the Anti-Inflation Board. It is a very neat attempt by the Liberal Party to attempt to suggest that this should be tied in to the AIB figures on wages plus productivity and so on.

Mr. Nixon: We are not attempting to suggest anything.

Mr. S. Smith: We are doing it.

Mr. Grossman: But the rent review programme was not instituted by the federal Anti-Inflation Board across the country for the very good reason that they understood that situations differed from province to province in this particular area. For example, when the member opposite—I think it was the member for Wentworth—wanted to use the figures from BC—maybe it was the Leader of the Opposition—the Anti-Inflation Board in Ottawa was sensible enough to understand that it is just conceivable that energy costs in BC may not be quite the same as energy costs in Ontario or Newfoundland.

Mr. Deans: You have a fixation with BC.

Mr. Sargent: They aren't $11 billion in debt either.

Mr. Grossman: Therefore, they said: "Provinces, we think that it is appropriate that you develop rent review programmes on your own to complement an anti-inflation programme throughout the country."

Mr. Kerrio: Your Minister of Housing said that.

Mr. Grossman: Had it been realistic to tie it into any of these magic figures surely your friends in Ottawa would have said that. But they were mature enough—and, I suppose, not needing to bargain for tenants' votes—not to jump to that approach.

Mr. S. Smith: Not a federal jurisdiction, and you know it.

Mr. Grossman: What we did in Ontario was the sensible solution. What happened here was not a tie-in to any magic figures, but very simply an understanding that the basis of having an alive economy protecting everyone was to permit a pass-through of costs. If you don't permit a legitimate pass-through of costs then you are not going to have one twit of relief for tenants two years from today, when we are back here debating —and I'll be back here debating—the renewal of a rent review programme.

Mr. S. Smith: And your son after you.

Mr. Grossman: The member for Wentworth stands up and complains and complains—

Mr. Conway: Stand up Larry. Stand up.

Mr. Grossman: —sweating heavily for appropriate reasons, that at the rent review hearing, by common acknowledgement, the figure has turned out to be 12 per cent. So what is he going to do? He is going to forget about all those landlords who said, "Look, I didn't go to rent review because it just wasn't worth it. Maybe I'll move from eight to 10. Maybe I'll get less. Sure I have some tenants coming off two and three year leases, but I think I'll make do with eight per cent."

Mr. Chairman, the major developers in the city of Toronto by and large adopted that approach. They did not take their tenants through the hearings. But if you knock it down to six per cent you are going to force all those landlords to go to the rent review hearings.

Mr. Shore: You know it.

Mr. Grossman: And then what is going to happen? Exactly what the member for Wentworth says is happening. That the proof is in the pudding—that 12 per cent is needed by a lot of people that are going through to the board.

Mr. Deans: No, no.

Mr. Grossman: That is the average. How many of them are going to end up getting 15 and 16 and 20 per cent? I can tell you a lot of them in my riding are going to the rent review board asking for eight and getting two. So there are a lot of people who, rather than being saved from going to the rent review board, are going to be forced to the rent review board. Instead of paying eight per cent more, they are going to be ending up with 12 per cent more.

Mr. Warner: Name them.

Mr. Deans: Minimum two per cent.

Mr. Grossman: And then we will be treated to the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy)—who is probably out chasing down the Conservative candidate's signs in the riding tonight—coming back here and saying—

Mr. Lewis: He will be back. You are quite right.

Mr. Grossman: If he is back it will hardly be a treat. I used the wrong word. He will be back here and he will be rising and saying, "Do you know what the backlog is? Do you know what the delay is? Do you know what the cost of the administration of that programme is?"

Interjections.

Mr. Grossman: "You are forcing all these cases in there." We'll then permit him to stand on his hind legs in this assembly and say, "The whole procedure is too complex, there is an enormous backlog. You are spending public moneys. What you have to do is have six per cent, no appeals." And boy, if we are still here then won't that be even more attractive? That's even a lower bid to the tenants than you are making tonight.

Interjection.

Mr. Grossman: It'll be great stuff.

Mr. Kerrio: Now I know that you are going to stay in those back benches.

Mr. Grossman: But I'll tell you what it won't be. It won't be fair to the tenants.

Interjection.

Mr. Grossman: It just won't be fair to the tenants.

Interjection.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I'll face my voters if the time comes and—

Mr. Kerrio: Wise choice.

Mr. Grossman: —treat them as mature. I won't try to bribe them. I'll explain to them that there is a pass-through of costs. I'll explain to them that our programme is and was responsible—that we didn't treat them as children. We didn't go out passing out two per cent solutions.

Mr. S. Smith: That you lost, fair and square.

Mr. Grossman: And, Mr. Chairman, when we are back here—

An hon. member: If.

Mr. Grossman: —we will be able in a few years to rise in this House and announce that a programme won't be needed because the vacancy rate will have risen, which would be totally and—

Mr. Kerrio: That government will have to believe in tenants by then.

Mr. Grossman: —completely impossible if the opposition were ever in control of this House.

An hon. member: No, no; never.

Mr. Grossman: Except for the possibility that if they did form the government enough people would leave this province to create enough vacancies.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Before I recognize—

Interjection.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Before I recognize the member for Riverdale, I would like to announce that seated in the Speaker's gallery is a very distinguished guest and parliamentarian, the hon. Dr. Wahid Ali, who is president of the Senate of Trinidad and Tobago.

[Applause]

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Conway: Give us poetry.

Mr. Renwick: —I would like to try to deal with a couple of matters that have been raised on the assumption that the "Dear Ian" and the "Dear Jim" letters from Bob had not been written. There is something quite unrealistic about what is happening in

the Legislature tonight and I think we ought to now direct our attention away from whether or not there is going to be an election, which will be decided by the Premier and not by us, and to talk about whether or not the bill that we are going to pass and which will be law and which, regardless of electoral consequences or whether there is or is not an election, must be in place before May 1 in order to provide some sense of stability in this whole question of the rent review programme.

I want to address myself to the principle, as I see it, of what we are talking about. I want also to then try to address myself to the comment made by the minister when he used the term "gibberish", if we go to our understanding of what the motion moved by the member for Perth is about. I would like to also address myself very briefly to what the member for Kitchener-Wilmot said, so far as I could understand the drift of his remarks when he was speaking.

As I understand it, the limits are quite narrow actually. It does make it a little bit ridiculous to think that we are talking in terms of confidence or no confidence in the government. The government's position is eight per cent, or such lesser amount as may be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Our position on our amendment was six per cent or such lesser amount as could be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We are talking about a spread of two points.

We are all in agreement that a landlord or a tenant has recourse above the amount and the landlord and the tenant have protection on both sides under the review process. We all agree that after the trauma of starting up a review process, trying to iron out the bugs—there are still bugs in it and some of our amendments are addressed toward making it even more realistic and workable—we are all agreed that that is not the matter which is before us. We're talking this very narrow limit of somewhere, and if I can leave aside the Lieutenant Governor in Council reducing the amount, we're talking about eight per cent and six per cent.

[9:45]

The Liberal amendment agrees that it can't be higher than eight per cent, because their amendment specifically says, "by the lesser of eight per cent or the rate of increase," using the language which is in the Liberal amendment. So the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party are in agreement that the upper limit will be eight per cent. We think it should be six, so that significantly distinguishes us from the Liberal Party, unless of course they feel there's some merit, after the intelligent debate that's been put forward by members of this party, that they should change their position and support our amendment and withdraw their amendment. I know if they want to withdraw their amendment, my colleague, the member for Oshawa, could be prevailed upon to withdraw his subamendment. So we could be back to that basic argument.

The minister used the word "gibberish." We tend to agree that the AIB programme as a whole is gibberish and I'm glad that he generally agrees with us about that matter. But I do believe there is a definable meaning possible, as we understand the Liberal amendment, which would bring in a figure—not our six per cent—but would have the effect of bringing in a figure somewhat above six but lower than eight.

That's what we're really talking about. You're talking eight, we're talking six, the Liberals are talking eight at the top or somewhere in between. The question now is, was the minister right in saying that the language used in the Liberal amendment is gibberish and would make an unworkable law? I want the minister please to address himself to this question if he feels there is any further problem about it.

Our understanding is that the Liberal amendment says, "the lesser of eight per cent or the rate of increase for compensation allowed under the basic protection factor and national productivity factor as outlined in part 4 of The Anti-Inflation Act Guidelines for Canada." I take that to mean the basic protection factor as indicated in paragraph 46 of the guidelines, and I take the national productivity factor to be as stated in paragraph 47 of the guidelines.

We can set the national productivity factor aside because that's a specified percentage. The guidelines state: "47. National productivity factor—The national productivity factor for a guideline year is two per cent." So that's a fixed amount.

If I could turn to the basic protection factor as set out in paragraph 46 and deal with the third programme year which is the programme year starting on October 14, 1977, the basic protection factor at that time is the aggregate of four per cent, which is a definite amount, and a second amount that is a formula but indefinite, and that is, and I quote: "The amount, if any, by which the percentage increase in the consumer price

index during the second programme year exceeds six per cent."

So you have a definitive amount that can be calculated for use in the third year—that is the year starting October 14, 1977—calculated upon the consumer price index during the second programme year, which is the year that will end on October 13, 1977. So that it would have seemed to us as we tried to understand the Liberal amendment, that it is not gibberish; it is a readily calculable amount, namely, two per cent for national productivity, basic protection factor of four per cent, making six per cent, plus this calculation based on the consumer price index for the year which would end October 13, 1977.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Read the calculation and see if it's not gibberish. Everybody should read it. Read the calculation of the experience adjustment.

Mr. Deans: He's read it.

Mr. Lewis: The experience adjustment factor—

Mr. Kerrio: That's not gibberish at all. If you can't figure it out, they'd probably figure it for you.

Mr. Sweeney: Only if it exceeds six per cent.

Mr. Renwick: I'm glad that the minister interjected with that, because that's the misunderstanding I want to clear up.

If you will note, in the Liberal amendment, the reference is to base protection factor and national productivity factors as they affect the rate of increase for compensation.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Renwick: But it does not refer in any way to the experience adjustment factor.

Mr. Lewis: Exactly.

Mr. Renwick: I think that we've got to spend just a little bit of time to make certain that our understanding, which has been thrown into question by the minister, is the Liberal understanding of what their amendment is saying. Our understanding is that the Liberal amendment says the lesser of eight per cent or the calculation of four per cent basic protection factor, two per cent national productivity factor, plus the amount, if any, by which the percentage increase in the consumer price index during the second programme year exceeds six per cent; and that's somewhere between six and eight per cent, unless it happened that the consumer price index calculation was nil, in which case it would be a low of six per cent and a top of eight per cent. It's probably somewhere in between that, but lesser than eight.

Mr. Bullbrook: You're right on.

Mr. Nixon: I think you got that right.

Mr. Renwick: The minister threw in the word "gibberish" and he has again interjected the experience adjustment factor. I agree and everyone would agree—and I would like confirmation from the Liberal Party—that the experience adjustment factor is not included in the calculation which they were proposing.

Mr. Good: If it were in, it would be in the amendment. Do you see it in the amendment?

Mr. Nixon: It's not in the amendment.

Mr. Bullbrook: Can you read?

Mr. Renwick: Well—yes, I can read.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, it's not in the amendment.

Mr. S. Smith: You were right the first time.

Mr. Bullbrook: Sir Toby, we'd put it in if we wanted it in.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the member for Sarnia that, yes, I can read. I'm rather poor at mathematics.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's true.

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: I think where the minister is, perhaps, having trouble—I'm obviously not having trouble, but I want the minister to understand—

Mr. Kerrio: I think he's getting it now.

Mr. Renwick: —because you have to live with the Liberals long enough before you understand them and I've lived with them for a long, long time so I can understand them. I know the minister can't.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: You lived with the Tories for a while too, didn't you?

Mr. Renwick: The problem with the Liberal amendment in interpretation is that they used the phrase "rate of increase for compensation."

Mr. Bullbrook: That's right.

Mr. Renwick: Therefore, the minister looked at paragraph 45 of the guidelines and the minister made the mistake—and, of course, we made the same mistake when we first looked at it—that the calculations that had to be made were the result obtained from the two calculations taking into account the basic protection factor which is four per cent plus the consumer price index part, the national productivity factor which is the two per cent, and the experience adjustment factor for the year as set out under section 48 of the guidelines.

I would agree 100 per cent that we couldn't possibly put into the Act a provision with respect to the rate of increase in compensation if the three factors were involved: the basic protection factor, the national productivity factor and the experience adjustment factor, because (a) the experience adjustment factor is a very complicated formula and because (b) the result of that factor will not be known for a considerable period after October 14, 1977.

So I'm pleased, because of the interjections made by Mr. Edighoffer and some of his colleagues for the Liberal Party, that their understanding is the same as our understanding as to what their amendment means. Therefore, it's not gibberish and it does have a clearly defined meaning, and while we would like to have six per cent, we want, if possible, to get agreement on an amendment which will bring down the eight per cent.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Renwick: The reason we want to bring down the eight per cent—and I am not going to attempt to elucidate the clarity of the presentation made by the leader of the party when he dealt with the figures that are involved. I just wanted to say to the member for Kitchener-Wilmot that there was no great argument up to the point where the member for Kitchener-Wilmot went a little bit hysterical.

The realistic net impact on rent increase as we show it is 7.05 per cent, taking into account the two reductions which we made of administrative costs and fuel costs. I think the point which the member for Kitchener-Wilmot missed was that that was based on total operating costs of 55 per cent as the portion of operating costs to rent. We, on the basis of both the British Columbia study—which we admit is dated in 1975—

Mr. Sweeney: It's on a different base too.

Mr. Renwick: It may well be, but then, as the leader of this party said, we checked with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for its overall figure in the public and the private field of housing in which it is involved, and it was using figures for operating costs of 42 and 45 per cent. Therefore, we reduced the 55 per cent to 46.2 because that was the BC figure, to 45 per cent, because that was one of the CMH figures, to 42 per cent, because that was the other CMHC figure. By those reductions we brought the 7.05 down. Using the 46.2 per cent brings it down to 5.92, using 45 per cent brings it down to 5.77 and using 42 per cent brings it down to 5.38. It was on the basis of that calculation—

Mr. Sweeney: Can you explain that to tenants?

Mr. Lewis: We don't have to; just the government.

Mr. Renwick: —that we arrived at the decision that the proper base is six per cent, and we believe the proper base should be six per cent at August 1. We don't believe that the adjustment should wait until October 14, but as we understand the Liberal amendment, they will go with eight per cent from August 1 to October 14. On October 14 it will either be eight per cent or something less, but probably not six per cent on the basis of the basic protection factor and the national productivity factor as set out in sections 46 and 47 of the guidelines.

Mr. Sweeney: And that's fair to both sides.

Mr. Renwick: That's our understanding, and I did hope that I answered your question about gibberish by saying that we just simply do not consider that there is any need to take into account this very complicated additional factor of the experience adjustment factor.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if I could deal briefly with these figures, because a great deal of them have been bandied around. First of all, the average wage increase is said to be six per cent. The figure for 1976 is 9.8. The average wage increase, according to the figures that we have available for the first quarter of 1977, indicates an average wage increase of eight per cent, notwithstanding the AIB guidelines. We have not tied our figures to that. I just want to mention some of the calculations that are going to have to be done if the Liberal amendment carries, because—

Mr. Sweeney: You only have to do it once.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —while it's been mentioned that it will take effect on October 14, in fact, Statistics Canada issues the October consumer price index, which is a necessary component of the calculation, on November 15, after which the Anti-Inflation Board staff are in a position to do the following calculation—Mr. Chairman, if this isn't giberish, I don't know what is: What they do is they calculate the required percentage increase in the CPI for the second programme year by subtracting the October 1976 figure from the October 1977 figure, dividing the result by the October 1976 figure and multiplying the quotient by 100 per cent.

[10:00]

Mr. Bullbrook: You agreed to that.

Mr. Sweeney: Don't you have anybody over there who knows how to do that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: In any case, the October 1977 CPI figure—

Mr. Bullbrook: You agreed to that. You signed an agreement.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Sarnia will please be silent.

Mr. Bullbrook: I just wanted to tell them they agreed to it. They have an agreement right there. They agreed to that "giberish."

An hon. member: You've given your last speech.

Mr. Chairman: I'll recognize you next.

Mr. Bullbrook: I apologize.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, the fact remains that not until November 15 will the Anti-Inflation Board staff be able to start calculating the figure that is required for the Liberal amendment to become workable. If a landlord doesn't know that until November 15, which is the first day he can possibly know it, if he has to give notice under our Act, he would have to give notice for something like March 1, 1978. I ask the member for Perth to consider that in any possible reworking he may be doing of his amendment, if it's going to be passed, it will not be workable if it goes into effect on October 14, 1977. You would have to be able to give notice at least 90 days after November 15, which is the first day you'll know it.

Mr. Chairman: Will you please turn the television lights off, please? It's starting to bother some of the members. You can turn them back on again if there seems to be any obvious reason for doing so.

Mr. Good: It's certainly regrettable, in my view, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier and the government have used the debate on these amendments for such other purposes than the actual debate on amendments here tonight. It's the second time within less than two weeks they have used an occasion to try to do something other than debate the matter before the House.

The anti-inflation guideline tie-in, I think, is a very reasonable and sensible approach to the whole matter. Setting the rate at eight per cent had its merits at the time and, while there was a tremendous backlog of appeals before the rent review officers, once the initial numbers were cleared away we find now that there is a pretty steady flow. Many offices across the province have been partly wound down in that the number of cases before the rent review officers has declined a great deal.

The purpose of tying the allowable increase without rent review to the anti-inflation guidelines is a very practical one. People whose wages have been tied to guidelines, whose employment contracts have been probably cut back or agreed to when they were tied in with the anti-inflation guidelines, can understand if their rent is allowed to increase by the same amount. People do not keep constantly aware of the day-by-day or month-to-month inflation factors in our province or in our country. They do, however, realize that somewhere down in Ottawa a group known as the Anti-Inflation Board has at its disposal a figure that represents the inflationary factor in our country and that is kept constantly updated. People can then relate to that figure and feel that if that is what the legislation says and that is what the landlord is asking for, it must indeed be a reasonable increase.

The member for Riverdale explained to the House how this factor would work. Having presented this amendment some several days ago, we thought the purpose of this amendment would be figured out by both the NDP and the government long before this evening. We understood what it is and it is absolutely ridiculous that the minister should say this particular factor would not work and could not be applied. If eight per cent can be applied or six per cent can be applied, a percentage that you would get if we took the trouble to phone Ottawa to the Anti-Inflation Board—and they would give it to you on any particular date you want—if you can't figure

it out then I say all you have to do is get it from Ottawa and they'd figure it out for you.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They can't figure it out.

Mr. Good: All right. The figures that the minister gave us this afternoon in trying to justify an eight per cent increase may, in some instances, be correct. I don't know. To me they look somewhat cooked.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Come on.

Mr. Good: I have taken figures on a few apartment complexes that I had at my disposal.

Mr. Kerrio: Your man Miller said it.

Mr. Nixon: They look cooked to me too. Self-serving figures.

Mr. Good: For the two I looked at, property tax did not take 25 per cent of the revenue produced by the particular apartment building. Administration costs took only a fraction of nine per cent which you have allocated to administration costs. Your fuel cost, in one instance, was considerably lower at seven per cent than the actual percentage. While you may have got these figures from 125,000 units which came before the rent review officers, let me remind the minister that the cases coming before the rent review office do not represent a general cross-section of the apartment buildings in the province. They had exceptional expenses or they wouldn't be before a rent review officer. That's how you got these cooked-up figures.

I am not prepared to say what the figures should be, but I certainly think that most people in the province would agree that a figure which is tied to our anti-inflation guidelines would be a correct figure to allow. The anti-inflation guidelines as referred to in the amendment are actually regulations under the anti-inflation Act and are referred to, as I understand it, in their short title as anti-inflation guidelines. So the minister may be quite correct—the word "Act" should come out of there and it would be anti-inflation guidelines under the anti-inflation Act which I think would correct his big objection to that particular figure.

I suggest the minister and the government have tunnel vision on this matter. They don't want to see anything but their own side of the story, and as far as I am concerned, it is immoral that the Premier should send a letter and try to say that this is a matter of deep confidence whether or not the landlords in this province get another two per cent or whether they don't get it. They still can get it if they are entitled to it. All they have to do is make an application before the rent review officer. To suggest that that is any kind of tie-in with confidence is absolutely ridiculous. The truth of it is the Premier is all dressed up, and he has no place to go unless he can provoke the Opposition into forcing him to do something.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Are you supporting us, Eddie?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The voice of reason.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The voice of what?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the minister has threatened to resign from his department if the government extended the rent controls. He said he couldn't live with them. You know he is the same fellow that is rumoured to have said that he would rather commit adultery than drink beer in the Blue Jay ball park. Well, who wouldn't?

Mr. Nixon: Did you say that, Sidney?

Mr. Reid: Sid doesn't have that much sense of humour.

Mr. Breithaupt: Always making choices difficult.

Mr. Sargent: So he's dragging his feet in this department and the people of Ontario are going to suffer for it. Of all the people in the economy the Premier wants to take a whack at the people who rent.

Mr. Sweeney: After the unemployed.

Mr. Sargent: He singles out those people who can't afford to own their own homes and says, even though we have hundreds of thousands of our people out of work, we won't give these people who can't afford a home to buy, we are going to single them out and whack them. We are still going to give them an eight per cent increase in their rents. He wants to be responsible to the developers and landlords. On the other hand, the Treasurer, on the tax reform Act, said it wouldn't be smart politics to bring this legislation into being before an election. So you are playing both sides of the street.

Hon. B. Stephenson: When? What has he been reading now, Playboy?

An hon. member: Listen, Bette.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I was listening.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: All you do is read your own speeches, Bette. That's why you wouldn't know that.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Will the hon. member direct his comments to the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. Shore: Which bill are you speaking on?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the rental accommodation in this province is non-existent. The Minister of Housing has done a disgraceful job in supplying low cost housing in this province.

Mr. Reid: Any housing.

Mr. Sargent: Over the years, as I've stood in my place in this House, the big developers have had the ear of the government. Last year we had the big developers crying in their beer in our caucus; one man had 10,000 doors, he said—he had 10,000 apartments and we're supposed to feel sorry for him because of this.

Mr. Nixon: I must have missed that meeting.

Mr. Sargent: They've all taken their funds and they've fled south and there's no more rental accommodation available. But those who are lucky to have the houses, you're going to whack them at a time when they need some help. Fifty per cent of our people rent homes and there will always be renters.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Call him to order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Because the simple fact of life in Ontario today is that 50 per cent of the people in this greatest province in the world will never own their own home in their lifetime. The system under Premier Bill Davis—

Mr. S. Smith: The biggest disgrace of this government is the housing.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Order, Mr. Chairman. Order. This is not second reading.

Mr. Sargent: —is a system where no man will ever be allowed to build a home he can afford.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Make him speak to the amendment.

Mr. Sargent: I'm speaking to the amendment all right, John.

Interjection.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There was ample opportunity —two evenings and one afternoon—to speak on the principle of this bill. The hon. member had his chance then; he was not here. I suggest he stick to this amendment.

Mr. S. Smith: When we talk about your lack of housing policy, it hurts.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The Chair was under the impression that he was speaking to the amendment. Would he continue?

Mr. Kerrio: How's that, John?

Mr. Sargent: You're playing the numbers game with us under the guise of confidence.

Mr. Shore: You're the best numbers guy there is, Eddie, you know that.

Mr. Sargent: We've got good numbers over here—and they can't buy us over there.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Will the hon. member—

An hon. member: You asked for that, Marv.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You have been for sale since day one. Don't start something you can't finish.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Will the hon. member continue?

Mr. Sargent: And the Minister of Housing, he has his price too. A great Liberal—they bought you too.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Any time you are ready, I will talk about you too. Want me to show your pamphlets?

Mr. Yakabuski: So has the Downtowner got its price. It's big.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member is now not speaking to the amendment. Will he return to the subject matter.

Mr. Sargent: In maintaining their position of eight per cent, the Premier says that this bill—

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Want me to show your pamphlets, Eddie?

Mr. Kerrio: He struck a nerve, eh, John?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You ditch-digger, don't talk to me.

Mr. Kerrio: Get that, Hansard?

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier says that this legislation that's put in by the opposition tonight is prejudicing the tenants—this amendment is going to prejudice the tenants in Ontario. How in the hell can you intimidate a man when he can't pay his rent?

Mr. Shore: He is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: I'm concerned that in Owen Sound we have hundreds of apartments, which is German money, and one man has control of the ghettos in Owen Sound—one man—and they're whacking these people—

Mr. Yakabuski: When did you get control, Eddie?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Eddie Sargent!

An hon. member: That'll make good reading—

Mr. Sargent: Those are the people who can't pay their rents and you're going to allow an eight per cent increase to this German landlord.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member is straying now from the amendment to the amendment. Would he kindly return to it?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In the name of decency in the House have that last remark stricken about the racial origin of the landlord. Just on a matter of decency.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Frank, I will withdraw that. I'm sorry.

Mr. Yakabuski: And all the rest.

Mr. Sargent: But that's all, though. That's all.

An hon. member: Frank, that is the first thing you've done in eight years. You should be a chief justice of the Supreme Court.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: He's an embarrassment to the House.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Sargent: Our response is tied to the AIB, which in effect could be six per cent and could go as low as four per cent.

This government has money. It had $100 million to give to Syncrude as a token payment—$100 million of our money to Syncrude, that'll happen not in our lifetime.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Don't you want to have any energy left in the next 20 years?

Mr. Sargent: Do you want to speak?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will ignore the interjections and interruptions and continue.

Mr. Sargent I can't ignore her.

Mr. Grossman: You're away off base, Ed.

Mr. Sargent: And look who's talking—Mr. Grossman there. We spent $141 million of our money on the Spadina Expressway to elect his father and now we're giving money to re-elect him.

[10:15]

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member will return to the amendment.

Mr. Grossman: Shows what a good local member can do, Eddie.

An hon. member: What did you get, Eddie?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. member will direct his comments to the amendment to the amendment.

An hon. member He's being provocative.

Mr. Sargent: He was provocative; yes, he was.

Mr. Kerrio: Is that true, Larry?

Mr. Sargent: In summation, what we have is a complete numbers game, with people who can't fight back. Or maybe they will on election day.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am going to be very brief in my remarks—

Mr. Reid: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You may be grateful.

After listening to the previous speaker, who I assume was speaking in support of the amendment proposed by his party—although it was hard to tell from his remarks—

Mr. Sargent: If you'd kept quiet for a minute, you would have found out.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, and to the attention of the House, page 685 of Hansard for November 18, 1975. I would like to quote remarks made by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce at that time during the debate on the rent review bill.

Mr. Sweeney: What's that got to do with the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It has all kinds of things to do with the amendment.

Mr. Breithaupt: On a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Oh, we're not going to have a point of order.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I intend to get back to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there are others who have been called to order by the Chair with respect to comments that they might have preferred to make on the initial legislation which was passed by this House some two years ago. If the minister is going to be referring to comments that might have been made in dealing with a bill at a certain point in time, then surely that is an opportunity available to all members.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The point is well taken. The hon. minister should direct his comments to the amendment to the amendment before us at the present time.

Mr. Nixon: That's the end of your speech, John. You might as well sit down.

Mr. S. Smith: Nice try.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: With the greatest of respect, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was speaking—

Mr. Nixon: Are you debating his ruling? Are you going to appeal it?

Mr. S. Smith: Why don't you appeal it?

Mr. Grossman: What are you worried about?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am speaking to the point of order.

Mr. Breithaupt: There is no point of order. The decision has already been made by the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, are you telling me I cannot proceed in this way? Is that what you're telling me?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member can't hear the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, are you saying that I am out of order to read the comments that are part of my position?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I said that you are out of order to read verbatim from Hansard, referring to a debate some years ago. If you wish to relate it to the amendment in brevity, that would be in order.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You may rest assured, Mr. Chairman, that I do not intend to read eight or 10 pages; I wish to read one paragraph as part of the debate on this amendment.

Mr. Reid: It is out of context.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Wait until he hears it.

Mr. Sweeney: You wouldn't let me speak on the original bill.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The Chair will listen and then make the decision.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I indicated I would be very brief, but on November 18, 1975, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce said: "The eight per cent guideline here is suicide for the people who have their money invested in apartments when they're doing the refinancing. This is a fact. I'm not going to get into any argument about whether or not I am right or wrong. This is a fact." He went on to say—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —"I want to tell you, sir, 200,000 or 300,000 appeals immediately."

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, The hon. member has risen on a point of order. Would he state his point of order?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, that was a fact in 1975; it was true. But it's not true today.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I was out of order, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Are you ready for the question? The hon. member for Peel South wishes to comment.

Mr. Kennedy: For a couple of minutes.

Interjections.

Mr. Kennedy: Look, you fellows have prattled away since this bill was introduced and half the evening tonight.

Mr. Nixon: I feel a speech coming on.

Mr. Kennedy: I have in excess of 50 per cent of the people in my riding in rental accommodation, and I think I should have a moment to express their views and speak on behalf of them.

Mr. Reid: Here comes a believer in the AIB.

Mr. Kennedy: When the original bill was introduced, I did a considerable canvass of the people in my riding. What they were disturbed about was the 20, 30, 40 and 50 per cent increases. They said they would happily live with eight, 10 or 12 per cent.

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, are we going up to 12?

Mr. Kennedy: We came in at eight per cent. It was accepted.

Mr. Sweeney: It's going up to 12 if you guys come back in again.

Mr. Kennedy: All our people are expecting is a continuation of the rent review programme—not rent control as the members opposite would have; interminably, indefinitely rent control. I put this on the record, that they would accept this on the basis of a continuation in accordance with the bill.

I go abroad as Trudeau did, to Washington. I happened to be in Washington too, where they have rent control, not rent review. The Washington Post statement is, "no rental apartment construction has taken place in that city since 1973."

Mr. Ruston: That is not in this amendment.

Mr. Kennedy: The members opposite do a disservice to our tenants when they proclaim that rent control should be instituted and should go on indefinitely.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Speak to the amendment.

Mr. Kennedy: So I'm in support of the bill as presented by the minister.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, before the Solicitor General starts taking orders, we are prepared to proceed at this time with the taking of the vote with respect to these two particular amendments so that further amendments can be dealt with another time by the House.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Before taking the vote, I wonder if I could ask the member for Perth if he's prepared to make the correction to the title which was suggested, I believe, by the member for Waterloo North, who suggested that in fact our statement to you was correct—that you had used the wrong name of the Act in your amendment, which would make it unworkable.

Mr. Nixon: Are you going to vote for it if it's changed?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I suggest it would be much more orderly if the member who moved the amendment would correct it.

Mr. Nixon: Then you're going to vote for it?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. We understand the hon. member has informed the Chair that the wording should read "Part 4 of the Anti-Inflation Guidelines."

Mr. Nixon: Now you're going to support it? You're going to support it?

Mr. Bullbrook: What kind of chicken game is that?

[10:45]

The committee divided on Mr. Breaugh's amendment to subsection 1 of section 1, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 29; nays 72.

Mr. Lewis: Why are you fighting this campaign against the tenants of Ontario?

The committee divided on Mr. Breaugh's amendment to Mr. Edighoffer's amendment to subsection 1 of section 1, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 29; nays 72.

The committee divided on Mr. Edighoffer's amendment to subsection 1 of section 1, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes 54; nays 47.

Subsection 1 of section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, we've been giving some consideration in consultation with the other House leaders as to how we might deal with the balance of the bill

because of the late hour, and I'd like an understanding that we have unanimous consent to proceed tomorrow. I'd like to make sure that we have unanimous consent to proceed tomorrow as follows:—

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. House leader will continue.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I wouldn't want to disappoint you at this late hour. I would remind you that we're still in committee. You still have a chance to look after things when we get to third reading of the bill.

On the understanding that we'll proceed to deal with three private bills that will be on the order paper tomorrow—Pr8, Pr21 and Pr27—we will—

Mr. Sargent: What are you shaking about?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I'm shaking because I still haven't got over your contribution to the debate tonight. I think the Minister of Housing really laid you low tonight. There's no doubt about that.

Mr. Bullbrook: He'll rise again.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes. We'll then go back into committee of the whole House to complete the consideration of this bill and then we come out of committee on the understanding we will have unanimous consent to give the bill third reading and royal assent. So, we are agreeing to suspend the other order previously announced with respect to the budget debate.

Mr. Breithaupt: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Welch: On that understanding, I'd like to move that the committee rise and report.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the committee of the whole House reported progress.

Mr. Lewis: Whatever happened to the Ministry of Northern Affairs?

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with standing order 27(g) and provisional order 4, we have certain matters to deal with at this time. If you want to dispense, you may leave but we have to go on with this business. So therefore, in accordance with standing order 28(a), I deem a motion to adjourn to have been made.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege I suppose, I was informed the Treasure would not be available this evening to discuss the matter that I raised and I would ask that my particular matter be set over to Tuesday next.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the member is not prepared to proceed, then I certainly give my permission.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that interjection, I am happy to proceed.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We are all happy then.

GROUP HOME PLACEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: The member for Bellwoods was dissatisfied with the answer given by a certain minister. He may have five minutes to explain his point of view.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, may I wait for about a minute until the din of the House clears?

Mr. Hodgson: Proceed, proceed.

Mr. McClellan: Well, I will proceed. The context of my question to the Minister of Community and Social Services first needs to be briefly delineated.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I request those who are leaving to leave as quietly as possible please. Thank you.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Because of the chaos in children's services in this province, the family courts began placing children directly under authority of The Juvenile Delinquents Act, thus bypassing the entire shambles of Ontario's existing child care service system. On April 21, Judge Holland delivered a decision in the Supreme Court which appears to have invalidated that process.

My question today was a direct appeal to the minister. I was supported in that by questions from the Liberal leader and by the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) for some answers to the dilemma that Judge Holland's decision has posed to us and to the new crisis that child welfare services in this province had been thrown into as a result of that decision. We spoke specifically about the problem of a young girl placed in a group home, Youth Sphere, which was on Tuesday ruled invalid as a result of Judge Holland's decision.

The minister did not answer my question. He did not answer the Liberal leader's question. He did not answer the member for St. George's question. That has become a pattern.

This minister was appointed to solve the problems and the chaos, the scandal and the shambles and the disaster in children's services in this province. The so-called solution was presented to us on April 4 in the policy statement. Strangely, details were absent in that document. In fact not one single concrete solution to one single problem has been addressed so far to date by this minister, and today's answer was just the latest in this series of evasions by this minister.

If you want to walk through the rubble of the April 4 policy edifice, I invite you and the members of this House to read the Hansard reports of the social development estimates for Monday and Tuesday of this week. Under questioning from myself and the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) that policy balloon of April 4 collapsed under the weight of its own hot air.

[11:00]

Secondly, we have in the last few weeks had the devastating revelations of the application brief for a judicial inquiry into the administration of The Child Welfare Act, and we have had no answers yet from this minister and no action and no decision.

Thirdly, a very real crisis has now emerged as a result of Judge Holland's decision, which threatens hundreds of placements of children who are currently in group homes and makes it impossible for adequate child welfare arrangements to be made for future children.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called reforms are not in place and that the so-called timetable the minister announced for implementation has fallen apart under questioning. What is called for now is leadership and some decisive action. We have made a concrete suggestion to this minister, that if he picked up 100 per cent of the costs it would be possible for family court judges to continue to place children under the authority of The Juvenile Delinquents Act until such time as the reforms promised are in place; and we anticipate that that will be some two to three years.

In the meantime, there is a terrible hiatus, there is a complete vaccuum of adequate arrangements and provisions of child care services. Instead of answers, instead of decisions, instead of leadership, we have had smiles and shrugs and "I don't know" and "I don't agree" and "I wasn't told by my staff" and "I don't know what happened at the meeting today with the municipalities." In summary, "I don't know what to do" is what this minister is telling us. We are now right back where we started when the interministry report was revealed to us in December. The shambles remains, with the difference that the situation is now worse as a result of the Holland decision and we still do not have, from this government, an answer to what it proposes to do.

The reason I have brought the minister here tonight is to invite him to give us, for once in his brief ministry, a coherent answer, a coherent suggestion, a coherent proposal about what he is planning to do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has five minutes now.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I'll require five minutes. Perhaps part of the misunderstanding that has existed between the hon. member opposite and myself is that he has difficulty in formulating his questions. When he raised the question with me earlier this afternoon, it was my understanding that he prefaced it by saying, "Don't you agree that . . ." and my response, essentially, was no, because I did not agree with the proposition that he put forward to me at that time that the simplest resolution and the obvious resolution was for the province of Ontario to pay 100 per cent of the costs of the placement of the chilldren in question.

It seems to me the hon. member has a rather excessively simplistic concept of the kind of problem that is faced in Ontario with respect to children's services. If, in fact, he is suggesting that all the problems we might face in the area of children's areas, and particularly those that result from the decision of the Supreme Court recently, can be resolved by a simple decision to pay 100 per cent, then I disagree with him. That is what I indicated this afternoon when I said no. I have said it three times to him in the House already.

Mr. McClellan: Tell us what you're going to do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Only the hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Norton: May I suggest to him that the solution to that problem is not something that can be simplistically decided unilaterally. It involves the communities across this province, it involves the government of Ontario, it involves the courts of

Ontario, it involves the Children's Aid Societies of Ontario. His solution is as simplistic as every solution that his party puts forward in this House.

Ms. Gigantes: What is your answer?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Listen to me for just one moment—give me an opportunity to respond. Since that decision was made I have been engaged in consultation with all the parties I just mentioned, and I am pleased to announce, to this House, as I did this afternoon, that I have received great co-operation from all of those parties concerned. The welfare of the children of Ontario, I can assure you, is in good hands in terms of those people that I have spoken about.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: No child in this province will suffer as a result of that decision. The decision has been made that the decision of the court will be appealed. In the interim, certain undertakings have been made. One of those is that the municipalities will continue to respond to the orders that preceded the decision. The other is that for the intervening period, I will seek through consultation with my colleagues to provide for interim financing. That is yet to be determined. I will be in a position to announce that in the very near future.

However, I don't anticipate that will be 100 per cent. I will not support 100 per cent, and let me tell the member why: Because it is fundamental to the difference in the philosophy between his party and mine. Its members are always shouting about what economic control means. If 100 per cent support were to come from the province of Ontario, essentially the decisions would have to be made centrally and at the provincial level in this province with respect to the care of children. That is not something I'm prepared to accept.

It is the purpose of this government to return the responsibility wherever possible, in co-operation with local authorities, to the local community. We will pursue that as long as I am minister in this portfolio.

Mr. McClellan: You are wrong, you are wrong.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am not wrong. You are misled—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Thirty seconds left.

Hon. Mr. Norton: You are misled, and you are engaged in a headlong effort to mislead the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. McClellan: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The resolution of this problem, I can assure you, which will be announced within the next three or four days, will be one—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister's time has expired. Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: You should withdraw that remark.

Mr. McClellan: On a point of privilege, I didn't want to interrupt and take away from his time. But I would ask you to instruct the minister to withdraw the remarks about "on a headlong course to mislead the province."

Mr. Speaker: It is against the rules of this House to accuse another of misleading the House.

Mr. McClellan: Well, let's not play games with this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps upon reconsideration, it is imputing a motive to the hon. member, and I would ask the minister to withdraw those words.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I will amend my comments so that they might read, with the exception of the members of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: No, no—I want the words having to do with misleading withdrawn, please.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I thought that those members of the House already were probably misled—

Mr. Speaker: No, I'm talking about misleading anybody.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I shall at your request withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. To make myself clear—it was the motive that was imputed that I wished to have withdrawn.

LICENCE FEES

Mr. Speaker: Now we will hear from the hon. member for Timiskaming who had a

question of the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, I believe.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker, in what may or may not turn out to be the dying days of this Parliament, I can realize that with the time constraints of the question period today, when I just got the question in and the minister barely had a chance to give an answer, he may not have had an opportunity to present as full an answer as he might have liked to. I am afraid the answer that he did give could cause some considerable difficulty and that is why I wish clarification.

The $10 licence plate fee that will apply to northern Ontario for 1978 apparently will not apply to half-ton trucks. This fee, of course, applies to passenger cars and motorcycles. My concern in raising the issue this afternoon was that a number of families in northern Ontario possess as their sole family vehicle half-ton trucks, and they would not qualify under the present announcement of a $10 licence plate fee.

I have checked with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the minister in his answer this afternoon alluded to the fact that if half-ton trucks were registered as passenger vehicles they could qualify for a $10 licence plate fee. If that is a change in the ministry's policy, I welcome that announcement.

But upon checking with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, I was told that a person going into the licence office saying he would like to register his half-ton truck as a passenger vehicle would be told definitely that he could not do that. He could not register a half-ton truck as a passenger vehicle and therefore could not qualify for the $10 licence plate.

If the minister wishes to make an announcement changing that, that would be great. But as I understand it, the ministry at present does not licence a vehicle as to what it is used for, but as to what it is. The present regulation on a half-ton truck is a classification based on its manufacture and by definition a half-ton truck is a commercial vehicle.

At present, to have a half-ton truck registered as a passenger vehicle it would have to undergo major structural changes. These changes would have to be documented and this documentation sent to the ministry here in Toronto before the half-ton truck would be reclassified as a passenger vehicle.

As I say, if the minister is willing to make the change, I welcome that change. If he would like to share with the House that change in regulation tonight that would allow half-ton trucks to be classed as passenger vehicles, I look forward to that statement. Unfortunately the present regulations for half-ton trucks require a $33 minimum licence.

I also mentioned this afternoon that I felt half-ton trucks that were used for farm purposes should also be allowed the $10 licence plate fee. The reason I mentioned this is that at present most half-ton trucks would qualify for the minimum $33 licence plate fee. But with the new commercial vehicle rates announced by the Treasurer in this House, that would become a flat rate increase on all commercial vehicles of $22 plus nine per cent. Therefore, the $33 minimum with that new rate would become $60. So therefore, a farmer or a family that has as the sole family vehicle a half-ton truck would now pay $60 in the year 1978.

But the $10 licence plate fee for northern Ontario would mean that somebody who has a Cadillac, who would pay under the new regulations $80 in southern Ontario for his licence plate, would only pay $10. I'm sure the minister will agree with me that there's a tremendous injustice there. A family that can only have as their sole family vehicle a half-ton truck would have to pay $60 under the new regulations, where somebody whipping around the countryside in a Cadillac would pay $10. I would hope this would be corrected.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I would like to inform the member, you have about 15 seconds.

Mr. Bain: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would hope the minister will allow for families who have only a half-ton truck ent reduction that he mentioned for farmers would also be allowed this new $10 rate for their trucks. Possibly the minister might even give consideration to somebody who used his half-ton truck solely for recreational purposes. I would just like to add that the present reduction that we mentioned for farmers does not include the 5,000-pound or half-ton vehicle. Therefore, a farmer pays the same basic $33 now and is not given a discount so he can't use that to allow for a discount.

I look forward to the minister's comment that he will apply equity to all people in northern Ontario and allow this $10 rate for half-ton trucks.

[11:15]

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has stated, when this question was asked it was about 30 seconds before Mr.

Speaker declared the question period over and I don't think we had a chance to clarify the matter properly at that time. As I was saying when the question period ended, it was my understanding that a half-ton pickup truck or a van can be registered as a passenger vehicle. Perhaps my interpretation or my phraseology wasn't exactly correct; perhaps I should have said a recreational vehicle.

To expand on that, passenger plates are issued to half-ton pickups or to vans provided these vehicles have been converted to some degree to be used as recreational vehicles. This has been the policy of the ministry for some time. I would also say that the fee schedule at the present time contains special reduced fees for farm vehicles, starting at 6,000 pounds, which is the normal licence weight at which a person would license a truck if he was using it for farm purposes.

Mr. Bain: Not a half-ton truck though.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well, a half-ton truck weighs about 4,000 to 4,500 pounds. If one is going to carry any load one would expect him to licence that for 6,000 pounds. The safe load that can be considered to be carried on a normal half-ton truck is about one ton. He has to license it for one ton above what the net weight of the truck is, so it is around 6,000 pounds. People who use them only for passenger purposes generally license them for 5,000 pounds, but a farmer who is going to go to the mill to pick up a ton of feed is going to need a 6,000-pound licence and he does qualify at 6,000 pounds for a reduced fee.

Mr. Bain: How much?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The fee on a 6,000-pound licence is $41 at the present rate compared to $49 for a non-farm vehicle. The difference gets much larger on the larger trucks.

Mr. Bain: Not $10.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The new policy set forth in the recent budget by the Treasurer will affect many of the regulations made under The Highway Traffic Act. There are many charts and pages and pages of calculations. That is the regulation book that we use in the office that lists the fees for all the different types of vehicles that we license; the farm fees, the regular fees, the recreational fees and so on. These regulations must be reviewed in detail.

As I say, the budget speech just referred to the basic policy of the reduced rate. My ministry staff, in the next days and weeks, and I guess in the months ahead, will have to recalculate and prepare a completely new regulation to bring about the changes to implement the new policies as announced in the budget. These, of course, then must go to regulation committee and cabinet to be dealt with so that the regulation can be passed some time prior to December 1—obviously a period ahead of December 1 to allow the regulation to be printed and to go out to our agents so they will have them for issuing the new licences starting December 1.

The Treasurer's budget referred to about three lines. Obviously there are a great many pages required to verify all of these. We will be working out all of these different calculations during the summer and the new regulation will be ready in the fall. Traditionally, over the years the cost of the licence for a pickup truck has been roughly the same as that for a car, because I accept the fact that many families use a pickup truck in some cases as their only vehicle and in many cases as their second car.

Mr. Acting Speaker: There are about 15 seconds left.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Okay, I don't need it.

Mr. Bain: Will it now be $10?

Hon. Mr. Snow: These things will all be taken into consideration and will all be clarified when the regulation is published this summer.

Mr. Bain: Will it be $10?

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize I was going to have the pleasure of speaking with the Treasurer tonight since he sent me a note that he couldn't be present. I assume he was trying to keep me out of the House in order that he could claim that I wasn't interested in the topic.

Interjection.

Mr. Deans: In any event, I want to suggest that the question that was asked today by my colleague from Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) is the basis for the supplementary question I asked of the Treasurer. It deals directly with requests of municipalities for a great share of the moneys that they believe and we believe were committed to them under the Edmonton commitment. It appears in the budget that $108 million less than could have been paid was, in fact, paid to the municipalities.

The Treasurer says in his answer today on page 1435-3 of Instant Hansard:

"As it has turned out, slightly less than was anticipated was paid out during 1976 and there is a small variation in the amounts as they have finally been calculated and estimated at this point by the various ministries for 1977. I would not at this point, and I think I have made this quite clear, go back and suggest changes to a whole host of regulations and legislation and in effect say to the municipalities I am going to catch up on the errors . . . "

First of all, $108 million at this point in time is not a small amount. Secondly, we are faced in the province of Ontario with in excess of seven per cent unemployment generally, with over 25 per cent unemployment in construction and there were a number of concrete suggestions made to the ministry by the school board of Metropolitan Toronto and by other municipalities about projects which were both necessary and desirable and which could have gone ahead in this current year and could have eased the burden of unemployment for the people in the construction trades.

But that is not exactly the problem that I see. With regard to the specific proposals for work programmes, my colleague asked the ministry whether it is worthy of consideration of approval that these things be placed before the government and in fact whether they are a far better method of creating employment than the fast write-offs that the government has given to corporations.

The Treasurer said: "The philosophy of this government is quite clear. It's the private sector which is going to ultimately put people back to work in a meaningful way." He went on to say: "If you want to go on, recognizing that school board expenditures are going to be paid either by Metropolitan Toronto taxpayers or by us, then inevitably you must [have] either borrowing or higher taxes. That's your philosophy, not ours."

I want to begin by saying to the Treasurer this: that when you are faced with 25 per cent plus unemployment in construction; when you are faced with in excess of seven per cent unemployment generally; and when you have $108 million that should have been paid to municipalities for capital projects which was not paid; and when there are projects which in themselves are both necessary and desirable and which could have been started, or could even yet be started, in these municipalities during this current year, it makes abundant good sense to use that $108 million to put people to work.

What worries me about the Treasurer is exactly what he claims to be his philosophy —that he would rather sit back and hope by some fanciful means, with no initiative on the part of the government, that the private sector will somehow or other come up with jobs. But he has also admitted in the same budget that the private sector will not be able to come up with the number of jobs which would reduce the level of unemployment to a level which you and I, Mr. Speaker, and my colleague from Welland-Thorold, would consider to be reasonable in a province as industrious and rich with natural resources as this province is.

We have generally accepted in the province of Ontario, not only on our own but at the suggestion of the previous Treasurers—and I think even at the suggestion of this Treasurer in days gone by, not so long ago—that three per cent unemployment was an acceptable level for the province of Ontario.

The province has suddenly changed its mind, or perhaps it's only the Treasurer—

Mr. Acting Speaker: You have about one minute.

Mr. Deans: Thank you—and now we are talking about a 5.3 per cent permanent unemployment force. We are talking about 320,000 unemployed now in excess of 100,000 more than would have been generally acceptable. We are talking about money available to put these people back to work. We are talking about having to raise from the taxes paid by all of the others who are out of work the necessary moneys to provide either unemployment insurance on the one hand, or welfare benefits on the other hand.

We completely reject the suggestion that it's better to continue to collect taxes from those who work and to pay welfare benefits to people who could be working but who are put out of work by the policies of this government. We suggest that if there is the money to pay the welfare then there is the money now, using this $108 million and more, to put into effect the projects that are necessary and to put the very people who will now be having to live on welfare on the rolls of the employed.

Mr. Active Speaker: Your time has expired.

Mr. Deans: We opt for employment; we ought not to put people on to the welfare rolls.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, coming through the rhetoric which we've just heard and perhaps heard earlier in question period, obviously the member feels that some sum of money—$108 million—should be advanced to municipalities for make-work projects. That's not the position of the government. I've reviewed the answer I've given this afternoon and would not change that position.

Mr. Deans: I'm still not satisfied.

Mr. Speaker: I deem the motion to adjourn to have been carried.

The House adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 28, 1977

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, in committee 1031

Debate re answer to oral question on Group Home Placements, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Norton 1063

Debate re answer to oral question on Licence Fees, Mr. Bain, Mr. Snow 1065

Debate re answer to oral question on Capital Works Projects, Mr. Deans, Mr. McKeough 1067

Adjournment 1069

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Davidson, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Drea, F. (Scarborough Centre PC)
Edighoffer, H.; Acting Speaker (Perth L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lewis, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K.; Minister of Correctional Services (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Minister of Natural Resources (Muskoka PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North PC)
Smith, G. E.; Deputy Chairman (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Chairman (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A.; Minister of Energy (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)



No. 26

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament
Friday, April 29, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1977

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

COURT FACILITIES IN METRO TORONTO

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I want to announce my ministry's programme to expand and decentralize provincial court facilities in Metropolitan Toronto.

The purpose of the programme is to speed up the judicial process by avoiding unnecessary delays and to bring the court system closer to the people. The programme will cost approximately $2.6 million.

We are currently developing new court facilities in Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough. We will be locating 246 people, including judges, Crown attorneys and support staff, in these facilities.

In addition, I'm announcing today the appointment of a deputy Crown attorney for each of these three boroughs. Each deputy Crown attorney will direct the work of the Crown attorneys assigned to his jurisdiction. This will enable the Crown attorneys to provide more continuity in cases and enable them to spend more time interviewing witnesses and police officers, screening charges and preparing cases for trial. This will enable the Crown attorneys to generally provide better and more convenient service to the public.

With this programme, a Crown attorney assigned to a serious case, for example, will follow that case from start to finish. This procedure will enable the Crown attorney to more readily engage in pre-trial disclosure and discussion with defence counsel to the benefit of all concerned. This should result in cases being expedited to the trial stage and the actual trial, in many cases, being shortened. It should, of course, result in substantial cost savings for both the Crown and the defence and, most of all, the public.

This decentralization programme will ease pressure at the old city hall courts in downtown Toronto. The increase in the case load of the provincial courts criminal division in Metropolitan Toronto in recent years has been extraordinary. For example, in 1968, the case load was 830,467. By 1975 it had grown to 1,375,678, an increase of 66 per cent.

All categories except liquor charges have increased, but of particular concern and importance is the increase in cases under The Criminal Code and other federal statutes. In 1968, The Criminal Code dispositions in Metropolitan Toronto totalled 26,990. By 1975 this had grown to 82,640, an increase of 206 per cent in seven years.

The growing case load and the nature of existing facilities has resulted in a number of inconveniences for those involved as cases have been moved from one court location to another. For example, impaired driving cases from Scarborough are heard at the old city hall downtown. The Highway Traffic Act cases from Scarborough are heard in North York. This programme will therefore enable most cases to be heard in the area in which they arise.

In Etobicoke, we are locating new court facilities at 80 The East Mall. This will include five new criminal courtrooms. One family courtroom will be maintained at 16 Silverhill Avenue. These facilities will have a staff of 73 persons and are scheduled to open in August.

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Norman G. Matusiak, QC, as deputy Crown attorney for Etobicoke. Mr. Matusiak first joined the Crown attorney's office in 1964 and he has lived in the Etobicoke area for the last 15 years.

In North York, we will be providing six new courtrooms for a total of nine in the borough. The main facility will be at 1000 Finch Avenue West. The existing traffic court at 47 Sheppard Avenue East will be maintained. The courts staff in the borough, including judges and Crown attorneys, will total 73. The new facilities should be available for use by October.

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Robert Bruce McGee as deputy Crown attorney for North York. Mr. McGee

first joined the Crown attorney's office in 1967.

In Scarborough, we will be providing a total of 11 courtrooms, including three new criminal courtrooms, four new traffic courtrooms and one new courtroom for family matters. This major new Scarborough facility will be located at 1911 Eglinton Avenue East and will have a staff of 90. It should be available for use in November.

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Michael McKenzie Lynch as deputy Crown attorney for Scarborough. Mr. Lynch joined the Crown attorney's office in 1968 and has lived in the Scarborough area for seven years.

In summary, I am confident that this programme will provide the necessary improvements to court facilities in Metropolitan Toronto and at the same time provide more convenient access to the courts system by the public as a whole.

Mr. Bain: What about Sudbury?

ORAL QUESTIONS

BARRIE ANNEXATION PROPOSAL

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I pick up with the Minister of Agriculture and Food where he left off yesterday in his exchange with the leader of the Liberal Party? Can he indicate to the House if his ministry as part of its normal processes in the food lands branch provided specific commentary to TEIGA on the intended or proposed Barrie annexation with particular reference to the way in which the ministry viewed the use of that potential agricultural land for development? Is there in fact such a document in the normal processes of your ministry?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, on every plan that comes before either TEIGA or Housing, whether it is an official plan amendment or a plan of subdivision, there are always internal memos that go from my ministry which I do not see because there are so many of them. They comment on the due process. I know our people probably commented to the Simcoe-Georgian area task force. They probably commented on any other subdivision plan in the province of Ontario. I wrote the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) an official letter outlining our position on the land situation in the area, which letter was tabled in the House, I believe, by the hon. George McCague on a Friday morning.

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps the member for Dufferin-Simcoe is honourable but he hasn't yet acquired the title.

Hon. W. Newman: Sorry.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Is the minister prepared to provide publicly—obviously not in this legislative forum, but publicly within the next few days—the actual document which issued from his ministry, critical of the intended annexation and its use of prime agricultural land in that part of the province? Or is he determined to keep the document secret?

Hon. W. Newman: Internal documents in my ministry—comments go back and forth to the various ministries about the preservation of agricultural land—I don't see all those. I would like to have a look at what the member is talking about to see exactly what our people have done. Certainly I'm not prepared at this point in time, until I have had a chance to go over it, to say what I'm prepared to do.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: Was the letter that the minister wrote to the provincial Treasurer—and which was tabled in the House a week ago Friday by the parliamentary assistant to TEIGA — an accurate reflection of the comment that was made by the food land development branch, or a watered-down version of it, to conform with the provincial Treasurer's approach?

Hon. W. Newman: Every letter that I write to the Treasurer or any other minister in this government expresses the view of the ministry, especially of the minister, of how he views the situation anywhere in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would draw to your attention that the minister didn't answer my question. My question was: Was his letter a watered-down version of the commentary of the food land development branch or was it an accurate reflection of that branch's views?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the letter that I wrote to the Treasurer outlined our position very loud and clear, and as far as I'm concerned it wasn't watered-down. The letter indicated exactly how we felt about the proposed annexation up there, and I made it very clear in the letter.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Since the letter that the minister wrote to the Treasurer was in the year 1976, and since the staff

report from the food land division is dated August 1975, can he explain to this House precisely what category of secrecy requirement it is that's preventing him from letting us see the actual document that his food land branch has prepared? What is the reason for the secrecy, just so that we can understand it? Is it just to prevent embarrassment to the Treasurer?

Hon. W. Newman: It is not to prevent embarrassment to anyone. As I've said, we have comments going out on a daily basis to all ministries which I don't even see because they're internal documents. When a matter comes to my attention and I'm asked to comment on it directly, which I did in the letter to the Treasurer on the situation—I think one thing the member is forgetting is that we have issued food land guidelines for this province—and don't look like that because you read right from my speech when you talked about your agricultural policy. Don't look like that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of order.

Mr. Breithaupt: Who is looking like what?

Hon. W. Newman: We don't know what your policy really is.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: I can appreciate that the Premier (Mr. Davis) doesn't like it if I criticize his policies, but just for looking that way?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: What more am I supposed to do to avoid an election?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Get another pair of glasses.

Mr. Sweeney: What did you have for breakfast, Bill?

Mr. Lewis: If the Premier didn't have an issue before, the appearance of the leader of the Liberal Party is sufficient to justify the call.

WCB REHABILITATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Labour: Is the minister aware of the really quite deplorable state of vocational and medical rehabilitation services for workmen's compensation recipients right throughout northwestern Ontario, provoking great and open expressions of community concern? Can she indicate to us whether she is prepared to respond to this in an urgent fashion?

[10.15]

Hon. B. Stephenson: The Workmen's Compensation Board is in the process right now of hiring more well-trained staff specifically for medical and vocational rehabilitation. For vocational rehabilitation the vast majority of the new staff will be distributed throughout the province. Northwestern Ontario is one of the areas that is being concentrated upon.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that the level of medical rehabilitation being offered to injured workers in northwestern Ontario compares very badly with those services being offered to people who come to Downsview, as opposed to having medical rehabilitation in the Thunder Bay area?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am aware that in northwestern Ontario there is an excellent health facility in Thunder Bay.

An hon. member: It's overcrowded.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The hospitals are used by the Workmen's Compensation Board throughout the northwest as well as they are throughout the rest of the province. Not everyone is required to come to Toronto or to go to any other specific place, but the rehabilitation hospital is in Downsview. There have been some explorations of duplication of that service. These are ongoing and I am not sure when the recommendations will be forthcoming from that kind of review.

At the moment, in order to provide the excellent rehabilitation service for which the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario is well known, the individual injured workmen would be required to come to the Downsview hospital. The medical rehabilitation is carried out within the local hospital system and in most instances is excellent. The staff of the hospital in Thunder Bay are very well-trained, very good people who are very concerned. They do, in fact, serve the injured workers in that area very well on behalf of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Laughren: Is the minister aware that for workers who are disabled in northwestern Ontario and have a partial disability, there is virtually no vocational rehabilitation services

being offered those people whatsoever in that entire part of the province?

Mr. di Santo: Excellent.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I just said that the concentration of effort on the part of the vocational rehabilitation branch of the Workmen's Compensation Board is to be decentralized as a result of the new employment of trained vocational rehabilitation officers.

Mr. Lewis: How many?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The number is something close to 30 of those who are going to be outside Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: How many in the north?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am not exactly sure of the number which are going to the north. All I know is that the areas in which there have been problems in terms of recruiting vocational rehabilitation officers are those upon which the board is concentrating at this point.

Mr. Mancini: I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that she is now suggesting that she is going to send out more help as far as staff is concerned for the injured workers of Ontario, would she consider sending out more workmen advisers, so that when the injured workers go before the appeal boards at least they have a chance of winning their case?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes. The workers' advisers have been of great service, I think, to the injured workers, and this is an area which is being examined. We are trying to find appropriate people to do this. They are very special and dedicated human beings.

Mr. Speaker: May I just point out that the last question wasn't really supplementary because the main question had to do with the conditions in northwestern Ontario, not the general question of the province. Is this a supplementary on that question?

Mr. Angus: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is. Would the minister not consider having the Workmen's Compensation Board consider the construction of a new wing on to the Westmount Rehabilitation Hospital in Thunder Bay with adequate physiotherapy and occupational rehabilitation facilities so that the injured workers and others no longer have to be cramped 31 into a rehab room for group therapy?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It's an interesting suggestion which I shall consider. Thank you.

EXPLOITATION OF IMMIGRANT WORKERS

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question also for the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware of some of the very unfortunate practices whereby illegal immigrants residing in Ontario are employed and are either paid less than their wages would normally be expected to cover or else are exploited in some other way, by being asked to give gifts to their employers or something else as a way of keeping their jobs? Is the minister aware of these practices and could she tell us what her ministry is doing to look into these matters?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The ministry can, of course, investigate such situations when a complaint is lodged with the ministry. If the hon. member does have information about this, the ministry would be grateful to have it. Indeed, we have examined several such situations. The employment standards division is the branch of the ministry which is responsible for insuring that workers are not exploited and action has been taken in some cases. Indeed, illegal immigrants have been assisted through the Department of Immigration, as a result of the assistance provided by the employment standards branch.

But if there are instances of this which any hon. member is aware of, it would be of great help to the Ministry of Labour if we were informed about them so that we could, indeed, act.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Since the minister, I'm sure, is aware of the sensitivity of the issue, inasmuch as the exploited person is fearful for the loss of his job and is unlikely to come forward to report such things, is the employment standards branch of her ministry taking steps to do spot checks once in a while, taking steps to do any form of inspection or investigation, and, in particular following up some of the recent articles in the newspaper? Is she certain that no companies doing subcontracting work for the government of Ontario engage in this practice?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, I could not say at this point that I am certain this does not

happen. I do not believe that it happens because, indeed, the employment standards branch has been active in that specific area. Also, employment standards officers do inspect those companies which have perhaps had a bad reputation in the past for certain types of exploitation. But I would repeat that it would be of great help to the Ministry of Labour if any member of this House knows of any case, or knows of any company, in which this is happening, because it would assist us in our investigation.

HOUSING STARTS

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Treasurer: Is he aware of the preliminary data released by CMHC which indicates that urban housing starts in Ontario were 44 per cent lower in March of this year than a year earlier; and that the data also indicates a trend for the period from January to March showing an annual decline in urban starts of 32 per cent in Ontario, compared to the national decline of 18 per cent?

In view of this, is the Treasurer prepared to explain why there is nothing in his budget to encourage the construction of more housing, particularly at the affordable level? We are lagging behind the rest of the country.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I'm not aware of the data. I'll be glad to have a look at it. I indicated in the budget that I think the log jam in housing starts, if I can put it that way, is created, in part, in two ways—and this is true across Canada as well as in Ontario.

The year 1976 turned out to be a stronger year than anybody expected. In the budget a year ago, I think we indicated that we thought starts would be somewhere around 80,000 units. We felt that we were being awfully optimistic and so did the Minister of Housing. But as it turned out, there were something like 85,000 starts in Ontario in 1976. I've forgotten the Canadian figures but they were far, far higher than anyone had anticipated.

That, naturally, has spilled over into 1977; and what you see here in Toronto has also been true in a number of other municipalities where there have been a great number of unsold units. I think the figures for January-February indicated that there were something like 20,000 unsold units in the Metro area, which was an all-time high. We've been encouraged, and the Minister of Housing has been encouraged, that those units have started to move in the last month and a half and the housing market is brisk. This is, I think, a catch-up from the rather more intense activity of last year and also reflects, of course, the fall in mortgage interest rates from over 12 per cent, in some instances, down to very close to 10 per cent.

There is some feeling I think, too, that interest rates may go lower, perhaps below 10 per cent and there may be some reluctance, therefore, on the part of buyers or builders to proceed too quickly. But with improving sales and an increase in the housing market generally across the province in terms of clearing out some of the inventory of unsold homes, then it would be my expectation that starts would follow that. It would be a rather bold builder, large or small, I think, who would be plunging in and taking out building permits today or a month ago with the number of unsold units there were in this area particularly. And that is true in a number of other areas across the province. However, I will be glad to examine the data in question.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, in view of the Treasurer's answer, am I correct in assuming that most of the unsold houses to which he refers are in what one might call the middle or upper price range, whereas the need for housing starts would be in the affordable range? I would like the figures on that.

The other aspect of my supplementary question is with respect to the Comay report which the government commissioned and which said that 100,000 starts were needed annually for 10 years to avert a crisis. Does the Treasurer still feel that that particular figure is a correct target, in which case the seasonally adjusted figure this year aims at only 42,000? If the trend continues, how does he expect it to work out?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is a question that should properly be put to the Minister of Housing. My own personal view is, yes, it is too high in terms of somewhat lesser expectations in terms of population growth—

Mr. Lewis: Except for Barrie.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and in terms of a decline in interest rates which hasn't moved housing as much as one might have expected from a year ago. I would suspect probably that Mr. Comay's figure was a little high. But perhaps the member might like to redirect that to the Minister of Housing.

Ms. Bryden: A supplementary to the Treasurer: Is he aware that at the Ontario Economic Council conference last Monday Mr. Rene de Cotret of the Conference Board predicted there would be a 14 per cent drop in housing starts in Ontario and not more than 74,000 units started? Does he accept this prediction?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We said in the budget we thought that there would be about 80,000 starts. That is our number. As I said last year, we estimated 80,000 starts and it turned out to be 85,000 starts. I will be very surprised if the number of starts this year are bang on our prediction.

Mr. Deans: I will be surprised if anything is bang on your prediction.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is something that we will have to wait and see. But Mr. Rene de Cotret may be right. I think his number is a little low.

CORE CURRICULUM

Ms. Gigantes: A question of the Minister of Education: As the public is under the impression that the much-touted new core curriculum guidelines would be in place for the school year 1977-78, could the minister specify for us the dates of mandatory implementation of the new core curriculum guidelines, particularly those for mathematics?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The mathematics core curriculum guidelines will be phased in over the next couple of years.

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary: Does that mean they will not be mandatory come this fall or indeed even the fall of 1978?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is correct. In working with the mathematics teachers of this province and in allowing for a feedback from the teachers on the new curriculum, which represents some major changes because there have been no changes in the mathematics guidelines for quite a number of years, in working with the teachers' federation and the teachers, we devised a process that would allow a phasing in and validation period, which I think is to the benefit of students, teachers and all concerned.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, if there is a validation period to which the minister refers, can he tell us what form of standardized, province-wide test procedure will be used in the validation procedure for the new mathematics guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Wells: As my friend knows we are awaiting the report of a task force on evaluation and reporting. When I get that report from that group, I will then know what kind of suggestions have been made in this area. They will then be considered and any change or any new directions in that area will be announced at that time.

Mr. S. Smith: That is a validation period with no means of measuring it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I suggest the member talk to all the math teachers of the province and they will tell him the kind of validation they are going to carry on.

Mr. S. Smith: You are the minister, you talk to them.

Ms. Gigantes: I would like to ask the minister if it isn't true that this process we are going through right now is not one whit faster than the process that was under way before he announced the new core curriculum guidelines last fall, and that the new core math guidelines will not be in place one month faster than they would have been had you not made his announcement last fall.

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is not correct at all. In fact, that is absolutely wrong. If I hadn't made my announcement last fall there wouldn't have been anybody working on new math guidelines.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is this a supplementary or is this a new question?

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary first and then a new question later.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are we going to have a social contract this morning?

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary: If, as I understood the minister's direction from last fall, mathematics are now going to be compulsory for at least grade nine students and he is not going to have the new guidelines in place, what is going to be compulsory? What is the content of the compulsory course?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The school boards have been sent a memo indicating the guidelines that are in effect. These list the compulsory math subjects for grade nine and 10 that they can use for next year. They will begin an implementation process and a melding of the two guidelines together throughout the year.

My friend knows that the one thing we have always done in this ministry is work in

co-operation with those people who have to deliver the service.

Mrs. Campbell: You sure do.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are moving ahead with guidelines faster than we ever have in this ministry, but more time is being taken on these guidelines than some of the guidelines that took two and three years to prepare, because teachers and other writers have spent a very concentrated time working on them.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In working with—now that is not right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is absolutely not right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister ignore the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If my friend can show me where the mathematics—

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —guideline committee was put in place before we made our announcement I would like her to show it, because these new guideline committees—the intermediate guidelines in the mandatory subject areas—were set up after my statement was made.

PSI MIND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

Mr. Sweeney: I have a question of the Minister of Health dealing with the Psi Mind Development Institute. Firstly, what does his ministry know about this institute? And secondly, what is he planning to do, given the kinds of dangerous practices which they are engaging in?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, through his staff, has taken a look at this particular organization as it pertains—I forget the exact legislation that pertains to them. The matter has only just been referred to us, I think in the last 36 hours, from Consumer and Commercial Relations to see if we feel we have a role to play in it. I might say I have started some discussions with my staff about it.

But in addition to some concerns I might have over the reports about this particular organization, I have some concern about where you draw the line in establishing the kind of control that I think my hon. friend is referring to—the kind of control over organizations, be they religious or otherwise, that deal supposedly with the development of one's mind.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary: My supplementary has to do with actual fact. Does the minister's report include the information that there are three young people from the city of Kitchener who have been "processed" by this institute through the use of illegal hypnosis and verbal and physical abuse to the extent they have ended up in the London Psychiatric Institute and we have been advised they will be there for at least four or five months? That's dangerous. That's a health problem. What is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have asked for reports on those three young people. I am not trying to arrive at a conclusion one way or the other yet, but I think what the member is trying to say is that those three young people would not have had a problem except for Psi. I don't know that yet. Certainly if it can be shown to be, then we have to see what we can do about it. The Hypnosis Act is perhaps available to us, although I am told that it has never been used before.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary: When the minister is pursuing this particular matter, will he and his staff ensure that there are procedures developed by the ministry with respect to these various mind development courses so that the courses from a health point of view are conducted not only in an ethical manner but taught by qualified personnel?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That is a matter of concern to me, Mr. Speaker, because of personal experiences over the years with former students of mine who had become involved with various organizations. The difficulty—and I think the hon. member will appreciate this—is that many of these organizations purport to operate as a religious cult. I have some difficulty—I think we all do—in trying to define the line of demarcation between what in fact is a legitimate religious experience and what in fact is something that could be harmful to the individual. That obviously has to be of concern to all of us and it is a matter which I am taking

up, initially because of this one but in a general sense.

HURONIA REGIONAL CENTRE

Mr. G. E. Smith: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Is the minister aware of the local criticism that the recommendations of the Willard report as they apply to the Huronia Regional Centre are not being implemented, particularly the recommendation for an increase in staff ratio between the professional staff and the residents? Perhaps the minister would comment.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The concern that the hon. member has expressed is not based upon fact, Mr. Speaker. To date, substantial progress has been made with regard to implementation of the recommendations in the report of Dr. Willard. My recollection from my most recent checking on the progress is that well over half of the recommendations have now been implemented or are substantially towards full implementation. The balance of the recommendations are under active study and I am being kept abreast of the progress there.

With respect specifically to the question of staff ratio, the hon. member may recall the recommendation of Dr. Willard was that we move towards the 1971 revised standards for staffing of the American Association on Mental Deficiency. We are moving in that direction, although we have not yet achieved the 1971 standards. The way in which we are approaching it, as the hon. member knows, is that we are working towards the reduction of the number of residents in Huronia and, as the number of residents is reduced, we are trying to maintain staff; so through that process the staff ratio is constantly improving. I'm pleased to report that the progress since Dr. Willard's report has been very substantial.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Supplementary: Could the minister then explain why 76 employees of the Huronia Regional Centre have been laid off recently and no longer work there?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Although I'm not familiar with each of the individual cases the hon. member raises, it's my understanding that the persons who have been laid off are not persons generally who are involved in direct care within the facility. Certain programmes in the facility have been phased out—for example, the farm operation has been phased out and so on—so that a number of staff reductions that have taken place involved persons who have been employed in those programmes that no longer exist. They are not professional staff who have been removed. In many cases they were not full-time staff but were staff who were on a temporary contract basis.

Ms. Sandeman: Supplementary: Could the minister then tie in for us the number of residents of Huronia who have been relocated and make some comparisons with the number of staff who have been let go and the final staff-patient ratio at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I don't have the specific figures that the hon. member asks for at this point. I would be quite happy to undertake to get those to her immediately after the House rises today. The present number of residents at Huronia, I believe, is just under 1,200. That, I think, is substantial progress if one considers that a few years ago the population there at one time was, I believe, in excess of 2,600.

Mr. Lewis: You have a great voice. Lousy answers but a great voice.

CHILD WELFARE

Mr. McClellan: I have a new question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Has the minister's staff brought to his attention the remarks of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) in the estimates debates on Monday, April 25, with respect to the three cases from the Peel Children's Aid Society described in the application brief for a judicial inquiry into the administration of The Child Welfare Act? Has the minister seen her remarks?

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't.

Mr. McClellan: The minister has some staff!

The provincial secretary said, and I quote: "I'm very concerned, for example, about the three case histories that you spoke about. I personally have read them. Like you, I have read all the documentation too, and I feel heartsick that in this day and age in the province of Ontario any child is subjected to that kind of treatment who needs the protection." In view of those remarks, let me ask the minister, does he intend to establish a judicial inquiry or not?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I told the hon. member not long ago in the House, the matter is under investigation by my ministry. I have not yet received the report from my staff—

Mr. McClellan: I'm not surprised at that.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —on the specifics of the cases to which the hon. member referred. But I concur entirely with the views of the provincial secretary, as he related them. As soon as I have that report and have an opportunity to evaluate that, along with the information which I have now received from the last meeting with Mr. Wilson, I believe, then I will give it my immediate attention. I hope to have that report, if not today, then Monday.

FAMILY BENEFITS

Mr. B. Newman: I too have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. Is the minister considering the minimizing of the time lapse between the application and the granting of FBA, family benefits? Will he also consider making the family benefits applicable from the date of the application rather than from the date of the approval as it is at present, in the light of the fact that it imposes a tremendous burden on the municipalities where they have to provide welfare during that lapsed period of time?

Hon. Mr. Norton: With respect to the first part of that question, I have asked my staff to do everything possible to expedite the applications for family benefits. With regard to the second part of the question, I will pursue that with the staff to find out whether at this point we could do something to improve that situation as well.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: In an effort to expedite the problem, is the minister considering decentralizing the decision-making?

Hon. Mr. Norton: At the moment, there is a pilot project under way involving the installation of four computer terminals in four selected municipalities within the province to try to speed up the information exchange and to expedite the processing. I can say quite frankly to the hon. member that one of the matters that I discussed as recently as this week with senior management in my staff was the question of ways in which we might proceed to further decentralization of the decision-making process. That was discussed on a very preliminary basis. I have asked that it be brought back so that we can continue to pursue that as a possible way of improving the service.

Mr. Lewis: You can always go on an open-line show. You have a really good voice.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. Minister of Labour has the answer to some questions.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I have the answers to three questions, Mr. Speaker, and they're not particularly long. Could I give all three at this time?

Mr. Speaker: It depends on how long they are. We try to divide the time as fairly as possible.

KAYSON PLASTICS

Hon. B. Stephenson: First, the hon. member for Cambridge (Mr. Davidson) asked me yesterday about medical examinations of employees in a plant in Cambridge. I was in error, Mr. Speaker. I confused the name of that plant with another which is, in fact, involved in similar kinds of activities in which medical examinations have, indeed, been carried out. I am aware that there was an inspection of that plant in December 1976. I have not had a report on the follow-up to that inspection as yet, and shall so inform the member who is unfortunately not here.

[10:45]

ONTARIO MALLEABLE IRON

Hon. B. Stephenson: On April 25, I believe it was, the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) inquired about the activities of the Ministry of Labour on behalf of the employees of The Ontario Malleable Iron Company. The Ministry of Labour has been in touch on several occasions with the federal agency responsible for UIC and in spite of somewhat supplicant questions, the Unemployment Insurance Commission has decided that this group does not qualify for an extension. There are certain grounds for extension but a strike or lock-out is not one of them and, therefore, they are unwilling to grant an exemption in this case.

However, the hon. member also asked me whether the Ministry of Labour was involved in other activities; and, indeed, since the announcement made by the company the ministry has been in constant contact with both the union and the company in an attempt to establish an MAIA, an assistance programme for the employees of that plant. The company has accepted—at first they did

not agree with, and would not accept, the programme—but now we're having a little difficulty with the union. But both the federal Department of Manpower and the Ministry of Labour of the province of Ontario stand ready to assist the employees in finding employment adjustment in that area.

The other question is rather longer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think we'll leave that until the next time around, then. Thank you very much.

TORONTO ISLAND AIRPORT

Ms. Bryden: I have a question for the Treasurer: The mayor of Toronto asked, as far back as November 1975, for the Treasurer to comment on the regional impact of the proposed alternative uses for the Toronto Island Airport, including a possible STOL port. In view of the fact that the Treasurer replied on November 7, 1975, that he had instructed his staff, and I quote, ". . . to review the results of the Toronto Island Airport study as they appear from time to time, and supply the working group with any relevant comments on the implications of these results for the province's regional planning programme," could the Treasurer tell us when he is going to provide these comments, now that the study is completed and a public meeting on it is scheduled for May 13 and 14?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I received that letter from his worship the mayor a day or so ago and I haven't seen my staff's comments on it. But I think there has been some misunderstanding. We have made whatever viewpoint we have known to the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and, as I understand it, will not be supplying any direct input.

Ms. Bryden: Well then, the people attending the public meeting on May 13 and 14 will not know what the Treasurer's comments are or what he feels, and how this affects his regional planning programme.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I wouldn't say that. I think that what we have to say is brief enough and will be expressed by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications.

TOWNSHIP OF MALDEN INQUIRY

Mr. Mancini: I have a question for the Treasurer: The Treasurer's statement concerning the public inquiry into the affairs of the township of Malden states on page four that the first and second recommendations, which I consider to be the main thrust of the report, are going to be left up to the council for their implementation. Does the Treasurer not feel that the same type of report could have been rendered by an inquiry of the ministry? In this way, the direct costs of the inquiry would not have to be borne solely by the taxpayers of Malden township.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am saying that I am content to leave action on these two recommendations to that council at this time. Obviously, if they don't take action on it, then it may be necessary for us to do so. The matter of cost is something we have under consideration.

Mr. Mancini: Could the Treasurer inform the House of the exact cost of the inquiry and could he also inform the House if the same type of inquiry could have been carried under the title as an inquiry of the ministry, as was suggested by some people?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sorry, I can't indicate what the costs are. I don't know if they're known yet—definitively. I wouldn't agree that it would necessarily have been appropriate to have a provincially-initiated inquiry of a different sort—a royal commission or a commission under The Public Inquiries Act. I think we have generally handled these matters in the way we handled the Malden inquiry and I see no reason to change that.

Mr. Mancini: Supplementary: Is there any possibility that the province may be able to assist the taxpayers of Malden in the payment of this inquiry?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not until I know what the costs are. I've thought about it, as I said, and this is something that is under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Labour may give a final answer.

ROCKWELL INTERNATIONAL

Hon. B. Stephenson: On April 18 the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville inquired of me about the closing of the Rockwell International plant in Windsor. As a result of investigations, I have discovered that there were, apparently, in the company's mind, valid reasons for closing this plant. The shutdown, I gather, is permanent, the

reason being that the wage rates of the United States competitors were significantly lower than those paid to employees in Windsor. In addition to that, the company was having great difficulty since it produced cold rolled and stainless steel wheel covers, competing with the changing preferences to plastic and aluminum wheel covers. The company, therefore, feels that this plant is no longer a viable institution and must be closed.

An employment adjustment programme was established with both the company and the union. The Ministry of Labour and the Department of Manpower and Immigration are involved in this activity and the committee will be offering assistance to all of the employees of the plants.

The pension rights do not really fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Labour. They're really under the jurisdiction of the pension commission, but there are certain provisions made under The Pension Benefits Act to provide protection to employees' benefits in situations like this when a company closes and the existing pension plan is terminated. Arrangements that the company makes with their employees regarding the pension plan really is subject to approval of the pension commission.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: Did the minister ask the company to prove their figures when they made mention to her that they could manufacture the product cheaper in the United States than they could in Canada, or did she simply accept their word?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, it was not simply a matter of the cost of production being higher in Canada. It was also a very rapidly decreasing market and that was the major problem actually.

GANG VIOLENCE

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Attorney General dealing with the matter of crime in the city of Hamilton. I wonder if he would care to explain to the House what action he might take in response to some matters which I raised with the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) and the following response? And it's not the full response, obviously, because of the time.

The Solicitor General said: "Some difficulties have been encountered in coping with the activities of gangs. In many cases, persons who have been victimized by gang members are reluctant to lay charges or give evidence in court. When members are arrested, they are invariably released within a very short period of time to await trial, sometimes months. The courts have shown a tendency to be very sceptical about imposing a term of imprisonment when such persons have been convicted."

The Solicitor General is of the opinion that some action should be taken by the Attorney General and the federal government in order to bring about a satisfactory resolution to what is becoming a severe problem for citizens in the Hamilton area.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: We have been in touch with the Crown attorney, Mr. Takach, in Hamilton. Some six weeks ago, he had a meeting with some of the—

Mr. Conway: Spit it out.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —family court judges to indicate the seriousness of the situation insofar as the matter relates to juveniles and to express the general concern of the community.

Mr. Deans: Not only juveniles.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, I'm just dealing first of all with the juvenile aspect of it. With respect to people who will be appearing in the adult court as adults, the Crown attorney is very determined to prosecute these cases very vigorously. As a matter of fact, Mr. Harvey McCulloch who, as the member will recall, is a long-time Crown attorney in the Hamilton area, has been given specific responsibility in this area.

Furthermore, in one case—I believe it had to do with an obstruction of justice conviction —where an allegation of interfering with a witness was proved, a sentence of 30 days was given. In our view this was wholly inappropriate and we have appealed that sentence, so I can assure the hon. member that so far as the Crown attorney's office is concerned, we are going to act as aggressively as possible.

In relation to the matter of bail and these people released on bail, under The Bail Reform Act there is a very heavy onus on the Crown that must be satisfied to deny an individual bail. I would think in general terms the member would agree with the principles behind that legislation, but it does make it very difficult to deny bail to an offender and, as I say, in most cases for very good reasons, so it would be up to the federal government, of course, to amend The Bail Reform Act.

My own personal view is that it would not serve a useful purpose to amend what is

generally good legislation in order to allow you to be tougher against a select group of people. I mean it would not be in the interests of the whole community. It's a matter that we are continually reviewing, and of course I think the police themselves have to be prepared to allocate sufficient resources to investigations and the obtaining of evidence upon which we can convict people.

It is not just a question of keeping people in jail pending their trial. It is a question of convicting them at the trial. I am confident that the local Crown attorney's office, together with the police, are totally aware of the seriousness of the situation and will do everything within the law to discourage this type of activity.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: What would the Attorney General and the Solicitor General do, what kind of action can we expect from either or both of them, in view of statements such as, "In many cases persons who have been victimized by gang members are reluctant to lay charges or give evidence in court"? What kind of protection can we afford citizens to guarantee them that they are not going to be victimized outside the courtroom, or in their homes, or on the street, by others related to the gang members or other gang members who simply want to exact retribution?

What possible excuse can there be for one law officer of the Crown saying to me about the system of another that the courts have shown a tendency to be sceptical about imposing a term of imprisonment when such persons have been convicted? I mean that's nothing to do with the Crown attorney, I admit. It may have nothing to do with the police but, good God, it has got something to do with the courts and protecting people.

Mr. Mancini: Save that for the campaign.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't know whether the hon. member opposite is just sort of launching some sort of attack on the judiciary in that area, because as he knows—

Mr. Lewis: We just want law and order.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Just pay attention.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not launching an attack on anyone. I am reading from a letter written to me by the Solicitor General.

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order at all.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: It certainly sounds like an attack.

Mr. Lewis: Is the Solicitor General launching an attack on the judiciary?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am confident that the judiciary in that area—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. member: Sit down.

Mr. Germa: Don't you know the rules of the House? Smarten up.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Attorney General have a further answer to the question?

An hon. member: A serious one.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the judiciary in the Hamilton-Wentworth area are well aware of the seriousness of the situation and that the concerns of the community will be reflected in the disposition of the cases that come before them.

Mr. Cunningham: Supplementary: Given that several members of the Hamilton-Wentworth police force have, in fact, themselves been victimized by this gang and have been beaten up, would the minister not agree that this particular situation is out of control?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No.

SOUTH CAYUGA LAND ASSEMBLY

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Housing. Is it true that land is being offered for sale to the farmers from the South Cayuga townsite?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. I do not handle the sale of land nor have I any responsibility for the South Cayuga site.

[11:00]

Mr. G. I. Miller: Supplementary: Does the minister have any plans for the use of land on the South Cayuga townsite? Will the region have input into these plans?

One further question: Will there be long-term leases if it continues to be used for agriculture—say up to 20 years as the term of the lease?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is having some difficulty hearing what I said. I do not have the responsibility for the South Cayuga land so I cannot tell him what it's going to be used for.

Mr. S. Smith: Redirect it, smart aleck.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm not being a smart aleck, and if anybody recognizes one and should attempt to be smart, it's you. You've got a great deal of difficulty, I'll tell you.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I certainly wouldn't spend my last day in this House sitting there acting like that.

Mr. S. Smith: Redirect the question, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a further answer?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I understand that in fact we are extending long-term leases to the farmers in the area on that land. I say to the hon. member, and not in a smart-alecky manner, that he could direct his question perhaps to the Treasurer who has responsibility for that land.

Mr. S. Smith: You could have said that in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I said it in the first place. I hope you come up, Stuart. I really do.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a supplementary to that? Did the hon. minister redirect the question? The hon. member cannot do it. Does the hon. minister redirect the question?

Mr. S. Smith: Yes, he did.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister redirect the question to another minister?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I certainly will redirect the question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Treasurer have any elucidation to this?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if the question is, are we selling some land: not to my knowledge.

FARM MARKETING BOARDS

Mr. MacDonald: Question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: In view of the growing range of attacks on farm marketing boards, and of the official interpretation of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture that the new Competition Act is going to render some if not all of the activities of the farm marketing boards illegal, what is this government going to do to stand up and be counted in a very vigorous way in support of farm marketing boards and in support of the principle of national marketing agencies to co-ordinate the work of those provincial boards?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that question because we already have acted. I suggest the member listen to CFRB on Sunday morning to hear my comments about the competition bill—

Mr. Deans: Why should he listen to the radio to get your answers?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Hon. W. Newman: Let me finish. Nobody is more concerned about the competition bill that's been introduced in Ottawa than I am. I have come on very strong and I've always supported our marketing boards—

Mr. MacDonald: You always come on strong.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: I have always supported our marketing boards in this province, and I will be personally leading a delegation, even if it's during a certain campaign that may come—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Statement of fact.

Hon. W. Newman: —I shall be leading a personal delegation to the committee to put forward our concerns about the competition bill, because that's one of the cases where the federal Minister of Agriculture and I stand foursquare—to support marketing boards in this province.

Mr. Singer: Did you have shouting practice this morning before campaigning?

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: Does the government here support the minister like the government in Ottawa supports Gene Whalen?

Hon. W. Newman: The member will find out in the fullness of time.

Mr. Lewis: Even if the minister loses, we should have him back as House mascot.

STORM-DAMAGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. Kerrio: I have a question of the Treasurer: Would the minister recall a visit by the Premier to the Niagara Peninsula right after the severe snowstorms that we

had there? If he would recall, the Premier had a meeting behind closed doors and excluded the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) and myself from attending this meeting—

An hon. member: Shame, shame. Shame on you guys.

Hon. Mr. Welch: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not true. That meeting was in the hands of the region, and the region made the determination as to how that meeting was run. The member knows that.

Mr. S. Smith: Who appointed the regional chairman? The regional chairman is a well-known Tory, and you know that.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What a way to go down.

Mr. Ruston: Got all your Wintario cheques ready to go in the campaign, Bob? It will be $45 million.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Is this going to be another whisper campaign?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Niagara Falls will continue his question.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, apologies seem to be in order. I'm sorry, it may not have been the Premier that excluded us, it may have been regional government. Be that as it may—

Hon. Mr. Welch: There is a difference.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member just place his question?

Mr. Kerrio: Does the minister recall that such a meeting took place, and my question now is—

Mr. Good: Probably the member for Brock (Mr. Welch) was there.

Mr. Kerrio: The member for Brock was included, yes, sure.

Mr. S. Smith: He is special because he signs letters so well.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member just ask his question, please?

Mr. Kerrio: My question to the Treasurer is: In view of the severe costs that the Peninsula were put to during this emergency, has he reached a resolution—and will he tell this House what that resolution is—in the matter of some help in funding that very severe problem?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that's a question that should be put to my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) who, as I recall, announced in this House the decision as to how we would help; I believe to a maximum of something like $5 million.

So to ask whether we have reached a resolution, the answer is yes, and it was announced and the municipalities have been informed, and I suppose are making claims. Perhaps money has been paid by now. However, having said that, I should point out that the member for Brock has been on the doorsteps of both the Minister of Transportation and Communications and myself—

Mr. Kerrio: The media were not allowed in; the press was not allowed in.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —not behind closed doors, he has come to us openly and said, "Would you have another look at this?" The Minister of Transportation and Communications and I—and the Premier—are preparing to take another look at it; and we, in fact, are going to be meeting with the regional chairman and I believe five of the mayors.

Mr. Conway: And with the member for Brock?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question has been answered.

Mr. Kerrio: A supplementary: In view of this kind of fiasco, isn't it time that we had some kind of special legislation? Would the Treasurer consider legislation like they have in the United States of America where in such emergencies there is a vehicle in place to handle them without the people coming begging to the government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, there very definitely are vehicles in place, if that's the term, and assistance has been provided and is provided; but we don't want some sort of a rigid formula, and some sort of rigid legislation which is not going to allow us to give assistance in particular circumstances.

Mr. S. Smith: Just a Conservative Party card.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Obviously our assistance and the assistance of the government of Canada—

Mr. Warner: What a disaster.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —will vary in form and type, and in my view it would be wrong to put some sort of inflexible, rigid legislation in place, which would not serve the interests of the people well—recognizing, of course, that the Liberal Party likes rigidity and inflexibility.

Mr. S. Smith: Your party likes charity.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Singer: It expired before it started.

Mr. Lewis: It looks like the Treasurer has practically expired.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition to the Premier asking that he hold a commission of inquiry into the effectiveness, cost benefits and problems of regional government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If this is a petition to the Premier it is not a petition to the House per se.

Mr. Breithaupt: Give it to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Is it a petition to the House? How is it worded?

Mr. Godfrey: —a commission of inquiry into the effectiveness, cost benefits and problems of regional government in Durham, with approximately 1,000 names appended.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me, from the member's earlier words, that it is not a petition to the House if it is addressed to the Premier.

Mr. Breithaupt: So send it to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. members would check into the regulations concerning petitions, we shouldn't have a recurrence of this. You may deliver that directly to the Premier, if you so wish, but it doesn't seem to be in order.

REPORTS

Mr. Deans, on behalf of Mr. Renwick from the standing administration of justice committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the Perfume and Cosmetics Bars Limited.

Mr. Gaunt from the standing general government committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a report.

Mr. Ruston: Swan song.

Mr. Grossman: Can you believe it?

Mr. Gregory: I'll be back.

Mr. Grossman: You're damn right he will.

Mr. Gregory: I'm sorry I won't see you though.

Mr. Grossman: Half of you guys will too, don't worry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Mississauga East has the floor.

Mr. Gregory: You're going to find out.

Mr. Grossman: Ask your candidate in Mississauga, whoever he is.

Mr. Lewis: Who are you?

Mr. Bullbrook: That's Jules Morin.

An hon. member: That's Bob Johnston.

Mr. Grossman: Your candidate hasn't heard of himself. Look how hard he works.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the member for Mississauga East to present a report.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's not nearly as heavy as the Singer report.

Mr. Grossman: Yes, but he's not a lawyer.

Mr. Gregory presented the final report of the select committee on highway transportation of goods in Ontario.

Mr. Gregory: The terms of reference and the time limits assigned by the Legislative Assembly to this select committee posed a substantial challenge to members and staff. The members of the committee approached the task with vigour and a sense of purpose

that enabled them to complete and table an interim report, both on time and with unanimity. This final report is quite extensive and presents an in-depth investigation into the highway transportation of goods in accordance with our terms of reference.

The committee was fortunate in having the services of a very competent staff whose names are listed in the report. I would like in particular to commend our counsel, Mr. Max Rapoport, QC, and our director of research, Mr. Brian Caldwell. It was because of the work of these two gentlemen that the committee was able to cope with such a complex subject. Mr. David Callfas, assistant clerk of the Legislative Assembly, assumed enormous responsibilities not only in scheduling the many hearings across the province and abroad, but also in taking care of the physical arrangements for the committee.

I congratulate the members for their ability to work well together and thank them for making the position of chairman a very rewarding experience.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Bounsall moved first reading of Bill 74, An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

[11:15]

Mr. Bounsall: The purpose of this bill is to reduce from 48 to 40 hours in the week as the time beyond which overtime becomes voluntary. In addition, it would require employers to pay overtime for work done in excess of 40 hours per week rather than the present 44. The bill also ensures that these provisions cover those persons who are employed in the growing of flowers for the retail and wholesale trade and persons performing home work.

Mr. Breithaupt: Do you mean students?

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Bounsall moved first reading of Bill 75, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bounsall: The purpose of this bill is to provide four criteria for the reopening of a contract during its lifetime. These provisions are:

1. The making, giving or issuing of an order, direction or notice against any employer under any Act for health and safety reasons;

2. The changing or proposed changing of production standards at the place of employment;

3. The introduction or proposed introduction of technological change at the place of employment; and

4. The contracting out to other persons of work which would ordinarily be carried out by the employees of that employer.

NON-RETURNABLE BEVERAGE CONTAINERS ACT

Mr. Riddell moved first reading of Bill 76, An Act to prohibit the Use of Non-Returnable Beverage Containers.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Riddell: The purpose of this bill is to provide an alternative to the government's recently announced five-cent tax on cans, which will simply subject people to yet another financial hardship and will not resolve the pollution problem. This bill will require sellers to refund a deposit when containers are returned, which does provide an incentive to the people of Ontario to keep our province beautiful and free of pollution.

Mr. S. Smith: That's what you call a proper bill.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: Wait a minute. He is an auctioneer. He will take care of our people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the hon. minister and the hon. member for Sarnia, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm sorry about that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: The minister isn't sorry.

TERRITORIAL DIVISION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Bain moved first reading of Bill 77, An Act to amend The Territorial Division Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bain: This bill transfers the townships of Black, Benoit, Melba, Bisley, Clifford, Ben Nevis and Pontiac from the district of Cochrane to the district of Timiskaming, in keeping with the wishes of the people of those townships. It is unfortunate they were not originally consulted when they were transferred to the district of Cochrane, and this would rectify that situation.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Angus moved first reading of Bill 78, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Angus: The purpose of this bill is to prevent discrimination in employment on the basis of a physical disability. In order that a person with such a problem—particularly with reference to an individual who may have had a work-related injury—this bill will prohibit the asking of a job applicant if he or she has had a workmen's compensation claim. We have found in our task force of the NDP that too many employers automatically refuse work to an injured worker once they become aware that he or she has either made a claim to the board or is actually on compensation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We just need the principle of the bill. We do not back it up with information.

Mr. Angus: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and barring the Premier doing something foolish it will be debated on May 26. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH ACT

Mr. Drea moved second reading of Bill Pr8, An Act respecting The Borough of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

BOROUGH OF NORTH YORK ACT

Mr. Williams moved second reading of Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

PERFUME AND COSMETIC BARS LIMITED ACT

Mr. Breithaupt, on behalf of Mr. Peterson, moved second reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the Perfume and Cosmetic Bars Limited.

Motion agreed to.

The bill was also given third reading on motion.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

Resumption of the adjourned debate in committee of the whole House on Bill 28, An Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975 (second session).

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, before we continue our review of this legislation, I thought we might indicate to the committee that following consultations it has been agreed that we stack the voting as far as amendments are concerned. Once we've gone through the bill and discussed all the amendments we shall have one bell at the end.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed? It is understood that there is a 10-minute bell for stacked amendments?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: That's fine with us.

Mr. Breithaupt: I believe we are agreed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The orders of the House require that it be a 10-minute bell on stacked amendments.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That would no doubt influence the committee as to when the bell starts then, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with section 1 of Bill 28. Any further comment?

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Breaugh moves that subsection 7 of section 1 of Bill 28 be amended to read as follows: Subsection 11 of the said section 5 is amended to read as follows: "prior to giving written notice of hearing to the landlord and the tenant under

subsection 8, the rent review officer (a) shall order the landlord to file applications for settlement of rents to be charged during the 12-month period following the date of filing of the application under subsection 8 of all residential premises in the building or project for which tenancy agreements terminate at any time within that period, if and when such residential premises are re-let or renewed within that period and (b) shall fix a common date for the hearing of all such applications."

Mr. Breaugh: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes provision for the annual building or project hearing. It reflects, I think, a growing consensus among both tenants and landlords that they don't object particularly to the rent review process. But it certainly is an obnoxious thing when essentially you have to go back to do the same thing sometimes four, five and six times during the course of a year.

There was provision in the current legislation for this to happen, and this simply makes it a little easier. It would streamline the rent review process significantly, cutting down the number of hearing dates in the cases that would be covered under this amendment and you would be looking at the same set of statistics provided by the landlord and essentially the same set of arguments presented by the tenants. What it would do would be to facilitate, and, we would anticipate, probably improve the quality of the arguments that are made, and even give both sides who want to present their cases fairly before the rent review officer, a chance to prepare a better case—to make it more significant—and to have that hearing done once each year for each project for each building.

In our discussions with both tenant groups who are dealing with the rent review process itself, they indicate that this would be a significant advancement toward them, not just in making the rent review process more streamlined because there would simply be fewer hearings involved, but it would allow them to do a better job, more preparation and would solve a lot of the anxieties that happen when there are continual rent review hearings being held for the same building.

From the landlord's point of view, from those who have made their view known to me or to other colleagues in my caucus, they indicate that one of their frustrations is having to go back before a rent review officer with essentially the same papers in hand, telling essentially the same story, and that it becomes an obnoxious thing from their point of view because it's the same argument sideways for another unit in the same building. It does cause some difficulties when there are different hearings on different dates for different units in the same project or building and this particular amendment would solve some of those anxieties and some of those problems.

One of the side effects would be, of course, a rather substantial reduction in the number of hearings that had to be held. What might turn out to be the case is that the hearings have considerably more substance than they have now, that it would give the rent review officer more of an opportunity to review the cases in detail, and we would anticipate that the cases would be presented in a somewhat more substantive manner than they might be now.

We sense a consensus on both sides of the rent review process, both the landlord and the tenant, that this would solve a number of problems and seems to be a rather practical approach to it. It is not a major change from the process as it now stands, but would, in our view at any rate, make the process work much better and make both parties much happier with the process itself.

[11:30]

Mr. Edighoffer: Previously I had submitted an amendment to the same section setting out a different time period to fix a common date for a hearing. I think probably the best thing to do at this time is for me to present a subamendment and then I think we could consider the two of them together.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Edighoffer moves an amendment to Mr. Breaugh's amendment, striking out in the sixth line the word "12" and inserting in lieu therefor "four."

Mr. Edighoffer: I agree sort of in principle with the amendment but I feel that by replacing the 12-month period with a four-month period it could be a much fairer type of hearing for both the landlord and the tenant. We must remember that if rents and costs are automatically increasing, probably the 12-month period would be beneficial to the tenant. However, some things, such as interest, are decreasing now. I feel that if every unit in a building that came due over the next 12-month period had to be reviewed, it may not be beneficial, particularly to the tenant, if that lease was running out in 11 months. For this reason, I feel that by amending the amendment from 12 to four months, it would probably reduce

some of the administration costs and time and would serve the same purpose.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The proposal to conduct review on a building basis rather than unit by unit has been made almost ever since the original conception of the process. I suppose the suggestion was made by Professor Bucknall in his famous critique of the process. I just want to say that once again we're seeing a hasty, superficial and theoretical analysis of the problems. I just want to lay out the reasons why the government objects to going to this.

Mr. Renwick: Tell us. Give us the reasons, not the rhetoric.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have considered it and rejected it because obviously if it made sense and if it became more efficient to do it, that's what we want. I'm sure all members of the House want more efficiency. There is a little problem. Landlords do not always increase rents of all units within a four-month period or a 12-month period. You would be taking people into rent review who are not now hauled into rent review, and I mean tenants.

Mr. Renwick: Name one that does.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Many building rents are increased on a unit-by-unit basis depending on the size of the unit. A one-bedroom or a two-bedroom apartment may very well get a higher increase than a three or a four-bedroom because the three- or four-bedroom is in plentiful supply. In many buildings in Ontario landlords are selective in applying their rent increases.

Just note that the wording of the amendment talks about the rents to be charged. It doesn't talk about increased rents being given to tenants. For whatever reason, because of friendliness with the landlord or they've known them for a long time or they're in dire financial straits, some tenants may not get an increase for one or two years. Why should they be hauled into the rent review process?

At the present time, the rent review officer has the option of doing this where, in his opinion, it will be more efficient, and I think he's just as interested in efficiency as any member in this House. They can look at it. They can be selective and they can say: "Yes, this is a building that I think has to be done," or, as happened in the case of the Ottawa landlord, a project which has to be done. But I would leave that decision in the hands of the rent review officer on the basis of the applications which come before him.

Aside from the logical arguments, there are some legal difficulties again with this section which apparently suffers from sloppy drafting. I would just like to say, first of all, there is no filing of any application which is required under subsection 8. Maybe the hon. member should be talking about applications referred to in subsection 8 because they're not required. If there is no increase, there's no requirement for any applications. And what are you going to do about that?

We're looking at this question of when these things become effective. I have an example before me of an application which was filed on June 1, 1977. That rent is to take effect three months down the road. Then you would have a hearing for all of the units in that apartment, regardless of whether there is a rent increase or not, and some 18 months later there would be a rent review officer's order to take effect, long before you knew the situation with regard to fuel or interest costs.

The member for Perth says you're trying to go way down the road long before you know anything about the situation. We don't have his crystal ball and our rent review officers don't have it. Therefore, I feel we must object to this amendment.

Mr. Good: I would like to say that I personally don't think it would be a good thing to have rents fixed at hearings with a percentage of increase that would apply to all rents for that particular building for the next 12-month period. As mentioned by the member for Perth, this may be to the advantage of tenants in a situation where the inflation rate is increasing. Tenants may gather some benefit there, but in a situation where the inflation rate is decreasing, tenants then could be put in a less favourable position by having to accept a larger increase than was agreed to, say, 10 months ago, that would apply to a lease which was coming up at the particular date later on in time.

As an example, I would like to suggest that the way mortgage interest rates have fallen in the past eight months is a very good example of the difference that could result in a rent review officer hearing today compared with a hearing last July. Last summer mortgages were being renewed at 12 per cent rates and up. Presently the rate could be 10¼ and up. A difference of 1.75 per cent in a mortgage renewal on a

$14,000 mortgage per unit would result in a saving to the tenants at today's date of about $20 a month. I am sure this would have a direct application and a direct bearing made in a rent review officer's order today compared with eight or 10 months ago.

I would hate to see tenants put in an awkward situation where they would be obliged to accept an increase given today, even though their tenancy agreement would not expire for 10 or 11 months in the future. If we are convinced—and many of us feel that the economy is cooling off somewhat—that the inflation rate is being controlled to some extent, this will reflect in lower increases being given at a later date.

I would hope that the member for Oshawa would agree with me that his particular amendment could in fact and is more likely to cause hardships to tenants from here on than it would have previously. For that reason I don't think it would be in the best interests of tenants to be locked into a 12-month rent review period automatically as this would suggest.

I agree that there is some administrative advantage to having all units that will be coming up for review within the near future dealt with at a particular time. The minister will say there is that prerogative presently of the rent review officer to act. If proposed hearings in the next four months, even six months, could be consolidated into one hearing, I don't see that there would be that many administrative problems.

Surely the landlord will know what rents are coming up within the next four months or even six months that he is intending to adjust. They must certainly work that far ahead. If he is planning an increase over the allowable limits, he would have to apply for a hearing. I would think it would be advantageous in the interests of cutting down hearings if the minister were to accept some change in the Act, albeit maybe not through this particular amendment or through the amendment to this amendment, whereby landlords would be required to present to the rent review officer all contemplated applications for increase within the next few months. Some rent review officers under present circumstances, may ask for those; others may not. It would, at least, put landlords on their toes where they would have to ascertain a few months ahead—more than just the 90 days notice—which ones they expect to have a hearing on.

I would invite the minister's response. I think this problem could be worked out to the satisfaction of both landlords and the tenants if he could show us where some consolidation of hearings could be held where there would be some compulsion on the part of the landlords to get their hearings together into groups so that it could simplify the administration of the Act.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I certainly appreciate the comments of the member for Waterloo North and I agree with them entirely. I don't think there's any problem here at all because in the administration of the Act the rent review officer now has the power to ask for a list of all of the rents. If he gets one application in the building, it requires the landlord to submit a list of all of the rents in those premises.

The problem that we have with the amendment is that we're not talking about rent increases. It talks about rents charged. That would mean that everybody in the building would be drawn in or, in the case of the Liberal subamendment, one-third of the tenants, whether or not the rents were going to be increased, drawn into a rent review process and they would have to receive notice of the fact. This obviously is disruptive, I think, to the tenant. At the present time, with that kind of a situation the rent review officer normally does not order the landlord to file orders unless there are going to be rent increases. He can do that now and he does do it.

We have some grave reservations about the amendment. There is no problem with the intent. It is to increase efficiency and it's the kind of thing we're very interested in. But, for example, it does not take into account periodic tenancies, monthly tenancies, which are becoming more and more the vogue, particularly in urban areas. That would mean that a tenant who was on a monthly tenancy obviously would have to be notified every time there was a rent review application coming up. Under the NDP amendment, theirs would be coming up every month. These would cause rent review. Under the Liberal amendment, they would be notified three times a year of a rent review hearing which they may or may not have an interest in. I would rather leave it to the experience which has been gained by the rent review officers to determine when it's feasible and when it's more efficient to consolidate hearings, which they've been doing.

Again, I go back to my own constituency where I really have only one major landlord who has about three major projects. We have

done those most expeditiously. One of them, I think, takes into account something like 3,000 rental units, almost 10,000 people. It was done in one set of hearings. The same thing was done with one called Parkwood Hills and Heron Gate. These things were done and they were consolidated. I think that has been the practice everywhere in the province where it is seen to be efficient, but where it's not seen to be efficient, I think we should leave it to the discretion of the officer to make those orders.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are there any further questions? We will vote on the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. Edighoffer.

All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it. I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

Amendment stacked.

Are you ready for a vote on the amendment by Mr. Breaugh?

All those in favour of Mr. Breaugh's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Amendment stacked.

Mr. Hodgson: One, two, three, four, five.

Mr. Renwick: Do you remember you had exactly 20 yesterday?

Mr. Chairman: Any further comment on any other section of the bill?

Section 2 agreed to.

[11:45]

On section 3:

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Mr. Handleman moves that subsection 1 of section 3 of the bill be struck out.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I might explain the purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, the original drafting of the bill made it optional as to whether or not written reasons would be given for a decision of the rent review officer unless he was requested to do so. In retrospect, and with calmer minds having been brought to bear on this, we felt that if a request was not made at the outset of a hearing, it could very well lead the rent review officer to assume that he would never have to explain his decision and might possibly lead to some sloppiness in dealing with the evidence. So we have continued the mandatory requirement for written reasons on a rent review officer's order.

Mr. Breaugh: We accept the public apology for sloppiness in drafting and silly simplistic notions, Mr. Chairman, and, in an effort to make minority government work, we will support the government's amendment.

Mr. Edighoffer: We have looked at it very carefully and we will support the amendment.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Breaugh moves that subsection 2 of section 3 be amended to read as follows:

"The said section 7 is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

'3(a) At or prior to the commencement of any hearing the rent review officer shall satisfy himself about the sufficiency of any notices under subsection 1 of section 115 of The Landlord and Tenant Act or under section 6 of this Act, and no order of the rent review officer shall be effective unless the notices as required are sufficient.' "

Mr. Breaugh: Very briefly, it strikes us as being incredibly logical that the first thing the rent review officer does is ask whether sufficient notice has been given. It doesn't strike me that it will be an incredible bureaucracy to administer if you remind him to ask the pertinent question before things get under way, and it will solve the problem once and for all.

We cannot see why the tenant, who in most instances is not going to turn out to be a professional person in appearing at hearings, ought to lose the rights encased in the previous Act and enforced under this one because he forgets to ask the right question. It strikes us that the professional involved is the rent review officer and that it is not a great burden on his job to ask the question, "Has proper notice been given?"

Mr. Edighoffer: This amendment seems reasonable to me. It seems logical that that should be the first question of the rent review officer and we, in this party, will support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's so reasonable that, in fact, that is what the law is now. No matter what the rent review officer may do to satisfy himself as to the sufficiency of notice, if the notice is insufficient, it's insufficient; and that's the problem we have faced right up to the judicial reviews that

we have undergone. The rent review officer in every hearing asks whether proper notice has been given. He is given certain information and certain evidence. He satisfies himself—he is not a judge; he is not a lawyer in many cases—that notice has been sufficient. The suggestion that no order of a rent review officer shall be effective unless notice as required is sufficient seems to be a little bit redundant. It is quite obvious that if they are not sufficient the order is ineffective. I don't understand why on earth we would pass redundant legislation when this is exactly what the law says now and it is the way the courts have interpreted it. But certainly we have no objection if you want to write into law that the rent review officer shall do this, because he is doing it now and always has done it. That doesn't mean the notice is sufficient. Simply because the rent review officer is satisfied it is, the courts may not be—and that has been our problem all along.

We're concerned, of course, that somebody brings it up at a stage far down, challenging the sufficiency of the notice, and then goes to review in a situation that might very well have been determined at the original hearing. If there's a question of notice there it should be brought up, not after the whole process has been completed, then the courts are hauled into it.

Mr. Good: Perhaps the minister can explain one thing to me. Your amendment in the bill under that section now would appear to say that unless the tenant has objected to the sufficiency of the notice—in other words, the onus is on the tenant to show that there is proper notice. Under section 3(a) that's the way it appears to me; the onus is on the tenant to prove that the notices had been given and everything was in proper order before the proceeding starts. We don't think that that onus should be on the tenant. That onus should be on the rent review officer, to make sure that everything is in order before the proceeding starts.

What are you going to do about that 3(a) that you have in there now? Could we have just a little discussion with the minister on this?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, if I can, as briefly as possible, say that, yes, the rent review officer is required to say to all the parties, "Are you satisfied? Show me, if there's any question at all about the sufficiency of notice I would like to know about it." All he's got, of course, are the forms which have been filed. He's asking people, "Have you, in fact, received notice?" If they say no, that protects their rights to appeal, there's no question about it. If they say, "We're satisfied with it," the rent review officer still has to satisfy himself, and he may say "Look, I see some flaws in this notice and I'm drawing it to your attention now." That's all that has to be done to protect the person's right of appeal, whether it's a landlord or a tenant.

All we're saying is that if everybody sits there and accepts that the notice has in fact been sufficient, both at the rent review officer hearing, the rent review board—which is a hearing de novo, where you have an opportunity to bring in all the new evidence you want—then after all these processes are gone through, a person goes to judicial review and says "I forgot to do it there and I forgot to do it there, and here I'm doing it," I think they are really abusing the privilege of going to court. You can't have three hearings de novo, and I defer to some of our legal friends, but that's what we seem to be saying. You can bring in all the evidence you want whenever you want to throw any decision of the rent review officer out. We just think that there has to be some finality to this thing.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question? All those in favour of Mr. Breaugh's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Amendment stacked.

Any comment on any other section of the bill? If so, what section?

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Breaugh moves that section 6 of the bill be amended to read as follows: "The said Act is amended by adding thereto the following section: 11a. On or before July 1, 1977, each landlord shall furnish to the rent review officer, in prescribed form and thereafter maintain up to date particulars of rent charged in relation to the premises, services and facilities provided under any tenancy agreement on or after January 1, 1977, for each unit of residential premises leased by the landlord in the area in which the rent review officer has jurisdiction, and the rent review officer shall prepare and maintain a public register of the particulars."

Mr. Breaugh: It's not a very complicated motion but it would be useful from several

points of view to establish a public register of what the rents are for a particular building. That would give us information on all of the buildings within the rent review officer's jurisdiction.

This is used in establishing the rental decision the review officer might make in most instances now and it would provide us with information that would be useful in a number of other areas. It is not a complicated idea. This is information that is known to a number of people but is not now in one place at one time. It could be a rather authoritative and comprehensive list. It is not a complicated thing nor would it be a time-consuming thing to administer, since you would do that when the landlord comes in and the landlord certainly has that information. It would be of considerable assistance, I would think, to the rent review officer in the first instance, and to landlords in a given area in the second instance to know what the going rate is exactly for particular units in projects throughout that particular community and to tenants when they are coming in to prepare their own case for the rent review officer.

Mr. Edighoffer: Speaking to the amendment, I would, first of all, have to say that I am sure that this would create a tremendous increase in bureaucracy. I really feel that an amendment such as this probably wouldn't give the information to the tenants regarding increases prior to January, 1971. As I said previously, I agree to some extent that there should be some type of registration but I think that we would be hiring more bureaucrats. We would be sending more notices out by July 1977 to make sure that all this information is put into a public register.

I feel we can't support this particular amendment. However, Mr. Chairman, I did send you a notice of an amendment I wish to make. I would like to ask you if we could vote on this one first, and then I could put my amendment to the same section afterwards.

Mr. Chairman: We are stacking votes. I would assume all these votes will be dealt with in consecutive order. I would say yes, subject to stacking.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I just wanted to comment on the amendment. I am pleased to hear the Liberal spokesman recognizes the tremendous amount of paperwork that would be involved in this. Coming from a member who so forcefully criticized the amount of paper work in the programme now, it just boggles the mind.

It says each landlord. I assume that means each landlord in the province of Ontario. I don't know where they are, or who they are. They come to us through the rent review process, and that's one way of finding out. We will register that two million—I don't know why we don't register every person in the province and say what he does, what he charges for his services and everything else. That would make it very convenient for the NDP some day.

Mr. Martel: You get more immature every day.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: But at the present time, as a tenant in the city of Toronto, I think I would dislike the fact that there is going to be a public register of what I am paying for rent.

Mr. Martel: You are not for real.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's a contract between me and the landlord. I think this is an invasion of privacy.

Mr. Martel: What about the lists that your friend gives out from T and C?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: At the present time, a tenant can obtain information about his own unit by the simple process of applying for a rent review. All he has to do is to make out a simple little form and he can get all the information. Landlords applying for rent review must list the complete rental history of the unit back to January 1, 1974. We've had a lot of complaints about that, but it is necessary for the rent review officer to have that information. Under section 5(10) of the Act, the landlord must also file a list of the rents of all the other premises in the building or in the project, as determined by the officer.

We are saying that this would be impossible to administer, impossible to enforce and just a little difficult to keep it current.

Mr. Renwick: I just want to make one brief comment about the comment of the minister, that ridiculous statement he made about an invasion of privacy. If the method of assessment proposed by the government goes into force, you are going to have a public record of the fair market value of all properties. You are going to have a public knowledge of the taxes which are paid. You're going to have, under the amendment which we propose, public knowl-

edge of information with respect to the rentals charged by landlords for premises, in order that the tenants will have an opportunity to iron out the inequities which presently exist throughout the rental accommodation in Toronto.

[12:00]

I'm talking about variations in rent of significant amounts for identical accommodation, simply because, when there's a shortage of rental housing, the tenant has no bargaining position whatsoever; he has no basis on which he can make any association with his fellow tenants for the purpose of destroying the inequities of the present system. And for someone to indicate in this House that the publication of the rent charged by landlords for units and facilities and services is an invasion of privacy of the tenant, reflects a total misconception by the minister of the position of the tenant in the developer-landlord dominated area such as the city of Toronto.

Mr. Mackenzie: We'll talk to the minister about it.

Mr. Good: This matter is of concern to us, mainly to act as a protection for tenants moving into buildings for the first time and not being sure of the previous rent for that unit. As the rent review orders apply to the unit rather than the tenant, it is important that the previous rental charge for that unit be known to the new tenant moving in.

I concur with the member for Perth and do not think that a public record of all the rents charged in the province is necessary. Surely every landlord of every duplex, triplex, fourplex and small units should not have to file his rent to some public body. What an accumulation of useless statistics that would be.

However, there are important situations where it is imperative that a tenant know what the rent was in that unit prior to his moving in. And that is the crux of this whole problem.

Mr. Breaugh: How can you accomplish that?

Mr. Good: Now to accomplish that I don't think it's necessary to have public lists in the hall of the apartment—

Mr. Breaugh: How are they going to get it in time?

Mr. Good: —or lists filed in stack upon stack upon stack of filing cabinets or microfilm in the rent review office. I think there must be some way this can be accomplished. To begin with, I don't think that information, if it were filed with the rent review officers, would be given out necessarily over the phone. I think the tenant is going to have to go down and make an application to get that rent from the rent review officer.

Mr. Breaugh: Where are they going to get it—in the washroom?

Mr. Good: Section 6 of the bill now states under 11(a) that the rent review officer in respect of any pending application under this Act may request in writing that the landlord furnish him with written particulars as are available to the landlord for all the rent schedules back to 1974. So that means that where there has been a rent review hearing, this information will be on file with the rent review officer. Well, we think that's fine.

Mr. Breaugh: Stacks and stacks of paper.

Mr. Good: So then we have to get to the situation where a tenant is moving into a building where there has previously been no rent review hearing, so there will be no information on file. And that's the situation which concerns me: that the landlord be required to say to his tenant something more than, "Yes, that's what I charged the last tenant and that's what I'm charging you." I don't think that is good enough.

This is permitted under the present bill. If the tenant goes down and says, "I want to know what the rent was for apartment 427 in such and such a building," the rent review officer says, "Well I don't have that. There's never been a hearing on that building, I don't have it." But the tenant says, "All right, I'll fill out a form 5A," which would trigger a justification of rent increase under section—I think it's 4 or sub 4 of 5 of the bill.

Mr. Martel: More files than people.

Mr. Good: The legislation says that the rent review officer may request this information. He may or may not. Suppose the rent review officer says, "Oh yes, we know that outfit, they're fairly reliable. If they told you that's what the rent was, well that's what it was." Well, I don't think that's good enough, either. I think the rent review officer has to be required in this legislation to get that information as quickly as possible for the tenant when the tenant requests it. He is going to have to request it in writing the way the bill is now, by filling out a form—I think it is 5A. That form, when filled out by a tenant, is for a justification of rent increase.

Mr. Minister, your rent review officer in my area, and your people have told me that form 5, a form for justification of rent increase, can also be used by a new tenant for a justification of rent. If that is so I can maybe go along with that, but I am just not sure if that is what the bill says, because a rent review officer could very well say, "There has been no increase applied for here, so I don't know if we have jurisdiction or not." That is the only thing that worries me in this whole situation.

First of all, I think the rent review officer has got to be required to get that information. No "may" get it if he sees fit or if he wants to, he has to be required to get that information. I see no great advantage in having all this voluminous amount of material on file. I think if you get it when it is requested that would be quite okay, as far as I am concerned, but I think something has got to be done to make it compulsory that the rent review officer get that information at the request of a tenant.

As far as I am concerned the tenant should have to make that request in writing, and the way the Act is now he would make that request by filing a form 5A, which I am told does not necessarily trigger a rent review hearing. It just triggers a rent review officer requiring a justification of that rent, which may or may not be a hearing. I would like to hear the minister's response, and I hope what he tells me is exactly the way the book reads and what his people are doing when they enforce this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to respond to the member for Waterloo North on this. The information has has received is exactly correct. A tenant who wishes to find out what the rent is in a new unit, having moved in, where that unit has not been under review previously, simply makes out what we call an application for rent review which is treated, when it comes from the tenant under those circumstances, as a request for information. The rent review officer under this section would then go to the landlord and say, "We want to have that history back to 1974."

Our concern is with the word "shall" in here. I think if the hon. member will read the wording of the section—and this was made wide for a reason—what the word "shall" would do would result in the rent review officer having to ask for the particulars of every premise rented by that landlord whether it was in that building, whether it was in Timbuctoo, North Bay or wherever. This was made broad for a reason. Our rent review officers quite often must insist on a wide range of information to ensure that we are not getting into the situation of robbing Peter to pay Paul somewhere else, and that has to be available to him. It doesn't apply just in this case—it was also meant to cover the kind of case that the hon. member has outlined.

I think the word "shall" in there would really destroy what we are trying to do, which is to give the officer the right to get that information for the individual tenant but not require him to get information which is completely irrelevant to the position that has been put to him. We recognize the situation where we have not been able to get information, where there has been no application and a new tenant comes in, and that was put in there for that reason.

Under our new 11a the officer can demand the information. Under the new 17(1) it would be an offence not to file the information or to file false information. Again, to force the officer to demand all of the information whether it is revelvant or not really would be imposing an administrative difficulty, if not an impossibility, to enforce, and remove from the rent review officer that kind of selectivity I think he has to have in exercising this kind of power. It is tremendous power that is being given to him under this section.

Mr. Good: What would you do then if a rent review officer did say to a tenant, "The Act doesn't say I have to get that information. You will just have to take my word that that is the same rent that he was charging before"? I just don't think that is good enough, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: First of all, I think you are attributing a degree of insensitivity to the rent review officer that I don't think is there. Certainly what I would say is that we have issued instructions to our rent review officers. They know what they are supposed to do.

We get a lot of complaints from people saying you are removing their discretion from them. But I think they have to follow certain procedures and this is one of them. We're saying this is what the section is designed to do, without burdening the rent review officer and the landlord in supplying a great deal of information which is completely irrelevant to the particular request which is before the officer.

I am sure, as minister, if I were to hear of a situation where a rent review officer cavalierly dismissed a request of that nature, we would probably write him a letter from the executive director of the programme telling him to pull up his socks.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on Mr. Breaugh's amendment?

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Chairman, from the comments the minister has made, I am not completely satisfied that section 11a shouldn't be made mandatory, and I would like to move an amendment to that section.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Edighoffer moves that section 11a of the Act as set out in section 6 of the bill be amended by striking out "may" in the second line and inserting in lieu therefor "shall."

Mr. Breaugh: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if we might have a vote on our amendment and then we would be quite prepared to deal with this amendment. Would that be a proper way to proceed, as we've done it all morning long?

Mr. Chairman: It was the Chair's intention to deal with amendment 4, your amendment, and then deal with Mr. Edighoffer's.

Are you ready for the question on Mr. Breaugh's amendment to section 6?

All those in favour of Mr. Breaugh's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Amendment stacked.

We will now deal with Mr. Edighoffer's amendment to section 11a of the Act.

Does the hon. member for Perth wish to comment further?

Mr. Edighoffer: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman. I think this has already been discussed but I am not completely satisfied that it would if left as it is, bring the result expected. I personally feel that this information should be on record and, of course, therefore it should be mandatory to collect it.

While I am on my feet, I question also three other words in the section and I wonder if the minister could clarify why the words in the third line, "as are available" are still left in there. I feel they should be deleted. I wonder if the minister could explain to me why those three words are in the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I think without trying to take the place of any of the judges who may be called upon to adjudicate this, I think law has to be reasonable. I don't know how you can ask somebody to supply information which is not available to him—you know, reasonably available. You certainly can't ask people to go out and do detective work. We've had situations where it is not available. The landlord has bought a building, and when he's asked for the records, somebody says "Oh, I burned those a couple of years ago. I haven't got any records." It's very difficult.

I'm not saying he can't possibly do the detective work that might bring him to the position where he could supply the information. But you are talking about January 1, 1974, over three years ago, and it's pretty difficult for him to find out in many cases what the situation was. But if it is available, it has to be supplied. The failure to supply it is an offence under the Act.

But with regard to the hon. member's suggested amendment, again I just want to point out that while we are talking here about any pending application that could be a landlord who has one apartment which he has applied for rent review, forgetting about the tenant's side of it. He doesn't intend to apply for any of the others. Under the amendment, he would have to then supply to the rent review officer information about every unit that he has, anywhere, because it doesn't talk about that specific unit which is under application.

[12:15]

If you wanted to do that, I would have no objection to forcing the rent review officer to obtain information about an application for a unit which is under review; but not anything else, because I think you're adding to the paper work without really accomplishing anything at all.

Mr. Good: How do you accomplish that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It's your amendment, but make it workable.

Mr. Breaugh: I think we will support this amendment as proposed by the Liberal Party. Frankly, I don't even pretend to understand how the paper that is used to keep these records is going to be any thinner under this amendment that it would have been under ours. I don't understand how the people who write the numbers down are going to cost less under this amendment than under ours. I don't pretend to understand how you are going to get that information, unless it's a matter of public information, any easier under this than under ours; but then it isn't our

job to understand that party's political philosophy, we are just trying to get the best shake we can for the tenants.

Mr. Sweeney: Take it on faith.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am going to have to ask the indulgence of the Chair on this one then. If you could defer the vote, I would like to have our people put their heads to accomplishing what I think the proposer of the amendment wants without imposing on us that kind of work. The member for Oshawa is almost correct, but not quite, because this does not apply to all landlords. It only applies to all units of every landlord who makes an application. There is a difference between the two. This one is only less desirable by degree than your own amendment. I would like, if possible, to defer the vote until we can propose other wording.

Mr. Warner: Defer it till Monday?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Does the committee agree that we stand this down and deal with it later?

Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are there any further comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

Mr. Breaugh: I think the minister has some.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: On section 9, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Anything prior to section 9?

On section 7:

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Mr. Edighoffer moves that section 13(1a) of the Act, as set out in section 7 of the bill, be amended by striking out, in the fourth, fifth and sixth lines the words, "where the person establishes that he was unable to attend in person or by agent at the hearing as a result of circumstances beyond his control."

Mr. Edighoffer: This has been discussed a number of times in the House; I think it would just be best if he could have any reasonable excuse and make that to the rent review officer.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I don't suppose we have any objection to the intention of the amendment, but the results of it could be obvious. If everybody who is dissatisfied with the result of the decision of the board is going to say: "I have reasonable cause for a new hearing," the board will be rehearing not only its hearings but its rehearings. I think there have to be some finite boundaries to the reasons that can be given.

I'm told by our legal advisers there is a good body of law which would restrict, but not unduly restrict, the right of a person to a rehearing under this section as we have worded it. If you take those reasons out, you would have everyone who said: "I didn't feel like going that night" or "I had a headache" using that as an excuse for a rehearing.

I think we simply must try to restrict it in some way. We said during the original debate, way back, we would try to prevent frivolous appeals, and I think this is all we are trying to do, while at the same time opening up the possibility of a rehearing, which doesn't exist under the present legislation at all. We've had some problems with that, where people quite obviously should have a rehearing and we weren't able to give it to them. This opens up the door without opening it wide.

Mrs. Campbell: I'm somewhat puzzled by the minister's response to this particular amendment. What it says, in effect, is that where someone did not attend, then that person may ask for this right of hearing. Then at the discretion of the rent review officer or the board the person may be permitted to appeal on terms and conditions. Surely, it is enough that those terms and conditions are sufficient and we should not leave it to the result of circumstances beyond a person's control, that is too heavy an onus, I would think. One could distort what is beyond control to make it almost impossible for a person to get this form of relief. I see nothing wrong with the suggestion in this particular case, and I would urge the minister to reconsider his position on this one.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The purpose of the amendment in the bill in the first place is to make it possible for a rehearing to be convened.

Mrs. Campbell: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It was suggested by the board itself, so that they could do this. I would like to have heard some of the circumstances which would not be beyond the control of the party which might, at the discretion of the board, have enabled them to rehear the case or permit them to appeal. In

drafting this, we were trying to find reasons that would enable the board to allow an appeal. It was felt that some of the cases, such as sickness, such as being away on vacation at the time the appeal was held, were circumstances beyond the person's control or—

Mrs. Campbell: How is it beyond their control to be on vacation?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —having to work when it was on, having to take time off and lose pay; those things would be considered circumstances beyond the person's control. There have to be some reasons, because if it is discretionary, I think we would probably have to double the panels of the board simply to hear these so-called leaves to appeal, which is what they would be. Almost anybody who didn't like the decision of the rent review officer would feel they had a right to go before the panel and seek leave to appeal. Obviously the panel which hears that will not be the one to hear the eventual appeal; so we're really going to have to do something like this. As I say, our purpose was to open it up. I don't think we want to unduly restrict it, but we do have some concerns about how wide it is opened. Never forget, of course, the kind of pressure that comes from intervention in what is a really judicial process. For people to say give those people a hearing, but they don't have to give any reasons for it, just give them a hearing even though they may not be entitled to it; I would be very concerned about that kind of pressure being brought to bear on political persons who might have some control over the board.

Mrs. Campbell: It's interesting to me that the minister gave an example which had occurred to me, and which I would say has traditionally been disallowed as a reason by the courts, that is that they would have to take time off work and lose pay. That has never been the concern of the courts to any great extent. I would certainly submit to the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that if that is the sort of thing, then you'd have to get into the rather miserable position of giving for instances, and I think that should be avoided. But to say that because somebody had to lose a day's pay, that it was, in effect, beyond his control, I do not think that would wash. I notice that the House leader (Mr. Welch) who is a lawyer recognizes—I don't know whether he agrees with me—but I think he would recognize that the courts have not considered that losing a day's pay is something beyond the control of an applicant. He is nodding at me, I think, so I would suggest that this is a very serious matter.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: All I can say is, I defer to the hon. member's legal experience and simply say that I have to assume the board would have to consider all the circumstances before them and make a decision. I think I would certainly want them to err on the side of being less restrictive rather than over-restrictive in dealing with these reasons.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are you ready for the question on Mr. Edighoffer's amendment?

Those in favour will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Amendment stacked.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are there any further amendments, comments or questions prior to section 9?

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9:

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Hon. Mr. Handleman moves that clause (b) of subsection 1 of section 16 of the Act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by striking out "quit or" in the fifth line and inserting in lieu thereof "apparently."

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I think this is simply an improvement in drafting. There was some concern about whether there would be any definite knowledge as to whether or not the tenant has quit, so the idea was to make it possible to act in the case of an apparent abandonment of the premises.

Mr. Breaugh: Once again, in a last-ditch effort to make minority government work, and accepting the second public apology for sloppiness of drafting and inappropriate use of the English language—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Don't attack the civil service.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Perth.

Mr. Breaugh: —to keep this country together, we will support this amendment.

Mr. Edighoffer: This is not an earth-shaking event. We will support it too.

An hon. member: Levesque will agree with that. He will be happy with that.

An hon. member: It will keep the country together.

Motion agreed to.

Section 9, as amended, agreed to.

Section 10 agreed to.

On section 11:

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Mr. Breaugh moves that section 11 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"Section 20 of the said Act is amended by striking out 'and is repealed on August 1, 1977'."

Mr. Breaugh: This obviously speaks to the matter of whether, by some great crystal ball—obviously we don't have it, because the minister has it this morning—he has decided that by a particular date the problems with the rental accommodation in the province of Ontario will be overcome substantially, totally, by this proposal.

We think that is a ludicrous notion. We think it is a false premise on which to operate and it is the heart and soul of essentially what is wrong with rent review in Ontario: It's a patchwork, temporary programme, and that fearful premise runs through the entire process. We think it necessary to remove that.

We had some initial criticism when we suggested that the minister might be prepared to make a judgement on simple things like tying it to a vacancy rate. If he's at all uneasy about a vacancy rate, he might consult with his colleague, the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) who has a magic number and publishes it. He can do that if he wants to do it that way. But we would be quite happy to leave this legislation in place as a permanent piece of legislation until the rental accommodation problem is solved, at which time you could repeal the Act.

Mr. Warner: That's reasonable.

[12:30]

Mr. Edighoffer: This amendment is one that we cannot support, of course, because we have already said on many occasions that this legislation must be tied to the AIB guidelines, which we expect will be finished on December 31, 1978.

Also, the amendment really doesn't leave any incentive for the private sector to produce more units, which we've heard so many times in this Legislature. This has been referred to, and of course if we have an end to this legislation we can start planning for the decontrol period following the legislation. So, as I said earlier, we in this party cannot support this amendment.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, of course this amendment goes to the very heart of whether or not this is temporary legislation. I must say that after the hon. member's party last night voted to tie it to the AIB, in opposition to this side of the House—

Mr. Ruston: They are not sure.

Mr. Wildman: Will this be tied to the AIB on third reading?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —I wonder how he now rationalizes the fact he doesn't want to tie it to anything.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

All those in favour of Mr. Breaugh's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Amendment stacked.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, there was a section stood down.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Yes, I was going to comment on that.

The hon. member for Perth moved an amendment which was stood down. I'll reread the amendment to refresh your minds:

"That section 11(a) of the Act as set out in section 6 of the bill, be amended by striking out 'may' in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall.'"

Does the hon. minister wish to comment?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, I have sent to the hon. member for Perth a wording which he might wish to incorporate in his amendment. We're quite satisfied with the section as it stands before you in the bill, but it might be advisable if the hon. member for Perth would speak to his amendment further.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Does the hon. member for Perth wish to comment?

Mr. Edighoffer: Yes, we've checked the wording as it's been sent over and we are certainly in agreement with it. It will take me a moment or two to write it out, though, to present it to the House.

Mr. Renwick: Read it to us first so we can ponder on it.

Mr. Edighoffer: All right. We'll add to that amendment, "after the word 'premises' in the sixth line, the words 'in the building relating to each application'; and striking out the words 'rented by the landlord.' "

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, speaking for the government, with some reluctance we would accept that as written down, so the House will not divide.

Mr. Renwick: What's the meaning of it? What do you think it means?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Chairman, I think it means that what we were trying to accomplish is that the rent review officer shall, as I understand the wording of the amendment, require in the case of any application before him full information back to January 1, 1974, on all units within that building within which the units subject to that application are located. I think that would give the tenant seeking information about the building in his own unit all the information he needs, and would give to the rent review officer the information he normally requires anyway.

Mr. Renwick: I understand that.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Perhaps the hon. member for Perth will send the written amendment as soon as possible so we can place it before the committee.

Mr. Edighoffer: I think I'm ready. I'll read the whole amendment now:

"That section 11(a) of the Act, as set out in section 6 of the bill, be amended by striking out 'may' in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall'; and further striking out the words 'rented by the landlord' in the sixth line and inserting therefor 'in the building relating to each application.' "

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Any further discussion on the amendment?

All those in favour of Mr. Edgihoffer's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

[11:45]

The committee divided on Mr. Breaugh's amendment to subsection 7 of section 1, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 27; nays 61.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on Mr. Breaugh's amendment to subsection 2 of section 3, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes 46; nays 42.

Section 3, as amended, agreed to.

The committee divided on Mr. Breaugh's amendment to section 6, which was negatived on the following vote.

Ayes 27; nays 61.

Section 6 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Chair to give me the count on the first vote, sir—I'm sorry—the second vote?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: It was 46 to 42, as I recall it.

The committee divided on Mr. Edighoffer's amendment to section 7, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes 46; nays 42.

Section 7, as amended, agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: May we have a count please, sir; a head count on that vote?

Mr. Breithaupt: We just did.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, we did not. He took the original count on the second vote. I would like to have a head count on this side of the House please.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All right. We will retake the count.

Mr. Breithaupt: John has two heads.

Mr. Nixon: How about the best three out of five?

Mr. Good: A $200 fine for that.

Clerk Assistant: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 46; the "nays" 42.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Now that we have established that the clerks can count correctly—

Mr. Conway: The Minister of Housing can't.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: —we will continue to deal with Mr. Breaugh's amendment.

The committee divided on Mr. Breaugh's amendment to section 11, which was negatived on the same vote as the first vote.

Section 11 agreed to.

Bill 28, as amended, reported.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the committee of the whole House reported one bill with certain amendments.

THIRD READING

Bill 28, An Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975 (second session).

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, Her Honour will now come in for royal assent if the House will stand by.

[1:00]

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the Legislative Assembly and took her seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. P. M. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 28, An Act to amend The Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the Perfume and Cosmetics Bars Limited.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

ERRATA

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
2	21	2	21	between the Oshawa and Whitby industrial areas.
21	837	1	20/21	**Mr. S. Smith:** —it is headed, "Klees Condemns Wells Over French School." Show the

CONTENTS

Friday, April 29, 1977

Court facilities in Metro Toronto, statement by Mr. McMurtry ... 1075

Barrie annexation proposal, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. S. Smith ... 1076

WCB rehabilitation programme, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Angus ... 1077

Exploitation of immigrant workers, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. S. Smith ... 1078

Housing starts, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. S. Smith, Ms. Bryden ... 1079

Core curriculum, questions of Mr. Wells: Ms. Gigantes, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Sweeney ... 1080

Psi Mind Development Institute, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Breithaupt 1081

Huronia Regional Centre, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. G. E. Smith, Ms. Sandeman ... 1082

Child welfare, question of Mr. Norton: Mr. McClellan ... 1082

Family benefits, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. B. Newman ... 1083

Kayson Plastics, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Davidson ... 1083

Ontario Malleable Iron, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Breaugh ... 1083

Toronto Island Airport, question of Mr. McKeough: Ms. Bryden ... 1084

Township of Malden inquiry, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Mancini ... 1084

Rockwell International, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. B. Newman ... 1084

Gang violence, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Deans, Mr. Cunningham ... 1085

South Cayuga land assembly, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. G. I. Miller ... 1086

Farm marketing boards, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. MacDonald ... 1087

Storm-damage assistance, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Kerrio ... 1087

Report, standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Renwick ... 1089

Report, standing general government committee, Mr. Gaunt ... 1089

Report, select committee on highway transportation of goods, Mr. Gregory ... 1089

Employment Standards Amendment Act, Mr. Bounsall, first reading ... 1090

Labour Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Bounsall, first reading ... 1090

Non-Returnable Beverage Containers Act, Mr. Riddell, first reading ... 1090

Territorial Division Amendment Act, Mr. Bain, first reading ... 1090

Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, Mr. Angus, first reading ... 1091

Borough of Scarborough Act, Mr. Drea, second and third readings ... 1091

Borough of North York Act, Mr. Williams, second and third readings ... 1091

Perfume and Cosmetic Bars Limited Act, Mr. Peterson, second and third readings ... 1091

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, reported ... 1091

Third reading ... 1105

Royal assent to Bills 28, Pr8, Pr21, Pr27, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor ... 1105

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to ... 1105

Errata ... 1105

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L.)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E.R. (Waterloo North L)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Handleman, Hon. S. B.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D.; Treasurer, Minister of Economic and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rowe, Hon. R. D.; Speaker (Northumberland PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E.; Deputy Chairman (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E.; Chairman (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)

Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. S-1

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Social Development Committee

Estimates, Social Development Policy

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament

Monday, April 25, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

STANDING SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Shore, M. (London North PC) Chairman
Belanger, J.A. (Prescott and Russell PC)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio V. (Niagara Falls L)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)
Wiseman, D. J. (Lanark PC)

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

SUPPLY COMMITTEE

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1977

ESTIMATES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY

The committee met at 3:33 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Ladies and gentlemen, we now have a quorum and I will call the meeting to order.

The purpose of the meeting is to deal with estimates, and the first estimates we are dealing with relate to the Social Development field. The Hon. Mrs. Birch has an opening statement.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a short statement on the introduction of the estimates of the Secretariat for Social Development. I must admit that it is with mixed feelings—I'm flattered of course—that I find the secretariat selected to be the first considered under our new procedures.

The policy field structure adopted by this government in 1972 has come to be acknowledged, both by those who work within the system here and by external observers, as a potent and effective force in achieving co-ordination of policies and programmes. When the new structures were first announced, the newly-created provincial secretaries were dubbed super ministers. That was, of course, incorrect and reflected a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of the process which puts such a premium on problem solving through the co-operative efforts of ministers and staffs.

Because the responsibilities of the provincial secretaries are primarily internal they have not had a high profile and some people have suggested that while the policy field system has been a great success administratively and internally, it has not been as successful politically.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't happen to agree with that. In my position as Provincial Secretary for Social Development I have been able to accomplish some vitally important tasks beyond the scope of any individual portfolio. I think the dimension of the role of a provincial secretary is becoming more widely acknowledged and I am therefore pleased, albeit a bit apprehensive, that we were selected to go first in the estimates review process. It's a great answer to those who suggest the provincial secretaries are politically inconspicuous.

The role of the Secretariat for Social Development then, is, different from the functional mandate of the operating ministries. It is our responsibility to ensure the co-ordination of policy across ministry boundaries in policy fields. This government feels we must strive to provide social services in ways which do not disturb the basic fabric of life in our communities. We must recognize that our society has shown a capacity to tolerate diversity. In light of this philosophy, I would like to examine the role of the secretariat in bringing about change in the way special services for children are provided.

The history of the secretariat's role in this field illustrates our considerable involvement, starting in the area of mental retardation. As you will recall, my predecessor, the present government House leader (Mr. Welch), developed a green paper on mental retardation focusing on the need to provide services in community settings with de-emphasis on large institutions. Although much progress has been made in implementing the policies suggested by the green paper, there is evidence that some communities resist the establishment in their midst of group homes and services for the retarded, and others. In the years ahead, we hope to convince these communities to acknowledge their responsibilities and to ensure our retarded citizens their place in society.

Our continuing concern was evident again in September of 1975 when the government established a Council for Emotionally Disturbed Children and Youth, following a study and report by an interministerial committee led by a member of the secretariat. This council was created to provide a forum for the exchange of information and to strengthen the co-ordination of policy development. The council, which was chaired by a senior member of the Ministry of Education, had representation from the ministries concerned: The Attorney General, Community and Social

Services, Correctional Services, Colleges and Universities, Education, Health and the Secretariats for Social Development and for Justice. Copies of the annual review were distributed so you are aware of the expanded role and the new name given to the council last September.

We've been very pleased with the work of the council, and its accomplishments, including: First, compilation of a directory of all government-approved facilities for troubled children and youth; secondly, analysis of the implications of the repeal of section 8 of The Training Schools Act—and I will say more about the repeal of section 8 in a minute or so—thirdly, review of proposed mechanisms for interministerial research into special services for children; preparation of reaction to proposed legislation on young persons in conflict with the law; analysis of issues surrounding residential services for children and youth; review of current projects involving co-ordination of services, including the establishment of committees involving community representatives to develop provincial guidelines for the encouragement of inter-agency co-operation.

Mr. Chairman this council, under the very able leadership of Mr. Peter Wiseman, has played a valuable role in the development of policy, in the sharing of information and in improving co-ordination among the various ministries involved.

Let me now turn to a discussion of the secretariat's role in bringing to an end the use of section 8 of The Training Schools Act. As you will recall, in May of 1975 the Legislature enacted The Training Schools Amendment Act, thereby removing the provision which allowed a family court judge to admit an unmanageable child or a status offender to a training school if no community programme was available and if the training school experience was thought to be desirable. Proclamation of the Act was delayed to allow time for communities and the courts to adjust to the change and to allow time for the province to study the implications of the repeal on the programme that would be affected by it.

Because the programmes affected both the justice and social policy fields, the Premier (Mr. Davis) asked me to chair a special committee of ministers to study the problems surrounding this repeal and to make our recommendations to cabinet. In this role I visited family courts across the province and met with family court judges, provincial organizations and concerned groups, I also visited training schools, detention centres, group homes and health facilities in many parts of this province.

In addition, I requested the Interministerial Council for Troubled Children and Youth to prepare a report of the implications of the repeal for all of the children who would be affected by it. The council studied the adequacy of community resources, the responsibility for current wards in the transition phase and the issue of the responsibility for White Oaks Village, an especially fine facility for the treatment of disturbed youngsters.

Further work under my direction led to the decision to proclaim The Training Schools Amendment Act effective January 1, 1977. It was also decided that no child originally admitted to training schools under this section of the Act would be returned to a training school except as a result of new offences; and it was decided to maintain current wards with the Ministry of Correctional Services, but to move them out of training schools as quickly as possible and to terminate all wardships as soon as alternative arrangements could be made.

This is happening, Mr. Chairman. At the time I made my statement there were 103 children in training schools under section 8; by the end of March the number had dropped to 37.

We are also committed to additional selective funding with high priority for the development of a secure treatment facility for severely disturbed adolescents. White Oaks Village, known I am sure to many of you, has become a mental health facility under the Ministry of Health—it will operate in the future as a co-educational treatment facility—and a special committee of the Council for Troubled Children and Youth continues its work in making arrangements for hard-to-place section 8 wards.

Mr. Chairman, for some time, along with my colleagues, I have been concerned about the provision of residential services. Some of the gaps and duplications and inconsistencies in the provision of residential services were noted in the report of the interministerial committee on residential services. Members will recall that this committee was commissioned by the cabinet committee on social development to investigate residential services for three specific client groups: Children and youth, adults in conflict with the law, and the elderly population. While we have acted first on that part of the report dealing with children's services, I would like to assure you that very same emphasis is now being placed on developing appropriate new policies for residential services for the elderly,

to ensure that greater equity exists with respect to the cost of services and the arrangements for access and funding.

With respect to special services for children, I hardly need reiterate the contents of the Throne Speech or the statements that were made three weeks ago. Suffice to say that a unified children's services division of the Ministry of Community and Social Services has been created. As well, children's services committees with financial responsibility for ensuring that troubled children receive the services they need are to be formed in our communities. It is significant that these are new departures from past practices at both the provincial and local levels.

Mr. Chairman, the reforms I have recounted affecting children illustrate very well the accomplishments of a provincial secretary and the secretariat staff, but I must emphasize that this is only an example of our scope of concern. I have already made a brief reference to policy development affecting senior citizens. Much work has also been done concerning the handicapped, and I was very pleased when we were able to announce the introduction of a system of pilot projects to provide transportation services to the handicapped. The projects are being closely monitored and assessed by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. We will be watching that information carefully in our consideration of a future province-wide policy. Policy studies on housing and supportive services for the handicapped are now in hand, following receipt of recommendations from the Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped.

Let me take a moment, Mr. Chairman, to describe two other areas in which policy reviews have recently been initiated. One concerns rehabilitation services which are now provided under a variety of programmes by a number of ministries. These are being reviewed with the hope that we will be able to co-ordinate these policies and services. The other is a subject that has come to concern me personally, and that is the impact of various government policies on the family. Governments at all levels have a variety of policies dealing with individuals, but notwithstanding the fundamental importance of the family in our society, governments rarely give explicit attention to the impact of these policies on the family. We hope to do that; and to lead off our efforts a special seminar on the family is being held on Tuesday, May 10.

In addressing these issues that concern the secretariat and the various ministries in the social policy field, we have to keep firmly in mind that our hopes and expectations to fashion a more perfect society must be worked within the limits of the finite resources that Ontario, rich as it is, can provide through taxation. It was admittedly much easier in the 1960s to launch major new programmes, when both government revenues and government expenditures represented an increasing share of the gross provincial product. Although a good deal has been made of constraint in the past few years, I do not think it is sufficiently understood, Mr. Chairman, that this government has limited its expenditure, both generally and in the social policy field, to a virtually fixed share of the gross provincial product for the last seven years.

[3:45]

Ontario budgetary expenditure since 1970-71, and now projected for the year just commenced, averaged 15.1 per cent of the gross provincial product. Although there have been variations from year to year, they have been relatively small, and the important matter is that the share of the economy taken by this level of government has not grown significantly during the 1970s. The budgets of the social policy field, which accounts for the largest single share of provincial spending, have ranged from a low of 9.7 per cent of the GPP to a high of 10.3 per cent, with an average of 10 per cent. For 1977-78, the budget indicates that the social policy field will have 10.1 per cent of the gross provincial product to spend.

No small part of the effort of the cabinet committee on social development, including the ministers and their staffs and the provincial secretary and my staff, are devoted to the time-consuming and difficult task of sorting out allocations of resources to the various ministries and programmes. In most other governments even yet, ministry allocations are worked out between individual ministries and treasury boards or their counterparts on an adversarial basis. Our system is better described as co-operative, because the ministers in each policy field work together to develop decisions on these difficult matters.

The success of our system is, I think, evident. Not only have we been able to limit our share of the GPP but I believe we have in the process been able to bring greater benefits to the people of Ontario from our system of social services, which while admittedly not perfect is still perhaps the best, and represents certainly the best value in North America.

Mr. Chairman, let me close with a few comments on the details of the secretariat estimates for 1977-78. The total sum involved is a little over $2.2 million. A little less than a third of this is for the policy staff, for our administration and for my office; a little over a third is for the four advisory councils that assist us so very ably; and the final third is for the Youth Secretariat and its youth experience activities.

The largest part of the increase in expenditure projected from 1976-77 to 1977-78 is accounted for by the increased costs of distributing the senior citizens' newsletter, which as you may know, with a circulation of 740,000, is now perhaps the largest circulation newspaper in Canada, albeit published only quarterly. As you may also know, the content of this newsletter is entirely under the control of the Advisory Council on Senior Citizens. Of course the bulk of the increased cost for the newsletter is represented by increased postage costs.

Excepting the increase in the cost of the newsletter, the increase in our budget otherwise is 2.7 per cent.

I suppose it is very evident that I believe strongly in the cabinet committee process. Over the last 15 years or so ministers have been faced with increased demands on their time. The third report of the Committee on Government Productivity puts it rather well; it talks to the fact that the Legislature now meets for longer periods each year, departments grow larger and more complex, constituency business and activities such as speech-making demand more of our time; and of course the dilemma is that the demands piled up at the same time that responsibilities of ministers for such matters as policy and setting priorities became more complex. And so the cabinet committee system was introduced, with policy ministers appointed to lead in the development of policy decisions. I might explain, as an aside, that policy ministers do not have control over, nor responsibility for, a minister's programme management or policy proposals.

The list of policy items in your books includes items that have been completed and announced; such as French as a Second Language, the OECA network expansion, the repeal of section 8 and other items where the work is still continuing.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very pleased to answer questions in more detail about the work of our secretariat.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Madam Minister. I will now call on Mr. McClellan, the NDP critic, to make his opening statement.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Before I get into the opening remarks that I had wanted to make, I couldn't really let the minister's opening remarks pass without a couple of immediate comments in response.

Firstly, I want to take pretty strong exception to your analysis of the problems in implementing the mental retardation programme. When you say there is evidence that some communities resist the establishment in their midst of group homes and services for the retarded, although that may be true I hope you aren't deluding yourselves into thinking that is the source of the dilemma you have had in moving toward normal community living for the retarded. You would be doing yourself a serious disservice if you think that is the source of the difficulties you've been experiencing.

I would suggest to you, if I may, through the Chair, that you are closer to the mark on page nine when you talk about the need to reorganize rehabilitation services in this province, and that the difficulty in implementing the mental retardation programme has largely been a result of the failure of your rehabilitation services to respond to the programme needs of the working committees. The working committees have been unable to plan residential alternatives because of the difficulties in obtaining workshops for the retarded.

It really is, as I understand it—and I have been monitoring it now for about two years—almost as simple as that. Your rehab services are sufficiently disfunctional that it has thrown the planning of the working committees off time and time again, and it has impeded the development of the kinds of normal community living alternatives that all of us want so much to see at work.

I may say as well that I don't share your plaudits for the manner in which the section 8 repeal has been handled, but I will get into that in my lead-off and I think maybe I will also probably cover most of the other topics that you raised as well.

One of the reasons this ministry was called first was that we in the officiating opposition wanted it called first and asked that it be called first. At the time you had not yet announced the April 4 policy proposals. It's a measure of the importance and the priority we attach to the issue of services to kids, and I want to deal mostly with that in my lead-off.

We have pretty profound concerns about your policy statement and I would like to set them out to you. Number one, we see very

little in the history of the Ministry of Community and Social Services that justifies the confidence you are placing in it. It has not been, to put it mildly, a successful ministry. It has been the clinker in the array of ministries. Traditionally it has not been able to manage the mental retardation programme effectively, it has not been able to deal effectively with child welfare services currently under its jurisdiction; we are profoundly apprehensive about the capacity of that ministry to absorb and deal with all children's services.

Let me try to illustrate that concern. I raised with the minister last week the application for a judicial inquiry under section 3 of The Child Welfare Act that has been submitted by Jeffrey Wilson. I think those cases illustrate the kind of concern we feel.

Child welfare has always been the responsibility of Community and Social Services; the administration of the Act and the functioning of Children's Aid Societies have always been the responsibility of Community and Social Services. The material in that application brief raises real questions about how well the Act is being administered at the present time. I want to just put on the record and deal at some length with the kinds of problems that application brief reveals to us.

You will recall—I'm not sure, really, if the minister is familiar with the details of those cases—Mr. Wilson has presented in scrupulously documented detail the cases of three children in the care of the Brampton Children's Aid Society. I want to go over those cases. Because of the requirement of The Juvenile Delinquency Act, I'll use initials for the children's names. I want to explain and put on the record what has been happening in this particular instance, because it raises concerns about what's been happening with respect to the administration of the Act, I think, in other areas.

The case of T. is that of a young boy, age 15, a ward of the Peel Children's Aid Society. In February 1976, T. was placed by the Peel Children's Aid Society in a residential group home, MacDonald House, with the threat that it was either that or training school, no other facility was available. As punishment for unacceptable behaviour, T. was placed in isolation on April 7, 1976, in an unheated, rat-infested, unlit garage, referred to by MacDonald House staff as the "Buckingham jail."

On April 8, after sleeping there overnight, he entered the home where the other residents of the group home were eating. He demanded food, he was refused; he phoned the police for help. Then he phoned the house social worker for help.

He got into an argument with the house social worker, he slammed the telephone down and broke it. For this he was charged with a criminal offence, with the wilful damage of property, and he was sent forthwith to the Barrie jail. He was locked up in the Barrie Detention Centre from April 8 to April 13, and while in the detention centre he was subjected to what in the transcripts are recorded as emotional abuse from a visiting social worker.

Jeffrey Wilson, who was eventually retained as his lawyer, as his counsel, secured his release to Viking Homes on April 16; but on the morning of April 13, T. appeared in the Barrie family court and the Peel Children's Aid Society demanded he be sent to training school as a result of the criminal charges that had been laid against him.

The Barrie family court judge waived jurisdiction without making any decision on it; but at two o'clock the same day, T. was in front of the Peel family court judge, Judge Durham in the Peel family court, and the Children's Aid Society representative told Judge Durham that T. had been found guilty that morning in the Barrie court. The Children's Aid Society worker requested that he be sent to training school.

Fortunately, Judge Durham refused to accede to that kind of obviously irregular and unjust procedure; Judge Durham demanded that T. obtain counsel and remanded it until April 20. When the court resumed on April 20, Judge Durham announced that, and I'm quoting from the transcript, that he had been misled by the Children's Aid Society, that the Barrie judge had made no finding whatsoever in the case; and if I may say even more shocking, Judge Durham revealed to the court that the Barrie judge, Judge Morton, had told him—and I'm quoting—he felt that the Children's Aid Society was trying to railroad T. into training school.

Mr. Wilson produced medical assessments of T. which contradicted and challenged the CAS plans for training school for this particular child. A suitable treatment placement was finally obtained by the child's counsel, despite continued resistance and obstruction by the Peel Children's Aid Society.

A second case is that of M., a young girl age 14, also a ward of the Peel Children's Aid Society. In March 1976, M.'s mother called the Peel Children's Aid Society for help because of difficulty with her daughter. The difficulty was school absenteeism. The

CAS worker visited the home on March 16, proceeded to threaten and to attempt to remove M. from the home without legal authority, precipitating a row between M. and her mother. As a result of this, M. was charged with a criminal offence, assault.

[4:00]

She was arrested and detained for nine days until sent by the court to Viking Homes for three months. On May 13, with no prior notification, no prior consultation, the Children's Aid Society descended on Viking Homes at 10:30 in the morning and removed the child. They made other plans for her which involved running her through the usual foster home mill. She was placed, in the course of the next few months, in a total of five different foster homes. She started running away. As I said, by August 20, she had been in five different placements.

The Children's Aid Society refused to bring the matter back to court under The Child Welfare Act for a review despite the obvious disaster. M.'s mother had to obtain legal counsel in an attempt to get the kid back in family court so that the court could review the situation and try to resolve the obvious disaster. The society refused to agree to bring the matter back to court and M.'s mother was forced to charge the Children's Aid Society with ill treatment not constituting assault under The Child Welfare Act simply in order to get the case back in court.

When the case was finally heard in court the Peel CAS refused to allow M. to appear in court or to have legal representation. Mr. Wilson, her counsel, had to subpoena M. into court in order to get her there. Adequate professional assessments of M. had to be obtained by Mr. Wilson at his expense through subpoena, because they were otherwise unavailable. The Peel family court, as you know, does not have its own assessment clinic.

Finally, on October 27, M. was returned home to her mother and the wardship of the Peel CAS was mercifully terminated.

I'll give you the final case, the case of K. who is a young girl aged 14 about whom I had some correspondence with the minister, as the minister will probably recall. K. was a ward of the Children's Aid Society since February 1975. She had a history of attempted suicide. After a number of failed treatment placements she was placed by the Children's Aid Society in Thistletown. She was a very disturbed young girl. Her case is very similar to the case of Norma Dean. There's a very remarkable similarity in the history of this case except that it didn't have the tragic outcome. It could very well have had exactly the same tragic outcome.

In Thistletown, K. continued to attempt suicide. She ran away some 15 times in 1976 and it was obvious to everybody that the Thistletown placement was a real failure, we'll put it that way; that the Thistletown treatment placement was not working and that some alternate solution was obviously essential.

In October 1976 she ran away again. She was picked up by the police. She was waiting in the local police station to be returned to Thistletown when she got into a row with her visiting Children's Aid Society social worker. She was still a ward of the CAS. As a result of this row, she was charged with a criminal offence by the Peel Children's Aid Society, the offence being assault. This criminal charge was laid without any consultation with the supervising professionals at Thistletown.

On January 20, 1977, Judge Durham of the Peel court summoned all the actors in the case before him. There turned out to be 15 different professionals from at least eight separate organizations and the judge's comment was: "It makes you think of all the king's horses and all the king's men, doesn't it?" He demanded to know why the Children's Aid Society had laid a charge of assault against one of its own clients who was in need of treatment.

The answer was—and I re-read the transcripts a number of times—incoherent; but I can speculate, and my interpretation of the reason the Children's Aid Society laid that charge was that it was trying to switch jurisdiction of that kid. They were trying to get that child out from under the jurisdiction of The Child Welfare Act and put her under the jurisdiction of The Juvenile Delinquents Act so that they would not be responsible for providing ongoing treatment to the child when she reached 16. She was very close to 16.

This is a common practice, I gather, this kind of agency buck-passing and this kind of flagrant misuse of the family courts by agencies simply to shrug off responsibility for providing treatment to difficult kids. I understand the difficulties in providing adequate treatment service to a child as disturbed as K., but it is absolutely intolerable that any Children's Aid Society in this province attempt to initiate criminal actions against its clients for the purposes of avoiding its responsibilities to provide treatment, and I am quite

convinced that that's what was happening in this particular case.

The judge, I am sure from reading the transcripts, had a similar apprehension that this was the dynamic, this was what was going on in front of him in the court. He asked the Children's Aid Society representatives if they were happy with the effects on K. of them laying a criminal charge. The effects to that point were four appearances in family court, still no adequate treatment plan devised for the kid and yet there were three more appearances in family court to follow—seven appearances in family court for a kid who was profoundly disturbed, suicidal, in the process of making suicide attempts and of running away regularly from the treatment facility, and still no place to help her and still no treatment planned.

The Children's Aid Society agreed with the judge that the effects were not beneficial. K.'s story proceeds along now familiar lines. The CAS attempted to interfere with her right to obtain legal counsel. They succeeded in this until she was, in fact, released from Thistletown to the care of a friend by the court. Once this had happened she was able to get counsel, but we have a situation of those who are laying criminal charges against their own client also at the same time preventing the person from obtaining legal counsel to defend themselves against these charges.

The CAS violated a court-determined treatment plan—I won't go into the details but it's clear in the transcripts of this particular case. The CAS refused to bring the issue back to court for review, as it had done in the other cases that I cited, so this forced K.'s lawyer to concede her guilt of the charge of assault simply because of the necessity of getting her back in front of the judge so that some authority would be there to devise an adequate treatment plan for the child.

Finally, K.'s lawyer obtained suitable treatment for her himself. The system did not. Contrary to your sense of what was happening in this case and your correspondence with me, it was the child's lawyer who eventually found an adequate treatment facility for the child.

In these three cases we have a number of common threads; agencies responding to family problems by initiating not treatment or diversionary measures or rehabilitation measures, but by initiating criminal proceedings against their clients. Despite the bizarre misuse of criminal justice measures, the legal and civil rights of the clients are repeatedly violated; and finally, in the application of best interests law, these cases show that neither the best interests of children are being met nor are their legal or civil rights being safeguarded.

All of these cases were known to the ministry. All of these cases were known to the Minister of Community and Social Services since early fall 1976, because Jeffrey Wilson personally advised the minister of the details of each of these cases.

The Minister of Community and Social Services has the legislative responsibility for the administration of The Child Welfare Act and for the operation of Children's Aid Societies. He was presented with the details of these cases and he knew what was going on in some detail, particularly with respect to T. and with respect to M. The application brief, which I don't have with me but which the current Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) has, provides documentary evidence that the ministry was advised about these situations, which I can only describe as the child welfare equivalent of malpractice. It's the only way I can describe the activities in each of these three cases.

Section 3 of The Child Welfare Act has very clear responsibility vested in the minister, and that responsibility and authority means that he is ultimately responsible, and his ministry is ultimately responsible, for what happens with respect to the administration of child welfare. He is empowered to strike a judicial inquiry whenever there is evidence —no, it doesn't even require that, it simply gives him the power to do that at his discretion. I am sure the implication of that is that where there is evidence of malfunction or where there is evidence that the best interests of children are not being met by a Children's Aid Society he is obliged to investigate these matters and rectify it.

Yet he did nothing with respect to these cases. His ministry did nothing. His ministry officials have done nothing about this. If we are to believe the latest reporting in the Toronto Globe and Mail subsequent to the matter being raised in the Legislature last week, the present minister does not intend either to establish a judicial inquiry to look into these matters.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, how we in the Legislature are supposed to agree that the trust of all children's services ought to be now vested in this same Ministry of Community and Social Services? I believe that is stretching our credulity more than any of us are prepared to have it stretched. There hasn't been the kind of vigilance, the kind of dedication to protecting the rights and best in-

terests of children regardless of whose toes get stepped on. It just hasn't been there. Occasionally toes do have to be stepped on, occasionally there are inappropriate people in inappropriate positions and that has to be confronted and dealt with.

Setting aside that particular agency and those particular cases, the question of the relationship between best interests law on the one hand and the legal and civil rights of children in care on the other, is an issue that I think transcends the particulars of the three cases that are in the application brief. I am sure the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) knows much better than I do that this has been a perennial problem in the provision of children's services and in the administration of the courts, and it's a question that has never been adequately addressed and examined.

I repeat here, while we have the opportunity, our plea that a judicial inquiry be established, not simply for the purpose of investigating the administration of the Act as it relates to the Peel Children's Aid Society—that is obviously essential—but also to look at the broader question of the relationship between best interests law on the one hand and legal and civil rights on the other, and to come up with a set of independent judicial recommendations which would perhaps serve as an extra foundation upon which you can build your reorganization of children's services.

[4:15]

Having dealt in a preliminary kind of way with our concerns about Community and Social Services as the appropriate vehicle for reorganizing children's services, let me just conclude on that. We're not under any illusions that the warehousing of all children's services here at the centre at Queen's Park is even beginning to deal with the problem. We've argued for some time that services need to be decentralized. There needs to be a devolution of responsibility to the local community level. I would agree that a preliminary step involves rationalization here at Queen's Park, but we shouldn't be under any illusions at all that that represents a solution. That's just an organizational clearing of the throat that makes possible a fundamental reform of children's services.

Quite frankly, we'd be more comfortable if it was being done somewhere else, if it was being done in the Ministry of Education, for example. That may be an unusual proposition but in many respects it makes a lot of sense. Schools already represent a nicely organized, neighbourhood-based structure for delivering social services. It does make sense to us to develop an adequate network of children's services that build on what's already there and working quite well.

Let me deal with the second part of your reform, which I hope is the major part, the local children's services committee. There's an erroneous assumption that all that's needed is a kind of minor tinkering.

I hope I didn't wake anybody up.

There's an erroneous assumption that I think underlies what you're proposing. That assumption is that we have an adequate network of social services already developed and in place in this province and that all that's needed is some rather mechanical tinkering with the system to effect some kind of co-ordination of what exists; and that having done this relatively simple and mechanical exercise of pulling everything together in the centre and then setting up something you're calling a local children's services committee at the community level, you're going to be somehow dealing with the problem.

The problem is that the assumption is utterly wrong. Let me illustrate by a little anecdote. I was visiting the Peel family court a couple of weeks ago, just watching what was happening in the court. Towards the end of the morning, Judge Durham directed a young boy about 13 years old to a group home facility at a cost of $43 a day. I don't think it was Viking.

Mrs. Campbell: Surprise, surprise!

Mr. McClellan: I think it was Twin Valleys, as a matter of fact. It sounds like a very nice place.

As he was sentencing this child to Twin Valleys at a cost of $43 a day, he said, rather sadly: "What a great tragedy it is that in this community we don't have the kinds of family support services, family counselling services that might have been made available to this family five or six years ago, so that we wouldn't have to be now breaking up this family and sending this child to a residential treatment facility."

That little story speaks to what the problem is in this province. Nothing that I've heard so far from the ministry or from ministry spokespersons—and I again heard Gordon McLellan giving a very lucid description of the policy proposals this morning at Humber College—but nothing has been said about the need to develop an adequate network of preventative and personal and family support services at the local community level.

I dealt at length with this in my reply to the Speech from the Throne, and I don't feel that I should take the time of the committee to rehash that. I would simply direct you to the CELDIC report, which was written in 1970, which gives a comprehensive blueprint for the development of the kinds of personal and family support services that would reduce the incidence of custodial care and residential care and institutional care.

That's where the problem is in this province, that those services simply don't exist in most communities. I believe that's a direct quote from the interministerial report, that those kinds of services simply have not been established in most communities in Ontario. I'm talking about home help services and visiting homemakers' services and visiting nursing services, adequate day-care services, adequate home child care and family counselling, family therapy, group counselling, group programming for families, home child care, parent relief programmes. These things have not been accorded any kind of priority at all by successive governments in this province.

They are absolutely essential, basically for simple survival in the kind of society that we're in today. Yet we still have an almost archaic poor law mentality with respect to the provision of social services. We still see social services as crisis based, which is another way of saying that you don't apply social services and you don't organize and put social services in place except to deal with breakdown once it's occurred.

The ways and means that this society developed to deal with people who had shown some kind of breakdown or some kind of deviance was to place them in institutions originally, in work houses and in homes for the aged and in mental retardation institutions. By and large, we haven't moved very far from that, you know, we really haven't moved very far from that.

The orientation of the service system is still an assumption that there's nothing that you can do to prevent the breakdown from taking place, so you don't try to do it and you rationalize all kinds of excuses about the lack of adequate research data and the lack of conclusive scientific data around validating the advisability of establishing a comprehensive family support system. Instead, you pick up the pieces and you incarcerate the pieces.

Whether you're talking about incarceration in an orphanage or whether you're talking about residential care in some kind of small institutional facility, you're still in the same ball game. You still haven't moved out of that custodial bias that characterizes social services. You leave the provision of the most important and crucial part of the social service system, the family support services, to the private sector. You leave it at the mercy of United Appeal funding and the vagaries of voluntary funding and the funding and support are piecemeal and haphazard and chaotic.

Most communities don't have the energy to try to establish those kinds of services at all. A simply massive effort is required in order to do that. In the smaller communities outside of the larger metropolitan areas those services simply don't exist at all. Within the large metropolitan areas they exist precariously and on the basis of almost total inadequacy.

If you're talking about a fundamental reorganization of children's services, what you ought to be talking about is the development of a comprehensive network of family support services. I would like to see you dealing with as much priority with that rather than with the residential services, quite frankly; not suggesting for a second that you drop your concern around residential services, but in the long term that's what the issue is and that's where the energy and resources have to be applied.

Let me say finally that—having studied your proposals until I'm sick to death of reading the documents, I've gone over and over them, I've talked to people in municipal government, I've talked to people in the family court, I've talked to people in Children's Aid Societies, I've talked to people in all parts of the child welfare service system—nobody has the slightest idea what you're talking about when you talk about a local children's services committee. Nobody knows what you mean. I don't think you know yourselves what you mean, I really don't.

I really don't think that you have done anything more than to state a general direction. You've stated concern. To be fair, you have acknowledged the state of shambles and chaos in the children's services field and you have put forward a general direction. Somehow you understand that there needs to be a decentralization of some kind, that you can't pull together a service delivery system here at Queen's Park. You have to give that authority somehow, in some form, to the local community, but you don't know how to do it.

I gather that you whipped some of your staff people into preparing a policy proposal

in some two or three weeks and presented it. It certainly sounds like that, because there is almost no content in it at all. We are very, very surprised. I'm sure much of your estimates—and I'm sure you anticipated this—are going to be focused on trying to understand just what it is you're talking about when you say a local children's services committee.

I know the member for St. George shares my eagerness to know what it is, what this beast is. Who is it accountable to? Is it accountable to the province? Is it accountable to the municipal government? What is its composition? Who will determine its composition? What are its powers? Will it be responsible basically for case management or will it have additional responsibilities for planning in a serious way to meet the human service needs of a given community? What will be its relationship with the existing social service system? What is going to happen to the Children's Aid Societies?

I gather that you're talking about vesting wardship responsibilities with the local children's services committees, and yet when the question is raised at the PMLC, "What about the Children's Aid Societies?" the minister gives one of his charming shrugs and says that they won't be affected very much at all.

Frankly, that's rather hard to believe when you say in a policy statement that you're contemplating, I assume, the transfer of wardship responsibilities from Children's Aid Societies, where they are now, to some new undefined ephemeral entity called the local children's services committee.

Are they special purpose bodies? Are they the equivalent of a board of health? Are they an inter-agency council advising the regional government? Are they going to be the regional social services committee? What is their relationship going to be with local area municipalities? Are they going to be a fourth level of government, as was recommended in the CELDIC report and as was implemented in British Columbia? Is there going to be a whole new role for municipal government in the social service provision?

[4:30]

None of these basic questions have been addressed in any way at all. All we have is a phrase and a general glimmer of an inkling of a clue of a direction, which is somehow to decentralize. I'm not clear whether you've thought out the implications of a policy of decentralizing, of a policy that devolves responsibility onto a lower level of government. It's a policy which we support. I think I prefaced my remarks by saying that devolution makes sense to us, and indeed the direction that was outlined by the Seebohm committee in Great Britain makes sense to us rather than, for example, the option that was presented in 1970 by the CELDIC commission.

There is a whole host of implications. If you are thinking seriously about giving regional government or municipal government responsibility in a major way for human services, there are all kinds of implications, all kinds of consequences to that policy decision that I wish you would be honest enough to raise. If you are devolving responsibility onto municipal government then you are committing yourself to a fundamental transformation of local government, so that it no longer simply services as its basic function, it no longer simply services property, it also has a new major role of providing human services to people.

If you do that, and if that's what you're saying, you have to address yourself to the question of municipal finance. You simply can't dump those kinds of responsibilities onto municipal government with the present financial structure, because you are simply guaranteeing the most hostile reception for your proposals that you can possibly imagine. You cannot even contemplate, I don't think, in good faith, the suggestion that you are going to give the municipalities additional responsibilities for human service provision without at the same time giving them an entirely new deal in terms of municipal financing. It is absolutely essential.

Otherwise it will be simply inevitable that the function of municipal politics will be to protect municipal taxpayers from the added burden of human service expenditures and the social service system will simply deteriorate even further. I would suggest to you that if you are moving toward devolution you have to do it on the basis of providing total financial resources to municipal governments to assume this additional responsibility.

I may be way off base, I may have totally misunderstood the gist of the policy statement, vague as it is, because it's really impossible to get a clear sense of what it is they're actually proposing to do, and I hope when we come out of these estimates on Wednesday or some time next week, that we'll at least have an idea what it is this major new policy proposal actually is. I may be all wrong. You may be simply proposing a rather innocuous inter-agency council which does the equivalent of case management under a fairly firm provincial hand. I think that would be really too bad if that's all you were addressing yourself to.

At any rate, it would be useful to everybody for you to go back to your hallowed halls and produce a coherent document, perhaps a green paper. It's been done before; you did a very nice job, before you implemented the mental retardation programme, of providing a very clear and straightforward, understandable and comprehensive description of what it was you proposed to do. In fact we had two. We had the original Willis-ton report and then we had its reworking by the government which was put out as a white paper. We don't have that this time. All we have—and I am sorry to say it—is a certain amount of public relations hype with respect to the reorganization of children's services. We have a very attractive and plausible new minister, a very attractive and plausible deputy minister and virtually nothing else, nothing in the idea of an intelligible direction to go for the reorganization of services.

The final thing I want to speak to—and I will wrap up within five minutes—is your so-called process of consultation which has been initiated. For the life of me, I don't understand how people are expected to consult on something which has no reality to it. When I suggested this to the minister he denounced me as wanting to impose from the central authority, suggesting I would want to impose my will on everybody without allowing a chance for consultation.

There is a difference between confusion and leadership. This is a situation where government has to give leadership, even if that leadership simply consists of spelling out clearly and precisely, in detail and concretely, what it is you are proposing. If you are feeling that because of the enormity of the difficulties in children's services some kind of a process of public discussion and the soliciting of alternatives and options is desirable and necessary, that is quite legitimate. But you should have the decency to say that. Secondly, you should have the decency to provide something that people can react to.

Let me predict to you what is going to happen with the present consultative process you have initiated. All you have is a direction. You don't know what you are going to do. You don't know what you want to do. You are now going forward into a process of consultation which is not open and which will by and large involve soliciting from vested interest groups what it is they would like to see you doing without providing the kind of leadership that you appropriately should be doing.

You can shake your head, but that is precisely what you are doing. There is no way you can design a social service delivery system on the basis of that will-o'-the-wisp April 4 statement. As you wander around the province asking the Children's Aid Societies, asking the family service associations and asking the regional social service committees what it is they would like you to do, they will all tell you what they would like you to do and it will all be with respect to their own vested interest protection. I say that on the basis of having been involved in this arena for some 13 years. I know precisely what will happen to you.

The Provincial Secretary for Social Development should know also because she has had the same involvement. The present Minister of Community and Social Services, however, has not had that kind of involvement to that extent. I don't think he knows what a nutcracker he is actually going into with this rather silly and ill-defined phrase, local children's services committees. But he will find out soon enough and he won't get out of that exercise the kind of concrete proposals he needs.

If you do know what it is that you want to do, for God's sakes, spell it out. Nobody is going to string you up from a tree for presenting a coherent option. You get yourself into difficulty when you try to muddy, to obscure and to pretend that something that is insubstantial has indeed some substance to it.

Mr. Chairman: Is that all, Mr. McClellan?

Mr. McClellan: You would like that to be true, I know, Mr. Chairman; however I was just drawing my breath.

I think that is virtually all I wanted to say by way of an introductory statement, except to add that my colleagues and I will be dealing, as time permits, with children's services being the priority, with the equally-important issue of the inadequate network of personal non-institutional, non-residential services for senior citizens. As well, we would like to deal with the work of some of the advisory councils, some of which we feel have done the job of being a goad and a prod to government but, sadly, government has not responded as well as it could have. Others of those advisory councils have been, quite frankly, disappointing; but we'll come to that in the votes.

Mr. Chairman: The next speaker will be Mrs. Campbell. Mr. Sweeney, will you come and take the chair? Because of a previous commitment I will have to leave now.

Mrs. Campbell: I too would like to deal in the first instance with the comments of the minister. Before I begin, I would like to

express my appreciation for the receipt of the briefing material. I could have wished that we had had it sooner, as the Morrow committee hoped would be the case, because it meant that getting it as we did at Friday noon, we had to work pretty long hours over the weekend to be ready for today. I hope in future it will be possible to have it in advance. But it has been useful and I should like you to understand our position.

One of the things that comes to the fore immediately in the statement is the fact that this ministry was established in 1972 and its responsibility is to ensure the co-ordination of policy across ministry boundaries. I suppose that is where we come to the grips with our perception of the role of this ministry. Frankly, we have not seen any great thrust in co-ordinating policies. I am not going to deal with the matter of mental retardation because I endorse what was said by the spokesman for the NDP and I don't want to belabour the situation.

One of the things that bothers me a little bit is indicated on page 4 of this statement in reference to the accomplishments. I could have wished that the accomplishments would not have been so much in the mechanical field. A telephone directory of government-approved facilities for troubled children and youths was not, in my view, a high priority for anyone, having in mind the very real problems of children.

The statement that the government did not proclaim the amendment to the Act with reference to section 8 because it was delayed to allow time for communities and the courts to adjust to the change and to allow time for the province to study the implications of the repeal of the programmes that would be affected by it, to me is a very significant statement. If, in fact, we took that kind of time to understand the implications, we certainly did not work very hard at it because what we produced as a result was one complete mess, particularly so far as the municipalities were concerned.

[4:45]

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in 1975 when this was proposed, I spoke on the matter and expressed my deep concern about the elimination of section 8 until such time as the implications had been carefully sorted out. It was not that I was opposed to ending the use of section 8. I don't think anyone in the House was opposed to that, but I had seen the government with its very fine statements about the skid row people in Toronto and how we were going to keep them out of the jails and we were going to provide detox centres and halfway houses.

We kept them out of the jails but we didn't put anything in its place. This was what I was afraid of at this time and I think my fear was amply justified by the way in which the whole matter was developed. The implications simply weren't either understood or studied; or if they were then I would have to conclude—and I don't wish to conclude—that there was a deliberate attempt to confuse the issues rather than facing them squarely and understanding what the role of the municipalities would be.

We still have children placed in boarding homes without any adequate supervision by the province and with no right of supervision in anybody else. When you realize that after all these years—because you have had these reports for years—you haven't come to grips with the fact that you will stuff children into places where there is no accountability on their going in, no progress report required and no report when they are released, it seems to me to be something which is material and ought to have been more material than bringing out a telephone directory.

No one has come to grips with it yet, and as you are very well aware the minister today, as late as today, cannot tell us how many unlicensed homes there are functioning, possibly under conditions which may be hazardous and may be dangerous to health. When one considers what we are talking about in implications, that to me would be a first priority.

We have talked for years about the need for preventive services for children, for families, for all sorts of people in our communities. We even had a committee set up under the Hon. Rene Brunelle, and of course we never got beyond a first meeting; and all of us who participated knew that we wouldn't get beyond a first meeting. That has never been looked at. We have never considered it significant or important, and if one reads the priorities report one realizes that the greatest victims of this lack of concern are the poor in our society. It makes one wonder.

We have heard of the fact that there is not adequate protection for the rights of children, for their natural civil rights. I would like to add to the indictment the case of a mother and a child who came within the scope of the Sudbury Children's Aid Society. It is a matter which is known to all of you. I think it had a great deal to do with the illness of one of our very fine members because he was so exercised about it.

Here was a case of a Children's Aid Society that decided of its own volition that the mother was an unfit mother, removed the baby from her and ensured that she would not be allowed to continue breast feeding—all before the matter ever came to the court. I think this is something that one should perhaps look at if one is concerned about implications and is concerned about the treatment of children.

I have said, and I continue to believe, that we are eventually going to have to have a bill of rights for children in this province so that we can highlight their very real difficulties and the fact that they are, on the whole, bereft of any kind of real backup support.

It is almost impossible for judges to really deal with many of these cases in a manner which permits a judge to have a sense of fulfilment of duty to a child because of the lack of real services. I have to say that Toronto, of course, has better facilities and more assistance for judges than any other part of the province, to my knowledge; and I may not be up to date on that knowledge.

One of the things I would like to point out to the provincial secretary is the fact that the work of the secretariat always seems to be closed, and we believe it should be open and available for public scrutiny. We recognize the fact that you have cabinet deliberations and interministerial deliberations, but what we see throughout the briefing material are references and allusions to all sorts of committees and reports, one of which has been given the sort of public attention it deserves.

Why do we have to wait for a Freedom of Information Act to release these? It is our intention to ask for each one as we proceed. If you would like to counter the annual attack on the secretariat that it is indeed a useless body, then we would hope that you will share this information with us and not merely allude to its existence. Our efforts to obtain some of the material from you which has been produced by the Council on Troubled Children and Youth, which we will discuss later, does not augur well, however.

It is clearly obvious that this policy secretariat has been busy in the area of services to disturbed children. Indeed, I was interested that one person advised me that a directive went forward to "get with it and get Margaret Campbell off your back." I hope that's true. I hope it has had that effect and that perhaps we are moving more in the matter of our concerns, but let me just go through our role and the context in which our own policy was developed, and may I say I was delighted to hear from His Honour Judge Thomson that he found our report and our recommendations useful. I trust the minister will look at them and see whether there is anything there that can be helpful in dealing with the problem.

As early as January 1976, the Liberal Party was asking some very pointed questions about the Browndale Ontario programme, which is fully financed by the Ministry of Health. We continued these questions and demands for information with the purpose of finding out just how accountable the ministry was prepared to be for one of the programmes it funds. To this day, we are still waiting for answers to the most basic of questions insofar as how Browndale spends its public moneys.

In addition, the OPP has been conducting an investigation into Browndale which has lasted for over one year and is still continuing. I am sure that the government had this investigation in the back of its mind when the reasons to reform children's services were tallied up. As early as May of last year we were calling upon the government to release the interministerial report. Only days before its eventual release we asked questions in the House regarding its supposed findings. During the secretariat's most recent estimates, Dr. Smith speculated quite accurately about its contents.

When it was released it was only natural that we should take an interest in it and try to publicize its contents. We are very surprised at the reaction, because we would have thought that all those concerned in the care of children would have been joining together to work through from the chaos to solutions, rather than being offended at the fact that a report which was deemed to be prepared for publication had, in fact, been brought to public attention.

As I think you know, Mr. Chairman, because we wanted to stress our concerns for children, because we did not want to be dealing with the matter in a partisan fashion, we understated its critical remarks as we expected we would not be believed if we included its most scathing sections. It is not the sort of report that the party in power should be proud of; and it is not the sort of report, which shows clearly no co-ordinated effort at all, that should be a matter of pride to the secretariat whose funcion is to co-ordinate policies.

As early as May of last year we were pressing the Ministry of Community and Social Services over the issue of unlicensed children's boarding homes, of which there are about 70 operating right now in this province. We wanted to know when the govern-

ment would bring in legislation, as promised, to license all such homes regardless of how many children they house. To listen to the former minister's answer one would assume that legislative reform is the furthest thing from the government's mind. We did learn, however, that a draft Act, entitled The Children's Residential Services Act, had been prepared which would have combined, according to our understanding, The Children's Institutions Act and The Children's Boarding Homes Act.

The minister later told us that he hoped to introduce it in the fall, last fall. That never happened. The government knew full well that this area was one which we had been working on for some months. It was then only a matter of time before we would be lending our voice to those calling upon the government to introduce reforms.

We also were pressuring the government to act on the matter of court-ordered group home costs which were assessed to local governments at 100 per cent. We urged you on several occasions to pick up these costs in recognition of the fact that while the local government is expected to pay, it has no right to question the services delivered. Also, the repeal of section 8 has increased this particular case-load, in addition to the CAS case-load. Only days before you agreed to pick up 50 per cent of these costs, retroactive to March of last year, we were again asking questions about this issue in the House.

[5:00]

All in all, our record stands for itself. It has been a matter of great interest to us exactly what went into the children's services policy. It was with eagerness that we awaited the compendium. It was disturbing to see the only product of the Council for Troubled Children and Youth which was mentioned in the bibliography, which was part of the compendium, was the directory of facilities. I have already addressed myself to that.

As the minister will recall, the first annual review of the council was dated July, 1976 but was not released until March 3, although it had been promised even sooner. At the printers was the excuse most commonly given, which is surprising considering the fact that it is typewritten and photocopied. It contains a section reporting on the council's activities for the last year. From the action taken, or proposed section, we were able to identify some 10 separate studies, survey results or reports. We asked for these in an order paper question, dated March 31. The answer, which does not release a single item, called into question the purpose of this council and the accuracy of its report. More important is the attitude of the minister toward sharing information.

The annual review states: "A proposal for ministerial research and development is in the final stages of preparation." Remember this would have been back in July. Yet we are told in the order paper answer no formal written report on research and development within each ministry exists; the council only held discussions and as a result a cabinet submission is being prepared. The report on the implications of the repeal of section 8 was a submission to the cabinet committee that is not available to us. I think we all could understand why.

The review of existing legislation, funding regulations and data from an extensive survey, this material is supposedly incorporated in the council directory and cabinet submissions. We would like to see a copy of the survey questionnaire, as we suspect that not all the information obtained has been made public in the directory. Why can't we have the results of that survey?

The memo on children's mental health services in northeastern Ontario was also refused as it has become part of a study of psychological services for all children. The study of school board programmes involving psychiatrists was refused. It is apparently a submission to a cabinet committee.

So our efforts to find out exactly what this council has done have failed. So much for freedom of information, when not even the results of a survey are available despite the annual review very clearly stating that statistical tables from the survey have been prepared for analysis. If this government is committed to reforming children's services, it would open the work of this council to public view. Why should it have closed meetings and classified reports when your other advisory committees are open, for example status of women, seniors and so on.

So much for the matter of youth services. I do endorse what has been said with reference to the youth committees or whatever they are. I think municipalities are going to have to know in very precise terms what we are talking about, because they have been conned a lot of times and are in no position to expend money until they know their implications. Believe me, municipalities do have a way of understanding the implications of all sorts of proposals. They have to in order to survive.

I would hope that we would have this type of information, and if the municipalities have it I would trust that we might be

accorded the same courtesy. If they don't, then I believe we will have serious difficulties in believing the validity of the proposal in its most casual and abbreviated form.

I would like to say a word or two on the matter of the care of the elderly. I really think this is one of the areas where the slot-machine mentality shows very clearly. I'm sorry that I didn't bring with me—but I'm prepared to file copies if you would like to see it—some correspondence which I had with the Minister of Health.

It was brought to my attention that there was an elderly lady living alone. Her daughter was a missionary nurse and gave up her work to be home with her mother. She did have a need of some kind of relief because it was full duty, and people, caring as they may be, can't function 24 hours a day, 365 days in a year.

The answer, which came from a doctor in the ministry, was that there was nothing they could do. Obviously the mother was eligible for nursing home and the recommendation basically was: Let her be slotted in there and then we could sort of wash our hands of her and get on with other things. This has been an attitude throughout in the concerns of care for older people.

I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is very much aware, because of her work in Scarborough, that one of the very serious things for old people is when they have to leave familiar surroundings. Women particularly, and I've said it before, don't learn during a lifetime as a rule to develop the kind of locker-room quality that maybe gentlemen do, and they do not like to be stuck in a room, one of four people, with nothing of their own around them and with no privacy at all. They are not able to survive without that sort of assistance, because nothing else is in place.

I want to tell you in all honesty, in my riding, day after day, as I speak with my older people, they are very happy, for example, in Ontario Housing, very happy; but they say, "I'm afraid. I'm well. I can look after myself. But supposing I fall and break a hip? There wouldn't be anybody to find me." Or as one person said, "I might die and smell up the place before somebody knew I was dead." This is one of the reasons for seeking institutionalization—fear.

There's no need for anything more than the kind of buddy system that is now difficult to set up, but just to have some of these services. What do you do? You go and provide mobile library service, not particularly for the sake of the books but because it's someone calling. It's the loneliness of these people that is driving them into institutions, and not any special highly-skilled nursing care.

Yet when you go to the Minister of Health he does point out the add-on costs of this kind of a programme. We never suggested they should be add-on costs. We suggested that we should be developing these kinds of services not as add-on but as alternatives, and yet it has taken all these years to try to bring anyone to conclude that this is perhaps a good road to go.

If that programme is worked out so that the municipalities understand it, maybe we will create 700 jobs this summer. We work out, on the basis that because it starts late, the $2.6 million will spread to 700 jobs; and again this is our approach to meeting a need. The young need the jobs, no question about it. It's a lack of style in trying to come to grips with this problem that bothers me.

You and various ministers have pointed with pride to Meals on Wheels. Meals on Wheels is a good programme, partly voluntary, partly funded; but in the summertime my elderly people are just as accustomed to eating as they are in the wintertime. Three-days-a-week delivery of Meals on Wheels is totally inadequate, and to see an old lady, as I have seen, carefully taking her food and meticulously dividing it in two so it will stretch for two days—it's horrible, horrible. I suppose it's expensive, but if you put these people into a home for the aged or a nursing home isn't it going to be more expensive?

As for homemakers' services, there should be one homemakers' service—it should be after-care, and it should go on because, again, to have a homemaker in a home is not as expensive as putting people into these places.

Thus far I've talked really about financial expense, because—and I say this very sadly—I believe that the government gets very anxious to save money when it comes to the poor and the elderly. They are anxious to see that we don't give extended care for any length of time, because it costs. The social consequences of this are so severe, and I know the minister knows this. I'm worried about the fact that we seem to have accepted the principle of care as a kind of make-work programme for youth rather than as a programme to which we are committed, philosophically and on a long-term basis. I want to make it clear that at no time have I ever said that we did not need homes for the aged or nursing homes—of course we do—but when your own report states that 30 to 40 per cent of those in nursing homes don't need to be there, and when you know

that at least in Toronto, and I don't know about other parts, the practice has built up that people get their doctors to admit them into active treatment hospitals in order to get into a nursing home, the waste in that kind of operation is dreadful. Yet it is becoming very difficult to get a direct admission.

[5:15]

Perhaps one of the things that you might be looking at in the provision of care of these kinds is the nursing homes themselves, because perhaps their staff might be able to give some assistance and direction to needs in their own immediate community. I believe that the nursing homes, sadly, will continue to be filled. Another thing this kind of operation would do would be to at least look at a measured standard of care for our senior citizens in nursing homes, or others in nursing homes.

As you know, in the west they have graded services and payment in accordance with the various categories. Here we are expecting, in a lot of cases, the nursing homes to take on pretty sophisticated nursing care on a per diem that just isn't possible. I wonder what we think is going to happen to those people, or are we satisfied that if they are in this kind of care we have taken care of them and we no longer need to look at the food or the care or anything else?

I think if the nursing homes were dealing with people with a certain standard of care requirement then we would be able to see that they could manage the treatment and the care. As it is now, they are handling people some of whom don't need nursing care, some of whom need some nursing care, some of whom need sophisticated care, and they are all in the same place. I would think that could make for a better kind of distinction and operation in the nursing home.

Most of them, in my experience, in my riding at least, are pretty aware of the general scene around them, and I think could be very useful and very helpful in co-ordinating with the ministry, or with Metropolitan Toronto, or whatever, in the setting up of these services. They should perhaps be consulted. I too have questions, pages of them, but I will leave them for now and raise them as we go through the votes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I hardly know just where to begin. I thank those members who have had opening remarks to make. I do agree with many of your concerns. I think all parties share many of the expressed concerns that you have put forward. I too believe that over the past number of years we have allowed too much in the way of institutionalization of all kinds of people with all kinds of problems. Unfortunately, they were built up in isolation from one another and it isn't easy to turn that situation around and try to direct the care of people who do need specialized care back into communities and back into families, where I very strongly believe the responsibility should be placed—primarily with the family and then with the community. But in saying that, I also agree there have to be community resources to reinforce the families who do have problems with children or with older people.

I think perhaps I'll deal first with the comments regarding residential services for seniors. We recognize there are a lot of inequities in the provision of services for seniors, whether it be homes for the aged, nursing homes, extended care or some of the voluntary programmes that exist in communities. We are very concerned at the growing numbers of facilities that have sprung up to meet the supposed needs of senior citizens. We too would like to turn that around and are, in fact, developing services so that families and older people will have the alternative of staying in their own homes with services being provided for the community.

I would just like to comment to Mrs. Campbell, who spoke about one of our youth programmes that has just recently been announced, that I think she's under the misapprehension that it is a summer programme. It is not. It was never intended to be a summer programme.

Mrs. Campbell: Perhaps you would tell Mr. Norton.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That is intended to be a year-around programme. It is intended to elicit from young people and others the desirability of people to become involved in providing home nursing and homemaking services. As you know, it isn't easy to find people who want to become involved in that kind of a service. We thought it would be an excellent opportunity to have a programme with a pilot project to find out across this province how many people there are who would like to become involved in this kind of service. And so this is one of the first programmes. I notice you're smiling quizzically, but it was always the intent that this would be an ongoing programme.

Mrs. Campbell: I am delighted; but that wasn't the way it came out.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That is what it is to be. Primarily, it was to find out if there is that desire out there on the part of many people to become involved in providing this kind of home service. We're looking forward to a good response to that programme. Again, as you know, it is being administered through local governments and local social services within local governments. We are waiting in anticipation to see just what the reaction will be to that programme. We hope it will be good. Nothing would please us more than to be able to establish services to keep elderly people in their own homes, recognizing, as you have, that there will always be a need for homes for the aged and for nursing homes. That is the area of that particular programme.

Ms. Sandeman: May I ask the minister a question on that specific point? Were you going to move on to your next point? Can I ask you a question?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I was going to talk more about residential services for seniors.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Maybe we should let the minister finish that area of comment. Then if it's still not very clear to you, I'm sure the minister would respond to your question. I think she's still in the process of developing the point she started.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The whole area of residential services for seniors is again a very complex one. There are a lot of inequities in the system that have to be addressed. We have had a great deal of work done in this area. At the moment, we're considering the possibility of a green paper. I would like your reaction to that approach. It's an area about which people can become very concerned. There are those who are of the opinion we should continue to provide more and more in the way of homes for the aged, more nursing home beds and more of this type of facility, whereas we would like, as I say, to go in the direction of provision of more home services. The possibility of a green paper on residential services for seniors is under consideration at the moment. Did you have a question in relation to that?

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, I did. I'd like more clarification on this youth programme for working with the seniors. Am I to understand you to say that the jobs immediately to be provided will be jobs in some kind of survey to find out if the young people would like to work with the seniors, or did I misunderstand you?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I'm sorry, you misunderstood. We want to see how many young people would be interested in that kind of ongoing employment, in the provision of services for senior citizens.

Ms. Sandeman: So you are going to have a survey to see how many young people are interested?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That will be the result of how many young people apply for those position that will be available.

Ms. Sandeman: I see. Has it occurred to you, if you're talking about home services—some of them nursing services—that we have a large pool of unemployed nurses who would like to do this work, are already qualified to do the work and are hoping to have employment opportunities open up for their skills, which we've spent a lot of taxpayers' money training them to have and in which they have invested a lot of time? They would expect surely to be the first to have those jobs. I understand as well as any the need for young people to be employed, but are we to leave unemployed those already skilled unemployed women?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: There are many young nurses who are unemployed, and I would hope that many of them would apply for these kinds of positions. It's not just home nursing. It's home maintenance, it's light housekeeping, it's all kinds of services that could be developed within a local community that could certainly be handled by young people. As I say, I am not just thinking of young teenagers. Perhaps many of those in their early twenties would like to become involved in this kind of service. Certainly that leaves it open to many nurses who have not been able to find employment.

Ms. Sandeman: As the jobs open up this summer, are they to be administered by local authorities?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, they are.

Ms. Sandeman: Has it been discussed with the local authorities?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, it has.

Ms. Sandeman: The director of social and family services in my area and the chairman of the social services committee on city council feel that many programmes are being announced which municipalities are to be responsible for, but the discussion is after the fact and not before the fact. Their human resources are strained—they under-

stand and they hope there will be financial resources—but their human resources are strained to the breaking point already and they get a little discouraged when time after time announcements are made and they find they have to be the fall guys.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't understand why they would be the fall guys. These are programmes that are available to reinforce some of the programmes that are ongoing in the community. It's up to the local government, if they are interested in providing additional resources within their community. We're picking up the salaries of those people who are involved. It remains for the local government to make the decision on whether or not they want to participate in this programme. It isn't something that's being forced on them.

Ms. Sandeman: Have the programmes been discussed with them before these announcements were made?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I wouldn't think so.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Given the time, I think it would be wiser if the minister had the opportunity to complete her response to the two opening statements.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, I'm sorry.

Mr. Acting Chairman: You'll have an opportunity to pick that one up. It's getting to be rather lengthy. Just before the minister does, Mrs. Campbell had one question to tie off, and then that's it.

Mrs. Campbell: I was just following this along. As I understand it, am I correct in assuming that you're paying a salary at the rate of $20 a day?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's right.

Mrs. Campbell: I wondered if the nurses fitted into this in view of the fact that the Victorian Order of Nurses in Toronto, as I understand it, is charging at the rate of $13 per half-hour. Isn't there some kind of discrepancy in the services that nursing would give at $20 a day?

[5:30]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I pointed out, it is an employment programme. It is intended to provide services and to find out for our own edification if there is an interest by people in providing a homemaking, home-helping service. Certainly we are not suggesting that if a nurse comes along she is going to be paid above the regular salaries that we are prepared to pay for this service until we have had an opportunity to evaluate it. I don't know. That would be something the local government itself would have to make some decision about.

Mrs. Campbell: You mean they might subsidize it more?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: They might want to subsidize it, but that again is not part of our priority.

Mr. Haggerty: What are the hours involved per day, or by the week?

Mr. Acting Chairman: This will be the last question.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would assume that again is something that's worked out with local governments. That would not be our programme to work out. It's something that we have arranged and are promoting to help young people as well as help—

Mr. Haggerty: Surely, Madam Minister, if you set the salary at $20 per day you must also set the hours of work per week?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again, I think it would have to meet the needs of local communities. We are always being criticized that we are imposing programmes and—

Mr. Haggerty: It won't be below the minimum wage though.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Excuse me, Madam Minister; I think we are getting away off the topic of the response. Would you please continue there and these questions can all be brought back.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: All right, fine.

Mr. Acting Chairman: It's an important topic but there will be an opportunity to come back.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I just would like to remind everyone too that the forecast for The Homemakers and Nurses Services Act expenditures of the Ministry of Community and Social Services for the year 1976-77 is $5 million, and for the year 1977-78 we have budgeted for $7,763,000, an increase of $2,763,000. So I don't think we could be accused of not caring and not trying to turn the direction from institutional care. We are, in fact, attempting, through the homemakers and the nurses services, to increase this provision to the many people who would like to avail themselves of it.

Another point that Mrs. Campbell raised was the fact that there is a stated period of time when someone is available to avail themselves of the homemaking services. In fact, we do have a pilot project where we are providing homemaking services for chronic care patients and we hope, from monitoring that programme, to determine just what a policy would be in that general area. It is very difficult to just put a policy on across the province without really studying it very carefully and very cautiously, and making sure that we are aware of all of the ramifications from such a policy, so that it is all being done in that area.

Mrs. Campbell: Could I ask where the pilot project is?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that's in Kingston.

Mrs. Campbell: Toronto has such needs and it is always someplace else that has the project.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Let me get back to the question of the residential services for children. I appreciate that all people within the Legislature have the same concerns that we have, but I just hope that you will appreciate the difficulties in bringing about major reform, such as we have done with the consolidation of children's services under the one ministry.

It hasn't been an easy task. There are nine pieces of legislation, five ministries, something like 3,000 civil servants, and 110,000 children involved. It is not an easy task, just overnight, to consolidate those services and expect, under some magic wand, to have everything just fall into place. It is going to take time and it is going to take a great deal of understanding, a great deal of co-operation and a great deal of effort on the part of everyone involved.

We have never suggested that it is going to be an easy task. In fact, we have suggested and we have stated very clearly, over and over again, that it's something where we really have to have the support of everyone and the understanding of everyone of what we are attempting to do, and hopefully without the criticism which is so easy to give.

When you are trying to do the very best that you can and you are trying to go in the direction that you think the provision of services to children in this province should go, it isn't always easy to listen to the criticism, unless it's constructive. We are certainly open to any kind of criticism that will pass our way, as long as it's constructive.

Again I reiterate, I know of your concerns, I know the concerns of the opposition parties, and I would just say to you that all of the problems certainly have not been resolved and it's going to take some time.

You asked about the details of some of the programmes, and I would just say to you that the rationalization of all of the ministries and the Act at the provincial level is a tremendous undertaking in itself. There's no way that we can go out into the communities across this province and start suggesting what they should be doing until we get our own house in order, and that's what we're attempting to do at the moment—rationalize all those Acts, get them in one omnibus Act, which is going to take time.

Being a lawyer, Mrs. Campbell, you are well aware of those facts. You are well aware of the magnitude of bringing that all under one omnibus bill. It's going to take a lot of time and a lot of effort to make sure that it's done properly.

I'm very pleased that we have been able to establish a separate division within the Ministry of Community and Social Services. I'm very pleased that it has a person like Judge George Thomson. I've watched him in his court and I've seen the kind of things he does. I like his philosophy. He was a personal choice. I just feel it's in the hands of the right people.

Mrs. Campbell: He is excellent.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It is just going to take time. I'm also very pleased with the direct reporting relationship, where Judge Thomson reports directly to the minister. It's a separate division of that ministry and will be responsible directly to the ministry. We're getting some very excellent people; Dr. Clive Chamberlain has just joined the staff, and those of you who are aware of children and children's rights will appreciate a person of his stature.

Mrs. Campbell: He belongs to the courts though.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that we need him in this area until we can get the programme going in the right way. We're gathering a nucleus of people who share our concerns, people who have had experience in the provision of services for children, such as Dr. Naomi Rae-Grant. I don't think anyone could ever question her dedication.

We have a nucleus of people who are committed to turning it around and making sure that the provision of services to children in this province is really in a much better state than it has been in the past. As I say, it is

going to take time, but I strongly believe that the rationalization at our level has to be done before we can ever go out to the communities and impose on them what we think should happen there.

I guess you were not at the PMLC meeting; Mr. McClellan was. We certainly have had a good response from local governments. They are most anxious to co-operate, they are most anxious to become involved, and I think Mr. McClellan will admit that publicly they stated they were very pleased with the direction in which we were going. They were most anxious to co-operate and become involved. We will be meeting with them. Again, we have not imposed on them what we think. We know what we think it needs, but we would like to consult with them. There are different kinds of governments out there. They have different ways of handling social services.

Mrs. Campbell: They have different needs too.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: They have different needs, and for us to impose upon everyone across this province the same kind of policy, I just don't think would be appropriate.

Mr. McClellan spoke about the concern of meeting with the vested interests and sort of falling into the trap of accepting what they suggested. I would just say to Mr. McClellan that I've been involved for a number of years, almost 20 now, with many of those vested interest groups and I don't think I'm easily manipulated. I think we will be very cautious about some of these comments and some of these suggestions they may be putting forward.

As a matter of fact, I've met with many of the groups prior to this announcement, and again I must add that we're aware of their vested interests, but there are many people across this province who are providing services for children who are very caring, who are very dedicated and committed people. I think they should be consulted; I think they should have an opportunity to offer suggestions on what they believe the right approach to be. So I see it as a tremendous consultative process we have to go through. I think we have to get our own house in order and then get out there with the people who are at the community level delivering the services, the ones who are responsible for seeing that children do receive the kind of care that they require, consulting with them as to the best manner in which it can be done.

Of course there will be resources made available to them. We recognize for a fact that there are many areas of this province where they're lacking in resources. We feel very strongly that children should be looked after in their own community as far as possible, and only under very unusual circumstances should they be sent far away from their families.

As a matter of fact, my own personal philosophy is that there has been too much intervention into the families across this province. I think we can turn that around and again provide the support services for families instead of taking children away and having someone decide they're going to be better off in some institution or some group home or in some other facility. I'm really delighted, because more and more I'm getting information and reports coming back from people outside government, that they, too, agree with me, that radical non-intervention should be the approach we're taking, supporting the families wherever possible.

So I think that we agree in most instances. I get the feeling that you do agree we're on the right track. Perhaps we're not moving as quickly as you think we might, but I hope I can have your understanding that it is not easy.

Mrs. Campbell: I don't think anybody thought it was. But one of the things that is bothering me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that as I understand it, we are waiting for the preliminary bill to be introduced into the House to bring all of these services within one ministry, and that has not been done. That is not a complex bill. It would be the omnibus bill which has to follow that that is a complex matter; although you must realize that we were advised a year ago that they were working on some such bill.

Now I have referred to this—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That was just for the two Acts.

Mrs. Campbell: But at least they must have done something about that, surely, that's a start.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would think so; and I think the minister did indicate he hoped to get it in this session.

Mrs. Campbell: Well this is my problem. It seems to me if you really want to proceed, if you're serious, that at least the preliminary bill should be in before this House adjourns.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think there's any question about our seriousness. I think we have made a commitment that this is going to be, this is what is going to happen. It's just a question of getting that bill into the House. As the minister has indicated, by July 1 we hope to have gone far down the road into—

Mrs. Campbell: You can't go down the road until you have that bill, that's what's bothering me at the moment.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We're most anxious to see that it is introduced as well. I don't know if I could go on and answer all of your specific inquiries. I think I get an understanding of some of the areas where you have concerns. I've taken notes. They certainly will be considered, because I think this is an area where the more people who get involved with suggestions and comments about the direction we should be going, how we should be handling it—we welcome that.

Rather than try to answer all of your concerns, I think I would just say to you that I have taken note of many of the comments you've made.

[5.45]

I am very concerned, for example, about the three case histories you spoke about. I am personally aware of them. Like you, I have read all the documentation too and I feel heartsick that in this day and age in the province of Ontario any child is subjected to that kind of treatment in the name of protection. I'm very concerned about that.

One of my comments to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) when I came back after travelling around the province was that I was concerned about children's rights in the courts. As a result of that concern, he himself established a committee of outside people who are studying children's rights. Like you, I have been talking for a long time about adult rights for children. When one considers that a child who has committed no criminal offence can end up spending more time in our correctional system than someone who has robbed a bank or committed a murder, I think that has to be a dreadful state of affairs as far as the provision of services for children is concerned. I know we all share these concerns and that we all want to see this succeed. It will only succeed if everyone pulls together. Criticize yes, but make it constructive and make it always in the interests of the children of this province.

Mrs. Campbell: They are worse off than being parcelled out with the furniture in divorce actions.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's another concern of mine.

Mr. Acting Chairman: I was just going to suggest, given the time element, is it the wish of the committee to proceed with the votes; or do you have any last-minute questions to tie in with your original remarks, Mr. McClellan?

Mr. McClellan: I have a whole series of questions I want to pursue with respect to the April 4 policy. I really would like to come out of these estimates with a clearer sense of what it is that's being proposed. I still don't know and I'm not going to accept, without an awful lot of badgering and hectoring, the minister's reluctance to share the details.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Not if the construction is right.

Mr. McClellan: It will be very constructive. What can be more constructive than your laying out clearly before the Legislature and the people of Ontario what it is you're proposing to do. Surely that's a natural course of events.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I thought, Mr. McClellan, that I had indicated we preferred to take the consultative approach.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, right.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We don't feel we're experts. We don't feel we have all the answers at Queen's Park. We feel there are a lot of people across this province, people who have been involved in the provision of services for many years, who know the children's needs much better than we do. And there are local governments to be involved; there will be cost-sharing arrangements. That all has to be discussed with local governments. So we are just not prepared to say this is the way it shall be.

Mr. McClellan: Granted, you may not want to lay out a complete master plan or a blueprint. Nevertheless, I have a whole series of questions I'd like to put.

Mr. Acting Chairman: If we are going to go to direct questions then, I would repeat my original suggestion to you. Do you wish

to begin now or do you wish to adjourn this meeting until tomorrow? We should go directly to the votes then.

Mr. Villeneuve: I vote to adjourn.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Is that okay with you? Is there any member of the committee who disagrees with that?

Mr. McClellan: That's fine with me.

Some hon. members: No.

The committee adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 25, 1977

Social Development Policy programme S-3

Opening statements: Mrs. Birch, Mr. McClellan, Mrs. Campbell S-3

Adjournment S-24

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M.; Chairman (London North PC)
Sweeney, J.; Acting Chairman (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)



No. S-2

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Social Development Committee

Estimates, Social Development Policy

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament

Tuesday, April 26, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

SUPPLY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1977

The committee met at 3:40 p.m.

ESTIMATES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I see a quorum. May we get started? The minister would like to make a few comments as a result of the closing part of yesterday's meeting, if you wouldn't mind.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Very briefly. Mr. Chairman, the Liberal critic has indicated her intention to ask that surveys, reports and studies be made public in each instance that the parties suspect such documents exist. I would like to deal briefly with that issue now, if you don't mind, Mrs. Campbell, rather than repeat myself each time the question is raised.

Although the policy field structure has been functioning in this province for five years, there still seems to be some confusion in the minds of the opposition parties as to the nature of the operation. As I tried to point out yesterday, policy secretaries are not super-ministers. The bulk of our work involves problem-solving through co-operative efforts of ministers and their staff.

I need hardly speak to legislators about the parliamentary system and the need for cabinet solidarity, which is the key to the British parliamentary system that we have adopted in this province. Of course, it would be politically useful to the opposition parties to gain access to information, policy options and sometimes diverging opinions which lead up to the formation of government policy. However, even the most recent private member's bill on freedom of information, put forth by a member of the official opposition, would exempt from the list of public documents those documents relating to policy decisions under consideration but not yet final.

Much of our work detailed in the briefing books that we have supplied to the opposition party critics would fall within that limitation. The vast majority of our efforts, with the exception of the work done by the four very fine advisory councils, are by their very nature interministerial and internal. One can imagine the reaction if the government were to demand access to all documents in the possession of the opposition parties and all supporting evidence for their parties' positions. Of course, we are not going to do that.

Mrs. Campbell: Nobody suggested that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to involve this committee in a debate on the issues of freedom of information. As you are all aware, a royal commission has been appointed to deal with that very complex subject. However, I do not intend to prejudice these deliberations by setting precedents, by releasing documents, simply because we have gone the step of providing more detailed briefing notes than ever before presented. I hope this new procedure, adopted in agreement by all parties, will prove beneficial to our discussions. These new rules were fashioned in the spirit of co-operation, and I sincerely hope that spirit will extend to our debate, but I thought we should make our position clear as to the release of all the material that was made reference to yesterday.

[3:45]

Mr. McClellan: I would like to enter into a series of questions and answers with the minister, mostly in the form of a conversation, in the hope of coming to a clearer understanding of some government programmes and by way of raising some of our concerns.

Just for the benefit of the Chair and the other members of the committee, I thought I would probably take about an hour, and that will probably use up the majority of the time that I wanted to spend on the first vote. I think we're pretty equally balanced at this point between the second and third parties with respect to the sharing of time and it's my intention to make sure that we share that time equally and equitably. I think that would be acceptable.

Mr. Chairman: What do you mean by "the first vote"—an item?

Mr. McClellan: Yes, on the social development policy, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Campbell: It's the first vote.

Mr. McClellan: Let me start off by asking—

Mr. Kerrio: Excuse me, is it reasonable to think that with that kind of allocation for the three groups we can get through this whole thing?

Mr. Chairman: Have you done a time study on this?

Mr. Kerrio: I am agreed. I think we should do a little allocation, but in a way that we are going to be able to go through the various votes.

Mr. McClellan: I don't foresee difficulties. We have a total of 12 hours, we've used two and a half. We have another two and a half today, we have the whole afternoon tomorrow and part of Monday, and possibly Tuesday. There's quite a bit of time available.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, under these rules, unfortunately the leadoff speaker for the Liberals will be engaged in private bills tomorrow afternoon, and that makes a problem, because I, too, particularly as a result of the statement which has just been made, wish to address this committee.

Mr. McClellan: Well, that leaves you from 4:45 until 6.

Mr. Chairman: Until 5:45.

Mrs. Campbell: Fine.

On vote 2601: Item 1:

Mr. McClellan: I wanted to open up with the question of the local children's services committees. I understand that they will be related to regional government in some way and I would like to know how. What is it you are talking about when you say that the local children's services committee will be located within the municipal government realm? Let me make some suggestions and you can tell me which ones are right and which ones are wrong. Are you talking about a special purpose body, or are you talking about existing social services committees? What exactly are you talking about?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We are talking about many possibilities that we would like to have the opportunity to discuss with local governments. We are suggesting that it should be a consultative approach, and there are many kinds of reporting relationships that could be developed, but we don't want to be in a position of making that predetermination without the opportunity to speak to local governments.

I think you were in attendance when we made a statement to the PMLC that we would be meeting with the chairmen of local governments as quickly as possible, as well as with other levels of government.

Mr. McClellan: Would this mean that there could be a variation from regional municipality to regional municipality? For example, in Toronto it could be X and in Hamilton it could be Y, and in Ottawa it could be Z.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It might very well take that direction.

Mr. McClellan: You are that open to—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We are wide open to consultation. As you know, in Peel, I think that day at the PMLC, the suggestion was made that perhaps their social service committee, already in existence, would be the appropriate body to assume this responsibility. Certainly there was no discussion in that area, other than the suggestion that this was a possibility.

These are the kinds of things that we would like to have an opportunity to explore with the various levels of government.

Mr. McClellan: When you're talking about areas without a regional government structure, are you open to something like a community resource board? Let me back up and ask another question with respect to the role of the local children's services committees. I understand from your various statements that they will have at least two roles. One will be with respect to the intake placement and assessment of children within the region they have responsibility for. Is that correct?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: They would not have the role of providing the services themselves. They would have to contract for placement services and assessment services.

Mr. McClellan: Given in a particular community that a particular child has a particular problem and is in need of treatment what will the role of the local children's services committee be with respect to that inidividual child? Will they determine which of all the possibilities open to placement is the most appropriate?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That would be the role of that committee yes. They would determine the appropriate placement for the child.

Mr. McClellan: They will have funds to purchase service directly or through contract?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's right.

Mr. McClellan: I understand. Will they have additional responsibility with respect to planning for the overall human services needs, at least as they relate to kids and families? Will they have a responsibility for developing a human services plan to meet needs, to fill gaps, to identify gaps in future needs and that kind of thing?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would certainly foresee that that would be a role they would take because it would be necessary. As you obviously are familiar with many of the programmes throughout the province, you know there are gaps in services in many areas. One would assume that this committee would be in a position to point out those gaps and to bring them to the attention of the ministry. There will be additional resources available for some of those areas.

Mr. McClellan: Here's where it breaks down in my mind, though it may not in yours. They will be making recommendations to the ministry for additional funding. Whom is the funding for? Is it funding for themselves to purchase or to develop additional services to meet unmet needs?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would see their requesting funding through the local government, perhaps for a group home that might be needed in that area, or perhaps assessment services that are not available to them. Those are various kinds of resources that children with problems might require and which might not be available to them.

Mr. McClellan: Do I understand that all funds, all financial resources for a given region for the purchase of treatment services will be funnelled through the local children's services committee?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That again is something that we really want to have an opportunity to discuss with local governments. At the same time we will be discussing the funding with them of course. Although we have indicated there will be no major shift in financial responsibilities, there still has to be discussion about the cost-sharing arrangements.

Mr. McClellan: Leaving aside the question of cost-sharing, if I understood what you just said with respect to an individual child in need and the role of the local children's services committee in establishing the appropriate placement and paying for that placement, I take it from those remarks that all children within a given region would have their treatment need assigned by the local children's services committee, which would have the resources then to purchase the services to meet those needs.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's ideally what we'd like to see happen.

Mr. McClellan: Let me be specific then and blunt. What happens then to the budget of, for example, the Children's Aid Societies? How are their fund allocations going to be tied into the work of the local children's services committees? Obviously if what you've said is going to happen, you can't also have a series of other independent child service agencies making their own independent placement and treatment decisions and independently spending treatment dollars. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's correct. And, of course, again, we recognize the fact that there will possibly be changes in the role of the Children's Aid Society. It may assume another quite different role. It would just have the authority for adoptions and children in need of protection—these areas. But it might assume a different role than it has at the moment.

Mr. McClellan: Well, how are you going to determine what its new role will be? I mean, this is as revolutionary a prospect as the original establishment of the Children's Aid Societies and what I want to know and what I think a lot of people want to know is what process have you established to assess the current role of the Children's Aid Societies and come to a determination about what their new role will be?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again, and I don't like to keep repeating myself, we think that that is part of the whole consultative approach that we're taking. In many areas they might not have the advantage of a Children's Aid Society or some of the other resources. We would like to take that all into consideration, again, meeting the needs of a particular community before establishing the role of any particular agency. At this point—

Mr. McClellan: Surely there isn't any area in the province that isn't covered by a Children's Aid Society?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Well, I guess not really. No. But they do have different functions in different areas, depending on the resources of the particular community.

Mr. McClellan: The legislation that will be brought in to establish the local children's services committees then will have to take into account the current legislative responsibilities of the Children's Aid Societies. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course, that would be anticipated in an omnibus bill, yes.

Mr. McClellan: But what I'm suggesting is that in view of the role you're defining for the local children's services committees in relation to the Children's Aid Societies, you can't establish the local children's services committees until you've brought in the omnibus bill, that is to say, you can't bring it in incrementally.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's right, and I don't think that we've indicated that this is all going to happen overnight.

Mr. McClellan: It sure throws out of kilter the timetable that the minister has been expressing, since he's said that he hopes to have the local children's services committees in place by early 1978. He's made a very clear commitment with respect to that. But on the other hand, he's said that the omnibus children's legislation will not be available for many years.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Well, I hope it's not going to be that long.

Mr. McClellan: But surely—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Undoubtedly it will take some time. Yes.

Mr. McClellan: But you don't expect to have the omnibus children's legislation before the Legislature by the end of this year surely?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh, no. It wouldn't be that—

Mr. McClellan: Then why do you say that you can set up the local children's services committees by the end of this year?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: They could be set up, in consultation, in certain areas where they're prepared to go. I don't think that the minister indicated that every community across this province would have a children's services committee in place by that time. There are communities where, because of the structure, they might be prepared to go much sooner than other areas.

Mr. McClellan: But if you are talking about such a fundamental revision of the role of the Children's Aid Societies, which is a role sanctioned by legislation, I don't see how you can set up any local children's services committee until you've brought in legislation, even if it's with respect to a particular community, dealing with a redefined set of child welfare responsibilities. Is that not true?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course they do have very well-defined responsibilities within the Children's Aid Societies. We're all aware of that. But again, as I'm pointing out to you, the role of the Children's Aid Society has not been clearly defined—it's again something about which we want to consult with them and with the community involved.

Mr. McClellan: How do you propose to vest wardship responsibilities with the local children's services committee?

[4:00]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again, we have considered that—whether or not in fact wardships might be vested with the children's committees. But, again, it remains part of the whole series of discussions with the various groups around the province.

Mr. McClellan: But is it not true that unless you change the child welfare legislation, you would have wardship vested both with Children's Aid Societies and with the local children's services committee at one and the same time and in the same community?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, although there is a division of wardships and, of course, with the wardships under Correctional Services—with corrections coming into the new children's services—we would be assuming that role, which would in turn be part of the responsibility of the children's services committee.

Mr. McClellan: You have introduced what I was going to introduce, which is the third possible set of wardship responsibilities. Now, we will have wardship responsibilities under The Child Welfare Act, under the Ministry of Correctional Services and now under the local children's services committee simultaneously. Is that true?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You mention a very obvious problem that we are faced with, yes.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, it's an obvious problem but you are the one who said that you were going to set up these committees in early 1978. I didn't say that, you said that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I said we were going to begin to set up the committees.

Mr. McClellan: Oh, no.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think we have at any time suggested that we were going to wave a wand and the committees were all going to fall into place across the province.

Mr. McClellan: With respect, the minister said exactly the equivalent to that when he said that the committees would be functioning by early 1978. I want to know—well, I guess we obviously do know—I would like a realistic timetable for implementation.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that's an impossible question to answer. Obviously, with the complexities that you yourself have just addressed, it's impossible to put a time frame on it. It's something that we see a need for and a desire for but there is a tremendous consultative programme—

Mr. McClellan: I understand that. Then why did you put a time frame on it? Why didn't you just say that in the first place?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I assumed, hopefully, that we would have this all in place but, certainly, nothing as definite as to say that they would all be in place by 1978.

Mr. McClellan: Well, I don't have the documents readily at my fingertips but before the estimates are over, I will produce the—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I am sure that someone here has it—

Mr. McClellan: —the minister's statements to the effect that they would be in place in early 1978. I don't want to badger you on the point. I don't want to do that at all; that is not my intention. My intention was to come to an understanding of when we can expect to see the implementation of your reforms. That is all we are asking and we would like an honest and realistic statement of the implementation timetable. That is all we are asking.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It would have been quite simple, as I am sure you are aware, for the government to have imposed—

Mr. McClellan: It has nothing to do with—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Then it would have been quite easy to have gone about and done what governments so often do, make the decisions on behalf of local government. We decided to go the other route—

Mr. McClellan: Yes, I understand that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —and to involve them in the decision-making.

Mr. McClellan: Absolutely. I understand this utterly and clearly.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: One is not prepared to say that it will be done within such and such a time frame.

Mr. McClellan: All right, then. I suggest that you stop using, openly and publicly for public relations purposes, timetables which are patently unrealistic, as you are doing now. I appreciate and acknowledge the complexities of the process that we are all involved in. Let us try to come to an understanding of how long the development phase is in realistic terms, and when we can look forward to an implementation period that makes sense, not one that is obviously done for purposes of increased public relations benefits.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think public relations is a terribly important part of this whole programme because so much depends on the response and the co-operation that we are going to receive from governments and agencies across this province. It's just been brought to my attention that Mr. Norton indicated at the PMLC meeting that he would give a timetable by July 1, and that he also indicated that he'd withdrawn the January 1, 1978, date as the date that would be—

Mr. McClellan: He's withdrawn that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Mr. McClellan: That was just impulsive I suppose?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Or an attempt to get the programme under way.

Mr. McClellan: All right, let me ask another knotty question, spelled with a k. How does the local children's services committee relate to the juvenile and family court? At present the court has the ultimate authority with respect to protecting the rights of kids and with respect to directing kids into treatment. I understand from what you're suggesting that the local children's services committee will in some way supersede the decisions of the court, is that correct?

Hon. Mrs: Birch: No, not in that particular context. What we have suggested is that the family court judge would establish the finding and the local children's services committee would decide on the placement that was most appropriate in the interest of the child.

Mr. McClellan: How do you intend to remove from the family court the power they have to make placements? Or do you assume that Judge Holland's decision has done that for you?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I assume that we'll receive a great deal of co-operation from the family court judges across this province. We've had several opportunities to meet with them and to discuss this issue and I really don't see too much difficulty; I'll be surprised if there is. I think they're just as anxious to make sure that a child is placed within the community, unless it's a very unusual circumstance. I think they would be very happy to see it being accommodated through a children's services committee.

Mr. McClellan: So you'll be relying then on a kind of consensual co-operation with the courts to make that work.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Very much so. I think the success of the whole programme depends on the co-operation and the understanding of what everyone really is trying to do and that is meet the needs of each individual child.

I don't foresee many problems in that area. I think once everyone understands exactly what the children's services committees are intended to do, what their function is, what the other agencies who are providing services in the community are prepared to do, and the courts and the local government of course, that that co-operation certainly will be forthcoming. It's just going to take time to develop the whole programme.

Mr. McClellan: Okay, let me finally ask about the funding arrangements. Is this intended to be a cost-sharing arrangement or a more generous arrangement than the traditional provincial-municipal arrangements?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We expect it to be a cost-sharing arrangement.

Mr. McClellan: Do you have some suggestions about what the ratios would be?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We've had several suggestions from different municipalities as a result of the meeting at the PMLC, but certainly nothing definite has been considered at all.

Mr. McClellan: Can I ask you what the gist of the municipal suggestions might be?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Usually what other cost-sharing arrangements are.

Mr. McClellan: Eighty-twenty?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, it's a possibility but certainly nothing definite. It's just been a point of discussion with some of the municipal people.

Mr. McClellan: You don't anticipate difficulties with an 80-20 formula?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: One is never sure when you can anticipate difficulties. No, I really don't think so at this time.

Mr. McClellan: Wouldn't you agree that the traditional 80-20 formula has been a real barrier to the development of the growth of adequate family support services across the province—that historically in this province municipalities have been enormously reluctant to place the extra burden of social services, even if it's at 20 per cent on the property tax? Wouldn't you agree that much of the traditional reluctance and even hostility on the part of municipalities to move into the human services field has been because of the difficulties that it represents to municipal budgeting?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think there's quite a decided change in that historical thinking of the past. I find that more and more municipal governments want to be involved in the provisions of social services. As a matter of fact, we do have a programme under way at the moment, or it will be under way very soon, in Kitchener-Waterloo, a human services approach to the local community deciding on the social services along with the health services that are required for the community. I think more and more local governments want to be involved in the decision-making as to the social services within their own communities.

Mr. McClellan: Your experience, I suppose, conflicts with mine. For example, when you look at visiting homemakers' services, I attribute the failure of this province to develop an adequate network of visiting homemakers' services across the province to the failure of existing funding arrangements, pure and simple. Nowhere in this province, not in a single community is there an

adequate array or supply of visiting homemakers' services. Toronto has obviously the best developed system. Toronto made some real progress in 1975 in extending visiting homemakers' services only to see those gains completely wiped out by the provincial constraints and the traditional constraints.

If you're serious—let me suggest to you, rather than to question you—if you're serious about developing an adequate network of non-institutional services, if you're serious about saying that responsibility has to rest with the family, and that's government policy, and it's government policy to provide those services that make that possible to strengthen families and provide support to families, then you're going to have to change the funding arrangements. You may not want to change the funding arrangements with respect to residential or institutional services. That is to say, you may not. I'm not suggesting that would be our policy, but I'm trying to operate within the constraints of your policy.

Even if you continue the traditional cost-sharing within custodial services, surely it makes sense to you, by way of encouragement, by way of incentives, by way of making it possible to develop quickly the whole array of family support services that are seen as the essential component of government policy, then it makes sense to provide 100 per cent funding by way of an incentive, because the services are simply so poorly developed across the province.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course I take exception to that.

Mr. McClellan: The interministerial report says so. You just have to turn to the pages where it says it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think what it points out is that they're fragmented.

Mr. McClellan: It says: "They're poorly developed in many Ontario communities and not developed at all in most."

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No.

Mr. McClellan: That's what it says. That's what your own senior officials are telling you.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that we have, in the province, an excellent system of services. I think the problem has been that they have not been co-ordinated.

To get back to your other question, I feel very strongly that a community should have an interest in the services provided by providing some of the costs. I think it's important that they do have participation in the cost sharing.

Mr. McClellan: The historical reality suggests otherwise in this province and I think that deep down you know it. Your own officials have pointed this out in the interministerial report. Unless you're prepared to adopt some different policies with respect to family support services we're not going to see them developed in this province. It boils down to that.

[4:15]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think we have already indicated we are prepared to make resources available in those areas of the province where there is an inadequate supply of resources.

Mr. McClellan: That's most of Ontario.

Mrs. Campbell: That's the whole province.

Mr. McClellan: That's right; that's everywhere. I suggest to you that you're going to have to do exactly the same thing—and with much better results, let me hasten to add—as you did with your day-care expansion programme; that is to say, make money available at 100 per cent. And let us not use that as an example of a successful programme.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course, we'd never agreed on that either, because your philosophy is quite different than mine; so perhaps we would just waste time debating that particular issue.

Mr. McClellan: Let's not open that one up at this particular time.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, please let's not.

Mr. McClellan: But I suggest to you, and I'm quite serious, that if you want to develop family support services, you're going to have to bring in additional incentives. At this point in time, you can't go to municipalities and say, "Look, you have some new responsibilities; here they are, and it's going to cost you so much more money." People are cutting back on what exists now; they're not going to pick up additional responsibilities. It's as simple as that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course, we don't intend going to municipalities and saying exactly what you've just suggested, that "you're going to have to do this"—

Mr. McClellan: Sure. So you'll go to them and say, "Would you like to do this?"

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, we would say—

Mr. McClellan: And: "Here's what it's going to cost you." They'll say, "Get lost."

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We would say to them, "You have a responsibility for the children in your community, for the families in your community."

Mr. McClellan: You'll appeal to their high moral sensitivities.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I hope so.

Mr. McClellan: They will still tell you to get lost.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Perhaps I'm not as cynical as you are in that area.

Mr. McClellan: I don't think that's being cynical at all. I think that speaks to the kinds of very real pressures that elected municipal officials face, the very real pressures that they experience from their electorate; and it speaks to the inequity of trying to run major social programmes on a regressive tax base. That's what it boils down to.

It's inherently unfair to require that essential human services be financed from a regressive tax base. People understand that—everybody's constituents understand that it's unfair to do it; and, of course, they oppose it because they know it's unfair. As long as that inequity remains as the basis of funding these kinds of programmes, there will be resistance and hostility. It's guaranteed, it's inevitable; it's structured right into the thing. Until those programmes are funded on the basis of progressive taxation, you are going to have enormous difficulty in securing implementation.

We may just agree to disagree and we will watch things unfold but without too much in the way of optimism on our part here, because we have seen the same problem for many years; and it will be continued and entrenched.

Let me move on to a couple of other things. I don't have a preamble to this question: What age of kids are you talking about when you're talking about your new deal for children's services? What age of kid will the local children's services committee be responsible to assume responsibility for? Age 16 or 18?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As you know, the federal legislation on the young offender has posed certain problems as to what the maximum age should be whether it should be 16 or 18. It's being discussed at the moment within the justice policy field. I haven't had an opportunity to see their response to the federal paper; so it's debatable at the moment whether it would in fact be 16 or 18.

Mr. McClellan: What is Ontario's position?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We haven't a position until I hear from the justice policy field.

Mr. McClellan: Do you know if they've reached a decision?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I don't.

Mr. McClellan: Perhaps you could find out before the conclusion of the estimates and report back progress in coming to a decision so that we know at least what Ontario would like to see happen and what Ontario's position is in this debate?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I will check with the justice policy field to see if that is available.

Mr. McClellan: The third area I wanted to ask about has to do with children currently in training school. I think I understand what structures you've established to deal with the question of removing section 8 children from training school and finding adequate placement for them. I want to ask about section 9 children. Do you know how many section 9 children are currently in training schools?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I do not.

Mr. McClellan: I think when you made the announcement that you were repealing section 8, either in the announcement or in the course of the questioning, you expressed a concern about the numbers of section 9 children who were currently in training school. I assume you still have that concern.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I didn't express particular concern because my mandate was to deal with the children who were there under section 8. At that point, they were still under the authority of the Minister of Correctional Services and I wasn't dealing with that issue at all. I might have said off the record or something that I was concerned.

Mr. McClellan: Are you concerned? Let me ask you now because I am concerned.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I am concerned about the need for any child to be in a training school system.

Mr. McClellan: I have a number of transcripts of cases of children who have come before the family court under section 9 and have had absolutely explicit assessments and recommendations from the agencies that had been responsible for them that under no circumstances should these kids be sent to train-

ing schools, that what they need is a different kind of placement with a treatment emphasis. Yet because of the unavailability of treatment facilities at a given point in time, they have been sent to training school via Oakville.

Don't you think there needs to be some kind of case audit of children who are in training school under section 9, a case-by-case review of the treatment needs of those kids?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would certainly hope that that would be a role that the new division of children's services would undertake.

Mr. McClellan: Since you have already established a series of mechanisms for trying to deal with section 8 children, don't you think it would be useful to extend that to section 9 children and attempt to do a case audit and review the appropriateness of the training school placements, kid by kid?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You will recall I did make a commitment that those children who were presently in training schools under section 8 would be removed as quickly as possible and placed in the community.

Mr. McClellan: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We did, however, indicate that it would not be in the best interest to remove some children who were in particular programmes—and I don't mean those who were incarcerated in training schools, but those in correctional group homes and other facilities. In no way would we attempt to remove them if the programme seemed to be in their best interests.

We did establish a committee to deal with very difficult and hard-to-place young people. That committee has found placements for several children. They are still working and attempting to meet the needs of several others. These children in most instances really are disturbed and it is very difficult to find suitable placement for them. But I would hope at the conclusion of the placement of those particular difficult children who had been in under section 8 that indeed we would look at the others who are in our training school system.

Mr. McClellan: You have about 37 section 8 children now that you are concerned about?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: About 37. Not all of those are difficult to place. Some of them are in programmes that are appropriate for the moment.

Mr. McClellan: Are you saying then that you will do a case audit of section 9 children and review the appropriateness of the training school placements?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would think that that would be a very appropriate action to take, yes.

Mr. McClellan: Can we have a commitment? I'm speaking on the basis of knowledge of cases. I don't want to take the time of the committee to bring out the files and the transcripts and read the recommendations of professional agency staff and of court clinics and all that, but you know that it happens and that it's a major tragedy when it happens.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It is.

Mr. McClellan: There are kids in training school under section 9 who shouldn't be there, and while you're going through this process now with the section 8 kids, it's a good opportunity to extend it and try to come up with more adequate placement facilities for the section 9 kids.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Fortunately, over the last few years the numbers of young people who have been committed under section 9 wardships have been diminishing and, of course, the whole direction of the new policy was to monitor and evaluate those children who are in training schools under our new policy. So it is an ongoing commitment that we are prepared to make.

Mr. McClellan: Maybe I do have to trot out the cases then. I'll do that later in the estimates.

Just a final thing while we're talking about section 8, I haven't had a chance to confirm it, but I was told yesterday by somebody in the Ministry of Correctional Services that Judge Docherty in Kingston sentenced a child to training school under section 8.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: When was this?

Mr. McClellan: I believe it was Friday this is alleged to have happened. I understand why you're shaking your head, because it's illegal.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It is illegal.

Mr. McClellan: Yes. Would you mind investigating that and reporting back to us tomorrow?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, right away.

Mr. McClellan: I believe it was last Friday. I was told this by an official in

the Ministry of Correctional Services yesterday at a youth services conference and I haven't had time to confirm it, so I thought I would ask you to confirm it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'd be very pleased to. I hope it's incorrect.

Mr. McClellan: I do too. Let me ask you about Judge Holland's decision, the decision of the Supreme Court that has either voided the placement of children in group homes under a judicial order under The Juvenile Delinquents Act, and if it hasn't voided it, it's certainly opened all of those hundreds of placements open to case-by-case litigation.

We had some discussion of that in the House last week. You may recall I suggested to the ministry that by way of preventing litigation from municipalities fighting maintenance orders, you should immediately increase your offer from 50 per cent to 100 per cent. Are you aware that Metro social services is continuing its litigation?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I'm not.

Mr. McClellan: They were in court yesterday and again today, at least with respect to one case that I know of, the child who was in the care of Youth Sphere. The child is in a group home. There's nowhere else that this child can go. The child can't go home to her family. The only alternative is a temporary placement in Youth Sphere.

Let me just tell you what the arrangement was. There had been a succession of unsuccessful Children's Aid Society placements. It's another one of those cases of a 15-year-old kid turning 16 and the CAS wouldn't put him under wardship. Youth Sphere arranged a community placement with supervision and service and support to the aunt. The aunt got sick and they went back to court and the judge arranged for the child to go temporarily into the Youth Sphere group home until the aunt was well and the community placement can be restored.

[4:30]

Metro social services appeared before Judge Abella yesterday and contended that it would not pay the maintenance costs of service or the group home costs, the per diem, from April 13 on. So that placement is in jeopardy. The only thing that is keeping the thing together is that the family court judge who originally assigned the child to Youth Sphere is away on holiday until May 13, and only that judge can order her removed from the group home. The situation is that the child is still in the group home, fortunately, but Youth Sphere is being expected to absorb the cost as a loss. So we have the idiotic prospect of either Youth Sphere going broke as a result of this situation or, if the original judge had been there, he would have been obliged to terminate the placement and that kid would have been stranded in limbo.

I understand, regardless of Mr. Norton's hopes to the contrary, that Metro social services is going ahead with litigation, case by case. As these things come up in court, they will contest them; and they have the prospect of all of these placements breaking down. You don't have the luxury of sitting around waiting for this to happen. I understand it is painful in budget terms, but it is not the municipality's fault that this happened in the first place, and they shouldn't bear the brunt of it. Above all, the kids shouldn't bear the brunt of it.

I am going to say again, as strongly as I can, that you should raise your offer to 100 per cent and pick up these costs. Let's not fight and haggle about these dollar costs at the expense of kids who are in group home care right now, because that is what is going on and that is what is going to go on. Let me tell you, if Metro social services are playing this game, other municipalities are going to be in it with a vengeance.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think the minister did indicate to you that he was going to be consulting with the Attorney General as to the implications of this decision.

Mr. McClellan: We know what the implications are. He doesn't have to consult with the Attorney General. I told you what the implications are. The implications are what was going on in Judge Abella's court this morning and yesterday. That is what the implications are.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think the minister feels that he needs a little advice in that area as to just how the province should proceed.

Mr. McClellan: He is going to have to get it quickly and he is going to have to change his policy quickly. We are not talking about an academic exercise. We are talking about the stability of group home placements for troubled kids—that is what we are talking about—and hundreds of kids. The possibility is there, every time there is a court review of one of these placements, that the munici-

pality can come in and say, "We are not obliged to pay the cost of maintenance because of Judge Holland's decision"; that will stand and the placement will fall apart. It is as simple as that.

Let me ask you something. When you made your offer to the municipalities to pick up 50 per cent of the cost of court-ordered maintenance costs under The Juvenile Delinquents Act, was that cost shared under the Canada Assistance Plan?

Dr. Wright: It is expected that it might be cost-sharable, but this has not yet been established.

Mr. McClellan: In other words, the net cost to the province of Ontario is zero?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That is not really true. Our costs were $2.7 million, I think, to pick up the 50 per cent of all the costs across the province.

Mr. McClellan: If it is 50 per cent cost-shared, what is the provincial share?

Dr. Wright: I am sorry; I was distracted. I thought, when you mentioned the $2.6 million, that the question was about the employment programme for services to seniors.

Mr. McClellan: No. It was the announcement the government made at PMLC last week that it was going to pick up 50 per cent of the costs that had been borne by municipalities in paying for court-ordered group home placements. Is that cost sharable?

Dr. Wright: Again I think the answer is that it is not yet known.

Mr. McClellan: But your anticipation is that it would be?

Dr. Wright: I'm not assured that it would be. It think there are reasons to believe it may not be cost-sharable. Particularly in anticipation of the new social services Act, the federal government—

Mr. McClellan: Under the current Canada Assistance Plan.

Dr. Wright: No, but the federal government has been reluctant to extend authorizations under the present CAP.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I will attempt to get a clarification of that.

Mr. McClellan: I would really like to know because it sounds to me—and again I may be unncessarily bilious and surly—like the old con game of Ontario picking up 50-cent dollars and expecting the municipalities to pay their share but not picking up a cent itself. I'd be delighted to be shown to be wrong on this. I genuinely would be.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'll attempt to do that.

Mr. McClellan: Nevertheless, I go back to my original contention, as strongly as I can suggest, that you move quickly to pick up 100 per cent of the costs on your offer to municipalities in order to protect and stabilize the group home placements that are currently in jeopardy. I'd ask that you really think seriously about that, perhaps not to respond right now but to take it under consideration and investigate the extent of the litigation that currently seems to be under way.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It seems to be just in the Metro Toronto area at the moment.

Mr. McClellan: If you think the regional municipality of Peel isn't going to go on an orgy of litigation, you are very much mistaken.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I said "at the moment."

Mr. McClellan: How many days do you want to wait? How many placements do you want to fall part? Surely one placement falling apart is too many. That's what will happen. Not every judge is away on holiday.

Let me finish off by asking you about a different but related subject. It concerns government policy with respect to providing services to the learning disabled. We're aware of the number of kids who end up in the correctional system or in the child welfare system because of the problems, pressures and difficulties they've experienced as a result of learning difficulties, and still in 1977 we don't have an adequate set of government programmes and policies with respect to the learning disabled.

There's a project in my own riding, Project STEPS which provides a rehabilitative service to older kids between the ages of 18 to 22. The only way, as you know, they can get funding is from vocational rehab. Vocational rehab refuses to say as a matter of policy that it's responsible for funding this kind of service. The position of the Ministry of Community and Social Services is that the responsibility rests with the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Education plays the same kind of game. Services

like Project STEPS are teetering on the brink of collapse continuously and permanently.

Project STEPS' board of directors notified the minister of their intention to resign in February and were prevailed upon to continue the programme until June. Vocational rehab was cajoled into giving them an additional four placements so that they could survive until June and not collapse. Really this kind of nonsense has got to stop.

We've been promised and I've been promised in correspondence recently by the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) that his colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), is shortly going to make an announcement with respect to brave new government initiatives. When can we expect that? How much longer do the parents of learning disabled kids have to send their children to the United States at their own expense? How much longer do services that are trying to give rehabilitative help to the learning disabled have to teeter on the brink of bankruptcy and collapse twice a year? How much longer is it going to be before government in this province states that children with learning disabilities have the same rights as every other kid in this province to a complete educational service?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm very happy to relay to you that it is the intention of this government to release a statement very soon to take effect September 1977 which will provide further details regarding the expectations of school boards and the availability of support services of a non-educational nature. The staffs of the Ministries of Community and Social Services and Education are presently meeting to design ways and means of providing a continuum of provincially-based care, treatment and educational services to learning disabled students.

The education of children with learning disabilities is viewed to be the responsibility of the school boards of this province. The non-educational aspects of treatment or care will be made available, based on demonstrated need, within the child's local community wherever possible and we anticipate that statement will be made soon.

Mr. McClellan: Just so I can understand, will that require school boards to provide services?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That will probably be part of the statement that the minister will be making.

Mr. Grande: As long as the school boards pay it, you can make the policy and you know that it's empty words and empty policy.

Mr. McClellan: When will the minister make this? Because I've been promised this statement three or four times since I was elected. Is it going to be within a week or two?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I can't say. All I can say is, I'm just as hopeful as you are that it will be very soon.

Mr. McClellan: Are you saying that there will be a programme in place by September 1977?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It will be effective or should be in place by September 1977, yes.

Mr. McClellan: Okay. We'll wait for it then, and see what happens.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to continue somewhat in the same vein. In view of the chaos that now appears to exist as a result of the placements by judges of children into group homes with cost to the municipality, would the minister now not feel that her ministry did not adequately consider the implications which were, of course, the reason for the delay in implementing the retraction of section 8 placements? What more implications could there be to create chaos than what we have seen with Metro Toronto and with Peel? Why would her ministry not feel they should have considered the possibility of this kind of reaction from municipalities? And what consultative process was there with the municipalities in this case?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: There was a great deal of consultative approach with the court systems, the agencies.

Mrs. Campbell: But not the municipalities that would have to pick up the tab.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: But that has been a new development that occurred that we were not really prepared for.

Mrs. Campbell: But could you not have realized that you were paying 100 per cent of the placements of children in training schools under section 8 and that you would not be paying that kind of money for placements in court-ordered group homes? Did you not know that? Did you not have any experience of that through all the years the family court has been in existence?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Obviously we weren't aware to the extent that it was going to be abused.

[4:45]

Mrs. Campbell: May I say that I am terribly frightened at what I hear about your proposed youth committees. I have the horrible feeling that once again you have made a very nice statement, one which people welcome as a step forward. Yet, I do not find in your responses anything other than a very fuzzy overview of what, surely, has to be considered. Please, I understand the consultative process; I understand what you mean. But let me try to develop what is coming out of this, as I see it, because my concern—believe it or not—is for these children we are talking about, and not to posture here. It really isn't to posture.

We have now found that we will possibly have two groups dealing with wardship. We don't know. Maybe we will. Is the minister aware that this further complicates the situation? The court is, perhaps, going to have some basic finding to make; but this, if I can demonstrate it by a case, is to me an over-simplification. I would not like us to be trapped again. For example, at the present time in the courts, a judge may be dealing with a matter of wardship. While that very case is being heard in the family court, there can be a parallel case, in a matter of custody, going on in another court. I think you have to come to grips with that kind of situation for your committees and/or your Children's Aid.

What happens there is—and I have had the experience—the judge who is hearing the wardship case is suddenly faced with a custody order from another court. I happened to be the judge in question and I don't think I have been overruled since. I had to find that in view of the fact that the circumstances relating to the wardship were now completely different as a result of the custody, the wardship application could no longer be pursued, and that if that child were to have any hearing on wardship, then it would have to be begun de nova with the new circumstances which arose as a result of a placement by another court.

I would have hoped that someone would have addressed himself or herself to this very fundamental problem—and I think it lies with the Attorney General—but not even to have considered it or discussed it, I suggest is going to create very real problems, particularly if you have two groups dealing with wardship.

Another matter that concerns: has any consideration been given to a form of wardship akin to Crown wardship? Again, one of the things I had to face was the case of a child, very badly damaged psychologically and also mentally retarded, who should never have had any finding made. But after several months of trying to find the proper way to deal with that child, and recognizing that the home base was the last place that child should ever be, that child had to be sent to a training school for two days in order to establish the ultimate Crown wardship, which could presumably carry on after that child was released.

That kind of procedure, I can tell you, is very distressing to a judge. It shouldn't be necessary to enable a child to have an ongoing supervision, and ongoing protection, following the determination of the treatment and determination of the placement—in this case it happened to be Whitby—as the proper place.

That took months to try to work through in order to get the kind of a placement that would be for the ultimate good of the child. I wonder if any discussion has been held with anybody on the whole aspect of a kind of wardship which can continue in such cases on an ongoing basis, where the government itself would have some continuing responsibility. In a case of that kind it could not be, and everyone agreed— the Children's Aid and the Ministry of Health—that this particular child needed Crown wardship. What an archaic way to establish it. How do you propose that the children would get to the youth committee?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The children from the court?

Mrs. Campbell: Do they go from the court?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Those children who would be before a court of course would be referred from the court.

Mrs. Campbell: But what is the procedure? If you have a child in trouble—not with the law, but in trouble—what is the procedure by which this child gets to the committee? Is it via the Children's Aid Society which has the protection responsibility or has the committee the right to do what Children's Aid Societies, at least in Toronto, would have loved to be able to do, that is, to understand the problem in advance of the alarm siren going off? Is there going to be a better procedure? I don't know how you proceed in your discussions with the municipalities, but I have always found if I wanted to proceed to discuss something with somebody at least I had some kind of suggested procedures against which they could assess the position. Is there anything to indicate how this will be done?

We've talked about the children in conflict and we've talked about the top levels. What about the lower levels of age? What ages are we talking about in the lower levels? In wardship, of course, it could be an infant. But for other purposes what is it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would consider that it might also be an infant in these instances that would be referred for a placement, proper assessment.

Mrs. Campbell: I see. You are aware, I suppose, that many of the children who get into the courts get there via the police and Children's Aid, even though they are not really deemed at an age when they could legally have committed an offence. I'm concerned about the kinds of gaps that there can be under the federal suggestions. I'm thinking of children of seven who have been brought into the courts because there was no other procedure, basically, who are troubled and disturbed. Would you have those children taken to this committee, or to this group, or how would this work?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would assume the educational authorities, or the local community clinics, or any agency operating within that particular community, would avail themselves of the possibility of directing the child through the children's services committee.

Mrs. Campbell: Often, these children are too young for anyone to approach that kind of an assessment. Let's take a seven-year-old. A seven-year-old has been acting up. Whose responsibility is it to get this child into the hands of this group?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would assume that if the child was seven he would be in the educational system. I would also assume that if he were acting out and causing problems within the system, it would be brought to the attention of the parents or local people who are responsible, and in turn, brought to the attention of the children's services committee where an assessment would be made and a placement in the best interests of the child provided. It might not necessarily mean a placement in any agency or mental health clinic or children's mental health facility. It might mean some supportive services for the family to keep the child at home, which I would hope would be the avenue first explored.

Mrs. Campbell: You are aware that this doesn't happen?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm hoping it will happen once we get the children's services committee into place.

Mrs. Campbell: Are you thinking in terms, for instance, of one for Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We have discussed that—the advisability of having one for such a large urban area. Perhaps it's as well to start with one and to evaluate, after it's been in operation for some time. Perhaps it would have to be broken down into regions in Metropolitan Toronto. But I think that's something we would have to try before we could be sure we were going in the right direction. I think it's a very large area, for one.

Mrs. Campbell: May I suggest to you that one of the things on which I'm very critical at the moment of the federal government approach is their suggestion that children should be 12 before they're brought into the courts. I'm not critical philosophically at all, but what is frightening me terribly is the fact that children under that age, at least, sometimes are caught into a system where they can—certainly in Toronto—have the advantage of the clinic and get help. I had hoped this committee would have been thought through to the point at least where we would be looking at some procedures.

You must know there are great dichotomies in the school system about getting children into any kind of a—even a dialogue with parents about children that are having problems. Often these children don't have the problems in the schools, or don't act out in the schools. They may be, as I have seen, very passive in the school system and act out when they get outside of it.

[5:00]

If we're simply going to put in place something similar to the Children's Aid Society and call it by a new name or something, and perhaps, in turn, by opting out of the Children's Aid funding by the province, putting more pressure on the municipalities than they already have, I am deeply frightened by this announcement, which I believe ought at least to have had some for-instances, some suggestions as to topics of conversation with municipalities.

The minister has expressed the feeling that municipalities should take responsibility for those within their jurisdiction. When does she think it will start? She knows, and I know, that there are areas of this province which do not have group homes, and yet she speaks

about the advisability of children remaining in their own community. I think it's great to philosophize but I think we have to take the reality into consideration. When we know that is a fact of life—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Could I respond to that?

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, surely.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think one of the reasons —and it certainly has been brought to my attention—that many municipalities have objected to group homes is that up until now we have had many different ministries and agencies coming into a community and sort of imposing group homes without any kind of consultation on what it would mean to the local recreational programme, the local educational system and all the other resources of a community.

I think the resentment was borne out by the fact that many of these group homes were providing care for children who were not residents of that particular community but were from just any other community where the homes were not provided. I think that resentment was built upon the recognition that they indeed were providing for children in communities where they had not provided the resource.

With the direction that we hope to go, where children must be looked after in their own communities, I certainly feel that we will find less resistance by local communities in providing group homes and the other resources that are required.

Mrs. Campbell: May I just point out a fact of life? So many of the placements from Peel —and we did discuss Peel yesterday—are in Toronto. I don't think that is an answer, with respect. I don't think Peel has even been looking after them in the ones that they may have. I am not too familiar with them, but I don't think there is any doubt in the world that they have not been looking after children out of their municipality; they have been pretty well shifting them out to Toronto.

When you talk about the attitudes of municipalities and their responsibility for looking after their own, are we really going back to those days when we used to have to investigate where a child was born when there were charge-backs to the municipality because the child moved? I thought we moved progressively out of that kind of philosophy.

But may I point out to you that if you proceed in the way you are going, I say with respect, as I see it—and, of course, I could be wrong—that you are perhaps inviting municipalities such as Toronto to embark upon that kind of philosophy, because the experience in Toronto over a long period of time, before Metro, was that it had rather sophisticated social services compared with other parts—of Canada, let's put it, so I don't get into any kind of problems with my colleagues in the rest of Ontario—and we were inundated by people from other parts who were looking for some assistance because they didn't have it at home.

I think you can break it down to mean that that could happen, unless you have a programme which is across the province and in place. I don't think I need to be a genius to point out that it is that kind of implication which ought to be studied in your ministry. I'm truly very frightened and very depressed at what has come out of discussions about these proposed committees, because I really honestly see it—as I said before—as very akin to so many other beautiful statements of government, which have been full of sound and fury signifying precisely nothing. I don't want that to happen where children are concerned. They have been abused enough.

I had hoped that the minister, through her ministry—since it is the policy secretariat which is, at least, supposed to have some influence in policy development, if no other thing—that she would have developed, before this goes much further, some step by step suggestions for discussion with the municipalities. Of course, the fact is that you—with the greatest respect—are going to have to put some of this together fairly soon because of the budgeting processes of municipalities. And if you haven't, at least, got it into a position where you can get some consensus, or something in the way of dialogue with some kind of precision, you may be coming down with decisions at a time when municipalities are going to have to say: "We can't do it. Our mill rate is fixed. You'll have to wait another year." All of this is a matter of very important timing.

I would like to touch on one of the things I'd like a direct answer to, if I could get it. We would all like to see children not in need of placements, in group homes or any place else. That is an ideal to which, I think, everyone in this room would work. But meanwhile we have group homes. Yesterday, we discussed the situation with Children's Aid Societies in Peel. I would invite the minister's reaction to these statements, if I may.

During the course of our research—it has been extensive, and with very limited resources we have been able to understand implications—we investigated the situation in

Peel. We have met at least two children, and heard of several others, who have appeared before the Peel family court, who have been sent to Browndale for assessment and were subsequently placed in Viking Homes. This disturbed us immensely. May I explain why?

Viking at one time was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Browndale International. When it achieved its independence, it undertook to pay Browndale five per cent of its revenue over a five-year period. One press report suggested that this netted Browndale somewhere in the range of $200 a day. In addition, Browndale undertook to make available to Viking personnel services of several senior persons in their organization, including one Dr. Otto Weininger.

A question arose in our minds as to whether or not an organization performing assessments on children should benefit financially from the placement of those children in a residential setting. We understand these assessments were performed not by trained psychologists, but by students seeking PhDs in education. The children with whom we discussed the matter stated they had never met the psychologist in question, although he, along with the PhDs, signed the psychological assessments.

When we raised the matter, both in the Legislature and in the press, there were rather curious explanations. Dr. Weininger, for one, is alleged to have said he was involved with the Peel court through OISE, where he is a professor, and not Browndale. He further went on to state it was inaccurate to say Browndale is involved in these court assessments. In actual fact, the assessment clinic is referred to throughout the court transcripts that we had seen as the Browndale clinic, and parents of one of the children we interviewed made available to us a copy of their child's assessment, which was on Browndale stationery.

We are not alleging any wrongdoing or criminality. We simply raise questions about the ethics and the appropriateness of such assessment procedures. We strongly feel anyone performing any assessments of children should not have a financial interest in the subsequent placement of children in a treatment programme?

I wonder if the minister could comment on that position?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We feel just as strongly, and that was the rationale behind the children's services committee determining where the assessment should be done and where the placement should be without being directly involved in providing either the assessment or the placement—contracting out for the placement, but also establishing the assessment and determining who would be providing that.

Mrs. Campbell: I see. So the committee would determine who would do the assessment?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's right.

Mrs. Campbell: Could the same thing not happen there?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think so, because I would assume that the makeup of the committee would make that impossible.

Mrs. Campbell: May I ask the minister to follow through on that? I am not clear as to how that could be.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The committee members, when a child is brought to them, would determine where the assessment would be, who would provide the assessment. Based on the assessment, then they would decide where the child should be placed. Certainly it would not be done in conjunction with where the assessment had taken place. I think all of the concerns you have expressed about this very thing happening would be circumvented by this children's services committee.

Mrs. Campbell: Would they have attached to them staff for this purpose?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again, that is sort of questionable, depending on the kinds of resources that are available in some communities. It well might be if, in fact, it was decided that the social services department of a particular community were the providers of this particular children's services committee. If it were attached to the children's services committee perhaps there might be staff then available that they could contract or could avail themselves of for assessment services.

[5:15]

Mrs. Campbell: Are their assessment services of this nature in our cities, in our social services department?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I thought there was with the Metro Toronto social services.

Mrs. Campbell: For the assessment of children?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm not sure about that. Maybe someone else knows.

Mrs. Campbell: Perhaps I could find out. I hadn't heard. It could very well be, and that I'm just in error.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm not certain.

Mrs. Campbell: The second matter we would like to draw your attention to is the question of who exactly is looking after the interests of those children placed by the courts in children's boarding homes without the involvement of the Children's Aid Society?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm sorry.

Mrs. Campbell: Could we know who is looking after the interests of those children placed in children's boarding homes without the involvement of the Children's Aid Society? May I say we recognize that the Children's Aid Society does supervise to some extent children placed there through their involvement; but where it is a direct court placement who is really looking after the interests of those children?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I assume if it's to a particular group home then it has a certain responsibility for a reporting relationship to the judge who has made that placement. No? You've had more experience than I have, certainly. I would have assumed there would be a reporting relationship.

Mrs. Campbell: Are you not aware that there is absolutely no accountability when a child goes into the home, that no progress report is necessary and that there isn't even a necessary accountability when the child leaves? Are you aware that there are children who have stated they were invited to remain in a group home—these are disturbed children—on the understanding that if they stay there long enough they could become staff? Are you aware of that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I have run into staff who've informed me that they have at one point or another been part of the system.

Mr. Bullbrook: It sounds like the Legislature.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, it does.

Mrs. Campbell: In your opinion, the judge should have the ongoing supervision of these children in group homes?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm not saying that. I'm saying I thought that that had been so. I had taken for granted that they did have some responsibility in the past. I'm hoping with the new direction we're going that the children's services committee would be the people who would be responsible, who would be monitoring and evaluating the services and the placement of that child to make sure it continued to be in the child's best interest.

Mrs. Campbell: In view of the fact you haven't yet accorded to the municipalities the right to go into these homes for which they've been up until now paying 100 per cent, would you not think it might be an idea and a step forward at least to ensure that they could have some supervisory powers until we get the committees into place? We think the committees will take longer than 1977—that's the way I feel about it—and 1978. I really am depressed. I tell you I am.

What about the unlicensed boarding homes? Why do you think that no one has any answer as to whether they're safe from the point of view of fire or health or building regulations? As you are aware, I've asked the minister responsible on more than one occasion and he had to answer that he didn't know, but if I knew of any dangerous ones please to let him know. It seems to me it's a strange way to run a children's programme.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would assume that again the Children's Aid Societies have placed a great many children in unlicensed homes in the hope that the children were being placed in a family-like setting and in homes—I have many in my riding that have been brought to my attention—where, in terms of fire protection in the normal sense of a family being protected, they assumed the children would receive the same kind of protection in those homes. I imagine the Children's Aid Societies might have been placed in the position of having a great deal of difficulty in finding foster homes and placements for children, and that to impose a lot of regulations and red tape might have been very discouraging for many foster home placements.

Mrs. Campbell: I'm sorry, I wasn't speaking of foster homes, I was speaking of unlicensed children's boarding homes; and I was not speaking of those which have any involvement with Children's Aid. I am terrified when I hear a minister stand up in the House and say that he doesn't know how many may be unsafe from the point of

view of fire, health or building regulations; and, of course, you are aware of the fact that your own regulations haven't been followed.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think the minister had indicated to you, I believe it was in the House, that they have tightened up all those regulations as far as fire safety is concerned in those homes, because it all has to be passed by local fire people now as well as by the regulations set down by the provincial government. They must meet those regulations or they just will not continue to operate.

Mrs. Campbell: In this case in point, where the boy lost his life—and I am not suggesting that he lost it as a result of the non-compliance with the government's own regulations, but there is no doubt that your own regulations were not complied with. Months later, we are still not able to get that very simple information; and I think it is shocking if we have this much concern for children, that we simply don't know what the situation is.

I will leave that. I would like to point out briefly to the minister that the question of reports and the rest adopted by the Legislature came about as a result of the Morrow committee. The Morrow committee at no time thought or stated—in fact, they were quite emphatic the other way; they believed there had to be cabinet confidentiality. But what is happening in this ministry, to the detriment of its reputation I may say, is that everything seems to become a matter of cabinet confidentiality.

We have some councils, for example, that hold open meetings. Others are closed. I don't think the matter of the councils, for example, and their reporting should be regarded as cabinet confidentiality. I have to say to you if you can't get any reports out to us, other than those which report chaos; if you have people working to understand the implications and the implications haven't even been understood or studied, I remain highly critical of the operation of this ministry.

If there are reports which your councils have, then I suggest to the minister, that the public has a right to know why there is this chaos. There has to be accountability by your ministry, as well as any other, whether you're a line ministry or not. The reports we're seeking are reports. I still will ask for them, as we get to the vote, because they're not cabinet confidentiality type reports. They are exactly what the Morrow committee recommended and which were adopted by the House.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that it's a little unfair to draw a parallel between the advisory councils that report to the secretariat and an interministerial council. They perform two different functions.

Mrs. Campbell: Precisely.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't have to tell you that the advisory council is made up of people outside government who are free to criticize and to publicize their reports and their criticisms and their recommendations. But when you get to an internal interministerial committee or council, perhaps we have to be careful with terminology. They are charged with bringing forward for consideration at cabinet policy level all of the pros and cons of a stated intention policy; and those, I suggest, are confidential.

Mrs. Campbell: We haven't suggested anything else. We have suggested that we shouldn't confuse the two in the reporting system.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think perhaps we should clarify, for everyone's benefit then, the difference in the different councils that are available and that do advise the policy secretariat.

Mrs. Campbell: I think it would be good to know which sit in closed session and which sit in open session, and why. I'm speaking of the councils; not the interministerial committees, the councils.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The only councils that I have reporting to me are the four advisory councils; and then I have the Council on Troubled Children and Youth, which is primarily an interministerial committee.

Mrs. Campbell: Perhaps that's why what we got out it it was so blah, if I may suggest it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You may suggest and I—

Mrs. Campbell: It was full of sound and fury, signifying positively nothing. May I then just go to the one—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Perhaps I should bring up another—because it is in the briefing book, the Council on Rehabilitation Services. Again, that's an interministerial committee reporting to the social policy field with recommendations that will go on to determine future policy. I suggest to you that is confidential information as well. That's an advisory council.

Mrs. Campbell: Well the others are too. The others are listed as advisory.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I pointed out, perhaps we should be a little more careful of the terminology in describing the function of these different groups.

Mrs. Campbell: I think it would be helpful to understand why some are deemed to be confidential, made up of outside people, and some are not confidential made up of outside people. That's the sort of thing that's bothering me.

But you say the committee on youth, the advisory committee on youth, is interministerial?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, it's made up of representatives from government.

Mrs. Campbell: Don't you think it'd be a good idea to get some fresh air blowing in from the outside on that one?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Some of the ad hoc committees that have been established do have people from outside government serving on them.

Mrs. Campbell: And are they open?

Hon. Mrs Birch: No, they meet as a subcommittee.

Mrs. Campbell: Everything is so confidential. I would think that maybe there are people outside who have very good ideas about youth committees and other things which might be more precise.

[5:30]

May I just finally get back to that question I was discussing with you about the employment of people in the service of the elderly. I note that the implication seems to be that you will pay $20 a day salary, no administrative costs, nothing else; and then if the municipality was to subsidize that beyond $20 a day, they would be welcome to do so. But that is the range we are talking about for employment; and this is not summer employment, this is year-round employment. The care of the elderly is, again, really a question of saying to people: "Look, we are committed to a service to the elderly to keep them out of institutions. We are not committed to funding it at any kind of level that will, perhaps, attract the people with special skills." I don't understand it. Are you going to replace the VON's and the St. Elizabeth?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No.

Mrs. Campbell: Then how can you have two levels of nursing care? Are you going to define the kind of nursing care that you expect nurses to give? Are you perhaps going to have a breakthrough in that physiotherapists will enter this field, since they are now in a very poor position? Do you realize that they—mostly women, not all—used to have a salary 10 per cent higher than registered nurses? Today they are five per cent lower. You are not going to let them practise privately, unless they buy a practice; and if they buy a practice they can have stability in the practice for a maximum of only 15 years, probably for only 10 years. Has that been referred to the status of women?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No. But I would like to enlarge upon some comments I made yesterday about the pilot project that was taking place to provide home care for patients with chronic illnesses. I mentioned at that time that there were three pilot projects: Hamilton, Kingston and Thunder Bay. Those programmes offer a very wide range of services, including physiotherapy, occupational therapy, sick room equipment, homemaking services, drugs, dressing and nursing services. We understand these are coming on very well.

Mrs. Campbell: How are they funded?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: From the province.

Mrs. Campbell: At what rate?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't know, but I will find out for you.

Mr. Kerrio: Put some of that UIC money in there, Margaret.

Mr. McClellan: Not at 50 per cent.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No. Again, when you allude to the fact that this programme is meant to take the place of existing home care and home nursing services, that is not what it is intended to do. It is intended to supplement present services, as well as provide home maintenance, light housekeeping, those kind of things; with the home care and the home nursing services being provided as well in many communities.

Mrs. Campbell: If municipalities are not involved—if you can get people at $20 a day and that is going to be your contribution—what is the reaction of the municipality going to be about support of VON and St. Elizabeth, if you are going to get trained nurses working in the field at $20 a day?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't for one moment think we are going to get trained nurses working in the field for $20 a day. That came up yesterday when someone mentioned the numbers of nurses who are not employed. That is not to say they would not be given the opportunity if they chose to do so; but realistically speaking I can't see very many trained nurses coming forward to work for $20 a day. By the way, it is 100 per cent funding on a budget review basis for those three pilot projects.

Mr. Chairman: One hundred per cent, Ross, how do you like that one?

Mrs. Campbell: One hundred per cent funding. But you don't know at what rate? How are the ceilings arrived at? They are not open-ended programmes are they?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: They are pilot projects. It is based on a budget review, what the costs are. Then 100 per cent funding is based on that.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: They are very successful programmes.

Mrs. Campbell: I'm delighted.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We'd like one in Metro Toronto.

Mrs. Campbell: Indeed I would like to have one in Metro Toronto.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think it's a two-year period for these pilot projects.

Mr. Chairman: Mrs. Campbell, are you through?

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, for the time being.

Ms. Sandeman: We don't have a great deal of time. I'll have more time tomorrow, will I?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Excuse me, before you go on, may I just respond to Mr. McClellan's query about the boy in Kingston? I have some information on that, if you would like to have it.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, I would very much.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The boy is aged 15. Oakville is trying to find a Kingston placement. The judge has ordered that the boy cannot leave Oakville until the placement is found. If no placement is found within three weeks, the boy is to be duly returned to Hillcrest. The case is to be dealt with by the section 8, hard-to-place committee this week, as the boy is an extremely difficult person to place.

Ms. Sandeman: May I respond to that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, go ahead.

Ms. Sandeman: That's a very interesting device.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: He was already a section 8 child from before. He is not a new section 8; that's the problem.

Ms. Sandeman: Oh, I see.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If I could give you this information as it's just been brought to my attention, the probation and after-care officer brought this boy to court and charged him with assault under section 9. The judge decided to send him back to training school at Oakville for three weeks to find a placement. The hard-to-place committee is working now to find a suitable placement for this boy. We are delighted that it isn't an illegal thing.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you very much for giving me this.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, that puts our mind at rest. When you were halfway through your answer, I interrupted you. I suddenly had the vision of a new device opening up, of this hard-to-place, section 8 committee being used as a tool, but obviously that's not happening.

I am not quite sure where to start. I think I'd like to start in the middle of your briefing book, though perhaps I'm not allowed to because it's item 2 under social development councils. Are we allowed to do that, or do I have to stay with the policy? Stay with the policy. If I hadn't said that, nobody would have known. There is all kind of latitude. I was just trying to find something that would fit into 22½ minutes.

I will start in your briefing book with, first of all, the interministerial Council on Rehabilitation Services, which is described in section 3, page 3, of your very helpful briefing book. I must say in my short time in the Legislature that's really the best material I've had coming to estimates. I must tell you that when I went to Corerctional Services estimates last year and asked the minister if he had a blue book or a briefing book, he said what's that? So we didn't have very much help at that stage.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm delighted you're pleased. With all the criticism, it's kind of nice to have something complimented. Thank you very much.

Ms. Sandeman: I am softening you up. That's enough for compliments, my colleague says here.

Could I start by asking just for information? I am not clear what is the working relationship between the interministerial Council on Rehabilitation Services and the Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped. They are both reporting, as I understand, to the provincial secretary. Their terms of reference seem to be very much the same when one looks at the information given here. I am wondering is there a working relationship, or do we have two hard-working groups duplicating the work of each other?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We have a very good relationship, as a matter of fact, between our advisory councils and government internal advisory groups. They exchange a great deal of information. The government councils or advisory groups make themselves available for the advisory councils whenever there is a suggestion of a consultation. They really do have a very good relationship. This is fairly new, the interministerial Council of Rehabilitation Services reporting to the secretariat. We have just had one progress report but I am expecting great things from them.

They have two different functions. The Advisory Council for the Physical Handicapped is an advisory group made up of people outside of government which brings forth recommendations. The interministerial councils bring together those ministries that are involved in rehabilitation services with the hope that we will be able to provide a more co-ordinated planning approach to the provision of rehabilitation services throughout government.

Ms. Sandeman: I would like to turn to the work of the advisory council which is described in the fifth section. Maybe I could start with some specific questions. It seems to me there are three basic areas in which the disabled, as so many other groups in society, need support and help. They are income maintenance, housing and transportation. In section 5, page 6, on transportation for the physically handicapped, you discuss the proposed parallel public transit system and the modifications to existing public transit systems, but there is a third option for getting disabled people around, the personal transportation system. There's a very revealing statement there that study is needed.

The advisory council's report to you says: "Study is needed concerning the number of disabled requiring the provision of such a programme and the according cost." I would like to suggest that it is not only study of the number of disabled people who need personal transportation that we need but I have a suspicion we still don't know what disabled people we have in our community, and what their needs are. A very basic programme should be undertaken to discover disabled people.

I know, for instance, of a fellow sitting in bed in an upstairs room in the backwoods of Ontario, a paraplegic whose needs are not being met. I don't imagine anybody in the social service world knows about him. I presume he is getting a family benefits pension. If he is not, he ought to be. But there's a lot of people hidden away, particularly in rural Ontario and in small towns, whom we don't know about.

I wanted to ask you if you had ever considered the kind of action that is at the basis of the British Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act, of which the first provision, which is the basis on which all the other provisions for the chronically sick and disabled are built, is that it shall be the duty of every local authority—as you know, in Britain local authorities look after social services all around—to inform themselves of the number of persons to whom section 29 of The National Assistance Act applies, that is the portion that deals with disabled persons.

In other words, one starts with finding out who the disabled people are and the need for making arrangements under that section for such persons. Until you know who your client group is and what they need, it's pretty hard to put a sensible service network into place. So I think that we don't need only a study to see how many people need cars or invalid tricycles, or whatever it may be for the disabled, but we need a study to find out just what disabled people we have in Ontario; and I don't think we really do know.

[5:45]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No; and it's very difficult to find out. We have a housing project with the care package involved in Windsor. Before they got under way, in an effort to find out just what the needs were, really, for housing accommodation for physically handicapped in Windsor, they did a survey. They had a great deal of difficulty in getting people to come forward even to register as being disabled and being in need of that kind of accommodation. They found it very frustrating.

These were a group of disabled people themselves who found out that disabled people, by and large, were very loath to come forward and acknowledge the fact that they needed that kind of particular accommodation. I've heard that many times, as far as transportation is concerned. Again, people just are not too willing to admit they're disabled unless they're desperately in need of transportation. I don't know how you'd go about getting that kind of information.

Ms. Sandeman: It's up to the government to devise the strategies, but I can think of all kinds of ways. We have this enormous pool of unemployed young people. Although we don't want to be only concerned with making short-term summer jobs, a very useful short-term summer project would be a kind of census in all communities which wish to do it, and ultimately I would hope all communities. It would be a census of every household asking the right kind of questions: "Do you have anybody living in this house who finds it difficult to move around? Do you have anyone living in this house who cannot leave the house because of"—et cetera.

We had an OFY project in Peterborough which did a survey of elderly people and turned up some really useful information. Unfortunately, the services to deal with the needs that were discovered haven't been put into place. That was taken just on a random survey basis. I would like to see us really getting into discovering disabled people.

The knee-jerk reaction is to say: "My God, the cost!" But in the long run, if you can free disabled people from the prison of their homes and have them working productively, as a proportion of them I know could if proper transportation were provided, then the cost benefits and the personal benefits begin to make some sense. We could discuss strategies for that. Put me on your advisory committee and I'll find you some strategies.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Next time around I'd be very happy to.

Ms. Sandeman: In the meantime, I'd like to be a little more specific, because what we have before us right now is what you're doing, not what in the best of all possible worlds you might do. I did notice that in section 5, page 6, of your briefing book the advisory council suggested to you that study is needed. Under the "action taken" column, there's absolutely no comment at all as to whether you intended to have a study or whether the advisory council should perhaps themselves set up a study. There is no comment at all as to whether you felt that was a good idea or a bad idea. Do you want to comment?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think the advisory council themselves are attempting to do a study or a survey in that area. It's just been brought to my attention that there is in British Columbia a voluntary registry for the disabled organized by the provincial government. Perhaps something like that might be a good idea, to allow people to register voluntarily if they were handicapped in any way.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes. It's certainly a start. The dangers of requiring registration are very obvious, but I think we have a duty to discover the number.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Don't you think with some of the programmes we do have under way—and I'm thinking of many programmes that are now available to handicapped people—word of mouth gets around that there are transportation facilities available now? There are many voluntary programmes available in many communities. With some of the voluntary programmes that are available for handicapped people and the educational opportunities, the more this becomes available and the general community becomes knowledgeable, you'll find more and more people coming forward and becoming involved.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, that's one way of doing it; and that's happening in my own community where we have an excellent and already overburdened transportation system for the disabled. But you only have the disabled people coming forward in that case because there is a service they can use. What we need to find are the disabled people for whom we are not providing services, so that we know what services to provide. Rather than thinking, yes, probably there is a need for a transportation service for the disabled in Peterborough, do a little pilot survey, find out that there is and put it on. We need, really, a whole spectrum of knowledge about who are the disabled, what they need and where they need it, rather than this ad hockery around the province. This isn't to say that the pilot study in Peterborough, at any rate—and it is the only one I can speak of at first hand on bringing public transportation to the physically disabled—isn't an overwhelming success. I would have to say that project got off the ground because of local initiative, by service groups and the disabled themselves, and it was then picked up on by the ministry, not the other way around. Transportation for the elderly and disabled and anybody who has trouble moving around, I

think that is an area in which this government is sadly lacking in provision of services.

I asked a question of you today in the House, Madam Minister, on income maintenance.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Ms. Sandeman: I was a little disturbed, as a matter of fact. I'd like to ask you about the timetable of this briefing book. It seems to me this briefing book has probably been prepared within the last couple of weeks. On many pages there's a date—21/4/77—and if that is so, and you were given this report on income maintenance from your advisory council in February of this year, why would you say in the briefing book prepared maybe just a week ago: "It is our understanding that this report is nearing completion and it is anticipated that the report and recommendations will be presented very shortly"? I'm suggesting that you already had it, and that the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would take exception to that remark. I had met with the committee on income maintenance for the physically handicapped. I went over to the advisory council's office and discussed the report with the members of that particular committee. I was not given the report. They told me they were prepared to make it public, which they did—I believe it was yesterday or the day before, I'm not too sure which. But immediately the report was made public I had sent copies to all of the ministers who are concerned with certain recommendations that are here; so there was nothing to suggest that it wasn't done immediately it came to my attention.

Ms. Sandeman: I see. You got it when we got it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes—officially, yes. But I had discussed the recommendations in the report back—when? about three weeks ago I believe it was.

Ms. Sandeman: Between February and the present time you had discussed the recommendations?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The recommendations that were in the report.

Ms. Sandeman: Did you then discuss with the people involved in the decision about the amount of increase for family benefits, the very clear and specific recommendations in this report about increases and the amount of increases necessary?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I have not discussed this report with the ministers involved in any of the recommendations. I have sent copies of the report to each of the ministries.

Ms. Sandeman: Is there any chance, then, that now you have this we shall see another speedy increase in the family benefits and the GAINS D payments, based on information which your advisory council has given you and which seems to be incontrovertible; and there are apparently detailed supplements available. One hardly needs it, for a lot of this—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It's an excellent report.

Ms. Sandeman: It is, excellent. When are you going to take action on it, then, to implement?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: In view of the fact that the ministers involved, and I think there are about four or five of them who have received copies, are outside of my policy field—for example the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has received a report, the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) has received a report and the Minister of Revenue (Mrs. Scrivener) were all involved in these recommendations, that's three ministries outside of this policy field—I would hope that just as soon as I have their responses we'll sit down and discuss it within our own policy field.

Ms. Sandeman: Are you going to push as soon as possible for increases to the level that is being suggested here? In fact, events have already overtaken them because they used figures from February and in terms of the increase in the cost of living we saw a two per cent increase last month. I'm really concerned, because I don't know what kind of feed-back you have been getting after the Minister of Community and Social Services, (Mr. Norton's), announcement last Thursday, but I have been hearing from family benefit recipients, particularly disabled people, an enormous amount of disappointment; in some cases tinged with despair.

They knew, because I had told them, that Mr. Norton had promised an increase and that he was looking at all the factors. They were hoping against hope they would be able to catch up. They really haven't been given a chance to catch up with their expenses.

Those disabled people who are aware of the existence of the advisory council I am sure will believe, perhaps naively, that the careful recommendations of the income maintenance committee, or whatever it's called, will be

acted upon. They will hope there'll be a kind of supplementary increase to last week's disappointing announcement. What I'd like to know from you is are you prepared, on behalf of the disabled people, to take the advice and recommendations that come from your advisory councils and really push them? I know the Treasurer is going to make his usual noises about where is the money coming from, but we have some priorities surely.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It has just been brought to my attention that increases since 1972 have averaged 12 per cent. I really am delighted with that advisory council, as I am with all of my advisory councils. I've found that the recommendations of this one in particular are always so reasonable and make such good common sense. With that comment I will be awaiting the responses of my colleagues in the other ministries and will be proceeding from there.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, they are full of common sense. They say that themselves. The council feels that the accompanying recommendations are workable, equitable and a matter of first priority. I'd agree with that. That's a red herring about the increase since 1972, because the last increase in the pensions for the disabled was a couple of years later than that and hasn't kept up with the cost of living since the date of the last increase. We would probably need nearer to a 16 per cent increase at this stage.

In the last two moments could I just ask you about a recommendation here that doesn't directly, though it might indirectly, involve the expenditure of money, and that's recommendation No. 11, which I hope would speak directly to you. It is recommended that married disabled females be allowed to apply for assistance under FBA, GAINS D in their own right. I think the present regulations, quite frankly, are in contravention of the Ontario Human Rights Code, because married disabled women are treated differently from married disabled men.

Once again, this has been brought to your attention. The advisory council in their usual common sense way say they can find no justification for this and recommend that it be changed so that men and women are treated equally.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I say, they are very reasonable recommendations. I can say no more.

Mr. Chairman: It is almost the time to adjourn. There is a desire to try to get some of the private members' bills heard. One of them that we've got which appears rather important is the private bill respecting the Brockville General Hospital. That was one of them. The other is the one that we're publicly advertising on. Is there any objection, if we can get the material and the people together Thursday, to meet on Thursday? Is there a problem there?

Mr. McClellan: Morning, afternoon and evening?

Mr. Chairman: After question period. Would that create an undue hardship?

Mr. McClellan: All three of us are speaking on the private member's bill.

Ms. Sandeman: I'm speaking on two private members' bills. Not that you can't keep it up.

Mr. McClellan: It's possible for the moment we could do it, but I doubt whether we could be here all the time.

[6:00]

Mr. Chairman: A lot of you are committed on other committees and I can appreciate it. I would have liked to have done it. I don't think I am going to force you to do it. I don't think I can force you to do it, but I don't think I would like to do that at any rate.

Mr. McClellan: Normally it would be possible, Mr. Chairman. It is just circumstance that three of the four of us on the committee are speaking on a private member's bill on Thursday afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: We may try to do it Monday.

Ms. Sandeman: I would just add that Mrs. Campbell's own private member's bill also will be before the House on Thursday, so it would be unlikely that she could be here.

Mr. Chairman: We will see if we can do it on Monday. Is it the understanding that we meet tomorrow at 2 o'clock?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

The committee adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 26, 1977

Social Development Policy programme S-27

Opening statement: Mrs. Birch S-27

Social development policy S-28

Adjournment S-50

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M.; Chairman (London North PC)

Secretariat for Social Development official taking part:
Wright, Dr. D. T., Deputy Provincial Secretary



No. S-3

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Social Development Committee

Estimates, Social Development Policy

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament

Wednesday, April 27, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1977

The committee met at 2:05 p.m.

ESTIMATES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I see a quorum and I will call the meeting to order. Just before Ms. Sandeman starts, with your permission, I'd like to go to no later than five o'clock today. Are there any objections?

Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, even though you look at me, Ross. You're very charitable, Ross. I'll make it up to you another time.

Mr. Conway: You're hardly objectionable, Marvin.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Can you determine how we're going to go to deal now with the votes?

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Sandeman was in the middle of her question so I think I'd like to allow her to complete it. You were in the middle of something else.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, to be quite honest, the material that I'm dealing with could either be taken under the first vote as policy or the second vote as councils.

Mr. Chairman: The item is vote 2601, item 1.

Ms. Sandeman: I suppose that's policy, isn't it? Everything's policy. It's a very arbitrary separation; could we have this changed?

Mr. Chairman: We could deal with item 1, item 2 or item 3 separately, or we can merge them and keep talking.

Ms. Sandeman: Could we have the Chair's permission to merge them and keep talking, because I find it a very artificial distinction?

Mr. Chairman: Does anyone have any objections to that?

Agreed.

On vote 2601:

Ms. Sandeman: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister to take a moment to introduce us to the members of her staff who patiently sit here?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I never thought about doing that. Dr. Wright, deputy minister; Hal Jackman; Joel—

Mr. Chairman: Joe who?

Ms. Sandeman: Joel who?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That says something, doesn't it? And Terry Jones, Joel Shapiro, Eileen Hammond, Peter Wiseman, Bill Wolfson, Maureen Quigley, David Bruce and John Nywening.

Ms. Sandeman: How do we know what they do? There are some charts, aren't there?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Joel, I know, is with the youth secretariat.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Would you like them individually to tell you what their responsibilities are?

Ms. Sandeman: Would you like them to do that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Fine.

Ms. Sandeman: No? Ross is saying no. He doesn't want me to waste the time of the committee.

Mr. Chairman: You want to guess, do you, Ross.

Ms. Sandeman: We'll do the socializing afterwards.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: All right.

Ms. Sandeman: I would like briefly to complete my remarks on the handicapped and then spend a little time talking about the senior citizens policy field.

Yesterday I think we were having some discussion of income maintenance for the handicapped, and I think I suggested to you that we are hoping to see some reaction—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If I could, I would like to clarify the comments that I made yesterday about income maintenance. The council's

first annual report made reference to a study which the council had undertaken on income maintenance, and mentioned a target date of November 1976. However, the council did not finalize its report until 1977; hence, that February date on the front of the report. It was at that time, in February, that the council sent the report to the printer. The council decided to give wide distribution to the report and particularly to let all of the various handicapped groups across the province have an opportunity to see it so that they would know what the council was recommending on their behalf to the government.

I attended a meeting with the members of that income maintenance committee of the council on March 22, at which time we discussed the recommendations and I received my own copy. I think the question that you raised yesterday was why the recommendations of the council were ignored when we announced the increases in family benefits last week. I guess now you appreciate that the council's recommendations were received after the decision had been made on the provincial budget, which included the FBA increases.

Ms. Sandeman: Which still leaves the other question hanging. Will you then ask for a very quick review in light of these recommendations?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think I indicated yesterday that I have circulated the report to the five ministries that are involved in the recommendations. I am awaiting their response, and then it will be taken into consideration in the policy field.

Ms. Sandeman: So much of what the handicapped require to make it possible for them to live as the rest of us do, with mobility within our own homes, depends on the kind of housing that is available to handicapped people. One of the suggestions that the advisory council made was that the homes of handicapped people should be eligible for modification under the home renewal programme.

Personally, I think the response of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) was really inadequate. What he is saying, in effect is, that if you are a handicapped person and your house meets the requirements and your income meets the requirements of the home renewal programme, then you, the handicapped person, at the same time as you are having your roof replaced or whatever, if it's your floors that need repairing, then you could have risers instead of steps put in or, if your stairs are unsafe, you can have them replaced with ramps.

[2:15]

But only handicapped people whose homes are in a sufficient state of disrepair to be eligible for OHRP and who have the income requirements would be considered. It seems to me that kind of piecemeal ad hoc approach is absolutely useless to the disabled, particularly as this programme, as far as we know, is to continue for only one more year. It seems so short-sighted to have the handicapped wait until their stairs are in bad repair to get them replaced by risers or a ramp.

What the Minister of Housing is saying here is that the ministry has no intention at all of modifying housing for the handicapped unless it comes under the OHRP programme. I really think, Madam Minister, that we have to be more aggressive than that in ensuring that the handicapped can remain in their own homes. So often the alternative is pressure on institutional facilities, which we know is undesirable for people who can remain at home; it seems so short-sighted not to have a home renewal programme for run-down housing which is what OHRP is for.

We are talking about a home renewal programme for the handicapped; this could be housing which may be in excellent condition but because the householder is a handicapped person, it needs some modifications. I can imagine, for instance, the situation in which a young couple buys a new bungalow in perfectly good repair, and not eligible for OHRP. The husband is involved in a serious car accident, becomes a paraplegic, and is confined to a wheelchair. There is no programme in place to help him modify his house as other jurisdictions have, recognizing that part of the rehabilitative process is to help people remain in their own homes and cope with a disability in their own homes. The minister's reply just wouldn't cover that kind of situation at all.

I don't want to belabour the point. I think the advisory council understands only too well the need for proper housing for the handicapped. But very little action is being taken.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Well, if I could just respond very briefly to that. I don't know if you are aware or not but the Ministry of Housing is certainly making available new housing with modification for people with disabilities; that is proving to be quite popular.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, that's under the OHC programme.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Ms. Sandeman: But it is unnecessarily disrupting to handicapped people to have to move from their own homes if minor or sometimes major modifications could be made on their existing places of accommodation. It just seems that there is a real reluctance to follow through with the philosophy which is enunciated so often—that the handicapped must be able to live in their own homes, places which they have chosen to live in. Yet so often we say: "We will only deal with you if you will move either to a new OHC unit or into an institution." Of course, many handicapped people don't want to move into an OHC unit. Why should they? They have their own home. Their only problem is that it has three steps up to the front door and it needs a toilet on the ground floor. Do that and they could stay there.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that's exactly what the ministry is attempting to do. One of the great problems, of course, is that many handicapped people are perhaps not aware that this is available to them, so it's incumbent upon the advisory council itself, through its member groups throughout the province, to make this information available to people, to tell them that there are programmes which will help them to stay in their own homes.

Ms. Sandeman: Who are the programmes administered by?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Housing has one. There are others through the rehabilitation and senior citizens bureaus of the Community and Social Services. They provide this kind of help to enable handicapped senior citizens to stay in their own homes. To chronic care patients, they provide carpeting in some instances. They provide for washroom facilities on the main floor. They help with the stairs, perhaps renovating a room as a bedroom on a main floor. All these things are in process. They are available.

Ms. Sandeman: That is age tested, in a sense, isn't it, for the seniors?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: For the seniors it would be, yes. Senior citizens who have physical difficulties.

Ms. Sandeman: The problem with so many of these programmes is that they are piecemeal and ad hoc and not readily available.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It is very difficult to put in a general policy right through that would meet the needs of all of these individuals, whether they be just handicapped people of one age or another or senior citizens. But I am sure the advisory council will be continuing to put forward recommendations in this area.

Ms. Sandeman: I don't know that it is very difficult, Madam Minister. I would take you back to The Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act from Britain, which requires the following provision of services to the handicapped:

"The provision of practical assistance in the home; assistance in obtaining wireless, television or similar recreation facilities; provision of lectures, games, outings or other recreational facilities outside the home, or assistance in taking advantage of educational facilities; provision for or assistance in travelling to and from his home for the purpose of participating in any services provided in the area; provision of assistance in arranging for the carrying out of any works of adaptation in his home or the provision of any additional facilities designed to secure greater safety, comfort or convenience; facilitating the taking of holidays whether at holiday homes or otherwise; provision of meals; provision of or assistance in obtaining a telephone and any special equipment necessary to enable him to use a telephone."

The Act goes on and on talking about accessibility to buildings, universities and schools, transportation and so on—an omnibus piece of legislation that talks about all the services that are needed for the disabled, and makes provision for them wherever they may be, and makes it mandatory that these shall be provided by, in this case, local authorities. Of course, as we discussed yesterday, the first provision of that Act is that the local authorities must first find the disabled people and having found them provide the services.

I think the problem we so often run into in Ontario, with services for children, for the elderly, for the disabled, whatever, is to pick away at small pieces of the services without looking at a whole person, part of a community, part of a family, and setting our priorities on that scale.

I would like to turn to the senior citizens—the programmes and the policies for seniors. I think again we really have to look at the provision of services for senior citizens on a global basis. We should remember that most senior citizens are not in need of institutional care, and more seniors than are in need of institutional care are in institutions—which

tells us something about what we have allowed to happen—and that the major needs of seniors are the same as for all other groups in society; a reasonable income; proper accommodation; transportation; less need for employment opportunities than for younger groups because many seniors prefer to retire and enjoy their retirement; and proper health services. And very important at the moment, proper alternatives to institutional care.

The whole problem of senior citizens' income, I think, is still an issue, when so many senior citizens find themselves living on very tight incomes. They are bitter about the tax back on earnings, 100 per cent tax back. They are concerned, many of them, about the tax structure. I know that doesn't come under your purview so we won't get into that. But they are concerned, many of them. I was interested to notice that in your briefing book you ignored one of the recommendations of the senior citizens' council. You didn't even mention it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh really? Which one was that?

Mr. Grande: One?

Ms. Sandeman: One. Well, there may have been others. I mean you didn't even mention it. In the first annual report of the senior citizens council, 1974-75, on page 5 they have a section on income maintenance. On the overall goals, interdependence, independence, and equity responsibility, they have some good recommendations to make to you. But on page 5 of that first annual report, they pointed out that for sometime now solid and reasonable figures have been discussed in many circles to obtain basic living costs for seniors. They note that the Hon. Marc Lalonde has requested that each province research this problem. They say: "Since time is running out for many of our 65s, the council has requested the Hon. Margaret Birch to obtain this information."

I looked in vain for some comment on that in the briefing book. You jumped immediately from their previous recommendations on income maintenance, land spec tax, and Canada Pension Plan to the section on Where You Live, subsidized housing for senior citizens, which is on the next page. Was the information obtained?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think I have a very legitimate reason for not including that. That is one of the recommendations and one of the areas of concern that they did express; they did become involved in it. At the same time, Metro Social Planning Council decided to do a similar study on income maintenance. It was the decision of the council itself that it would just be duplicating an effort and that they could put their members of the Senior Citizens Advisory Council on to something else and await the recommendations from the Metro Social Planning Council. That's why; it was their own decision. It was a choice of their own priorities that they decided not to go ahead with the study on income maintenance.

Ms. Sandeman: Given the fact that the Metro study is now out, and that the Metro study suggests that OHS, GIS and GAINS payments for a couple living in Metro fall considerably below what the Metro budget suggests is necessary, do you have any comments on that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I know that the chairman of the Senior Citizens Advisory Council took exception to some of the recommendations that came out in the Metro Social Planning Council report. I don't remember what the specifics were.

Ms. Sandeman: If I remember the comments of the chairman rightly, they were suggesting that perhaps the Metro Social Planning Council had included some budgetary items and allowed them perhaps a little more weight in the budget than the advisory council would have done. I studied those Metro budgets fairly carefully and it seems to me they were very realistic. They allowed for the fact that older people might like to drive a car, buy a newspaper, go to the movies and visit grandchildren. The suggestion is that in fact on the basic pensions available in Ontario, there is no money to spare after paying the average Metro rent, Hydro, food, heat, et cetera.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that's a very general sort of statement, if you will excuse me. It might apply to certain numbers of people but, generally speaking, across the province of Ontario, I don't think that's a legitimate estimation.

Mr. McClellan: That's not what the interministerial report says. They say that senior citizens can barely make ends meet. Again that's a direct quote. Do you disagree with your own senior officials?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I certainly feel that senior citizens in the province of Ontario today are not doing too badly.

Mr. McClellan: Why would the senior civil servants say they can barely make ends meet

and that they are being forced into residential care because they can achieve a higher standard of living inside institutions than they can in their own homes in own communities?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again I think that's a very general kind of comment.

Mr. McClellan: Well, your people made it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You would have to ask them to explain that.

Mr. McClellan: Don't you intend to ask them to explain it? They don't employ you.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: My own observations are that today in Ontario senior citizens are receiving far more than in any other jurisdiction.

Mr. McClellan: It's a shame that your own officials don't agree with you.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I don't think that's a shame at all; I think that's a very good state of affairs. I wouldn't want them all agreeing with me.

Mr. Chairman: Are you through?

Mr. McClellan: I am.

Ms. Sandeman: No, I am very happy for Mr. McClellan to give me some assistance here.

Mr. Chairman: I have a little trouble catching the voices, so I would like you to continue your presentation.

[2:30]

Ms. Sandeman: Okay. But I think he should feel free to get carried away, because I think what he's saying is very true.

Nobody is saying that all senior citizens in this province live in poverty; that would be unrealistic, untrue and irresponsible. But while we have a considerable number who are in severe financial difficulty, I think it is incumbent on the ministry to be concerned to answer the concerns of the advisory council about income maintenance, the concerns of the Metro council, the concerns reflected even in this very small project report on the needs of older people in Peterborough, which I mentioned to you last day and which was done on a very small sample group.

Of that small group, 17 per cent said that their present income did not satisfy all their financial needs, 16 per cent did not have enough money for any recreation or entertainment, 33 per cent didn't feel that they were looked after fairly in the levels of pension—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Was the study called While They Wait? Which one was that?

Ms. Sandeman: I'm sorry; it's called Getting in Touch, an OFY project report on the needs of older people in Peterborough, done in the summer of 1975.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh, I see; it was one that was done locally.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, it's a local thing but I think it is very representative in view of the fact that 33 per cent of them were not satisfied with the pension levels, 17 per cent couldn't satisfy all their financial needs on their present income, 16 per cent of them didn't have money for recreation and entertainment, 33 per cent had no access to a car—and that is an interesting figure, because the question was carefully phrased. It didn't say, "Do you have a car?" It said, "Do you have access to a car?" and qualified it by saying, "In other words, is there a friend or a relative who will help you with driving?" And 33 per cent said no. That says something about the need for proper transportation for senior citizens.

While I've got this open—it's a little beyond the problem of income maintenance, but it speaks to the real needs of seniors in one representative Ontario community—11 per cent of the people questioned had problems preparing meals. They made comments like: "We get tired of cooking." "I've got no appetite lately." "Sometimes I haven't the energy to go shopping." "Cooking for one is tough." All the kinds of things you might expect. Five per cent of them don't have a cooked meal every day. That's small in numbers, I grant you, in terms of the nutritional problems that suggests, if you extrapolate that across the province—and we are a very representative city—the nutritional needs of as many as five per cent of the elderly people in this province are not looked after properly. And you could perhaps take it to the 11 per cent of people who have problems preparing meals; if it's very tiring to prepare meals or if you have trouble with shopping, your nutritional level is apt to drop.

It seems to me that the problems of income, nutrition, transportation and housing are all very much tied in together. But the basic problem for a lot of people is not having sufficient income, sufficient income to buy nutritious food and not having to put out so much on your hydro bill, which has

increased 30 per cent for the second time in two years; otherwise, you really aren't buying the food you should be buying.

There was a comment I wanted to ask you about on the advisory council's recommendations on home care, which I think is a very basic concern. The ministry has obviously recognized that if we are to keep people out of institutions, we must provide proper back-up home care services. On page 6-11 of your briefing book, the comment is made that the Ministries of Health and Community and Social Services have already undertaken a detailed analysis of the home care services available by each ministry, and explored the various alternative ways in which such programmes can be made available on a co-ordinated basis at the local level. I wonder if you're ready to share some of that analysis and alternatives with us.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think, as I indicated I guess on the opening day with regard to the section of the report on residential services as it related to seniors, a great deal of work is ongoing in that area because we decided that the first priority was the residential services for children. The work on that particular area went ahead of the seniors. But there has been a great deal of work done. I did indicate that consideration is being given at the moment that because of the complexities of that whole area we might consider possibly a green paper be distributed on the whole residential treatment for seniors concerned, which would include, of course, homemaking and home nursing.

I think I also indicated the other day, when you weren't here, that the budget for homemakers and nursing services under Community and Social Services has increased from $5 million to $7.763 million, an increase of $2,763,600. Regarding the home care programme of the Ministry of Health, the budget for 1975-1976 was $13,200,000. Including supplementary estimates, the budget was increased to $18,680,500 for 1977-'78, an increase in excess of $10 million over a two-year period. I think that's a clear indication that the ministries recognize the need for this particular type of service to help those who would have the alternative of staying in their own home.

Ms. Sandeman: What kind of services is that extra money available for?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Homemaking and home nursing.

Ms. Sandeman: And what will be the criteria for provision?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course it's based on need, again.

Mr. McClellan: Are you saying that homemaking services have been expanded?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, they have been.

Mr. McClellan: That will come as big news to the Toronto Visiting Homemakers Association, won't it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't know that it would. It's been available. It's certainly public knowledge that the expansion in those programmes has taken place over the last two years.

Mr. McClellan: If you really believe that you're just totally deluded.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The figures speak for themselves.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, they do. And the staff reductions speak for themselves, and the reduction in 24-hour emergency service in the Toronto Visiting Homemakers Association speaks for itself.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Those are details that I'm sure you'll be able to speak about to the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) and the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) when they bring forward their estimates. Those are details that I just don't have available.

Mr. McClellan: It's called cutbacks.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It can hardly be considered a cutback when it's an increase of $10 million over a two-year period. I really can't consider that much of a cutback.

Mr. McClellan: You can pretend that there have been no cutbacks all you want—you're not convincing anybody.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm not trying to convince you, Ross, I think that would probably be impossible. I'm just explaining to you the figures are there. The increase has been allocated, and $10 million over two years hardly could be deemed a cutback in the services.

Ms. Sandeman: The report that the Council of Health did on the distribution of hospital and nursing home beds in Metro, which was the rationale apparently—although it's hard to see it within the report—for keeping

Doctors Hospital open, had some very interesting things to say on home care. This is prepared in the last few months, dated March 7, 1977, and presumably reflects the present conditions in Metro. I don't know if you have read this—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I haven't.

Ms. Sandeman: I'm sure you have. "Care in the Home: The homemakers services presently organized creates another bottleneck in the system. Many patients occupying expensive beds in active treatment hospitals could be discharged and sent home if they had someone to look after them. They do not require organized home care, which is technically defined as visits from a doctor, nurse or physiotherapist, but they do require help with everyday living, cleaning, shopping and so on. This is the role of the homemaker services.

"Unfortunately, an interview at home precedes the start of the service and there can be a two- or three-week gap before the homemaker arrives. In order to circumvent the problem, home care rather than homemaker service will be requested for a patient and the homemaker will be provided without delay for a patient that is already receiving home care. This is an obvious and expensive misuse of the home care service in order to free an even more expensive active treatment bed. It would seem far more fruitful to integrate the homemaker service fully with the home care system and place this expanded service under the aegis of the assessment placement agency. The homemaker service would then become one of the home care options for a patient upon discharge from hospital or nursing home and his eligibility to receive such help would no longer be contingent upon his requiring professional health services."

Their recommendation is that the organized home care programme be broadened by allowing homemaker services to be provided as a single option when appropriate. What they're speaking to there is the crazy bureaucracy at the moment which so often makes it impossible for people to get the services which they need when they need them. This is why I asked you about the criteria, because if the home care and the homemaker services are tied in together and depend upon a nursing component, then many people won't get the homemaker because they don't need the home care; and the home care, up until now, has not been available for chronic patients. So you get all kinds of people who don't fit the existing criteria.

The comment that was made in this report —not on the home care service, but on the nursing home service—contains a very illuminating little phrase which I think could be used about homemakers as much as about the nursing homes. They say about the bottlenecks: "The most disruptive bottleneck in the health care delivery system stems from the current ministry definition governing eligibility for nursing home care." They discuss that at some length and then they say: "Surely patient need takes priority over the funding structure. The system should be geared to the patient and not vice versa." I think that is what has happened with the home care system. The needs of the person are geared to the funding structure and the bureaucratic tests they have to go through. We really need a turn-around of that.

In this report there is some very tough criticism of the whole nursing home system at the moment, including the care in the home system and decision-making in the system. The report is fascinating. It purports to be about distribution of hospital and nursing home beds, but it has a lot of interesting and tough things to say about our health care delivery system.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If I may just respond to that, I don't think I would disagree with much of that report either. I think that is why I have indicated to you that the system for the provision of residential services for senior citizens requires a great deal of attention in order to alleviate some of the inequities of funding, placement, assessment—the whole range of services available. That is why I have indicated to you that I think it perhaps needs to have a very careful study, and that is what we are considering at the moment.

Ms. Sandeman: I wonder if it has been studied to death already. We have had study after study, and each of them—I think you're doing it again, either consciously or unconsciously—concentrates on the institutional services.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I think this would go in the other direction of de-institutionalizing and providing alternatives for those who require them.

Mr. McClellan: Where are the alternatives? Where are the programmes that make it possible?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I pointed out to you—

Mr. McClellan: It's not a matter of rhetoric; it's a matter of programmes and resources.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We have had three pilot projects providing home care for chronic patients. They are very successful. They provide a wide range of services to people in their homes. We indicated to you the other day that we have an employment programme to encourage people to become involved in home maintenance and the kinds of home care programmes that you were pointing out—doing shopping and those things that would enable senior citizens to remain in their own homes. There are many programmes under way at the moment.

[2:45]

I think the whole situation has to be looked at very carefully because there are inequities in the system. We know that. There are inequities in funding. There are inequities in facilities. I think the whole area is one that deserves a great deal of consideration.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, if I may just make an aside on the inequities. I think the inequity for me was really pointed up last week when the announcement was made of the home help programme—the programme in which young people will work with senior citizens. My daughter has got a job this coming summer, working for Natural Resources, I guess. I believe she's going to be taking tickets at the entrance to a provincial park. She will be paid $4.41 an hour, for which I say thank God, because it's expensive to send her to university. But what do we say about the priorities in this province when we'll pay her $4.41 an hour to take tickets, and we'll pay only $20 a day for people to work with senior citizens in their homes—a service, in my mind, so much more valuable? A machine can take tickets. You can drop money in a slot; it can issue them. There are all kinds of ways that you can issue tickets at the entrance to a provincial park. But there's no way to give people support and care and concern and self respect in their home, except through the human component, of people working for other people.

You say a lot to people about how you value their work by what you choose to pay them for their work. I find it offensive that we should pay some $4.41 an hour for taking tickets and $20 a day for working with senior citizens. There's something very wrong with our priorities. Both those jobs, in a sense, are make-work jobs for students over the summer, although you're telling us that the senior citizens project is long term. Therefore, it deserves even more long-term serious respects as a piece of work worth doing and worth paying for. I leave that comment with you.

I wanted to remark on the obsession that we seem to have in Ontario with institutionalizing, although we all give lip service to deinstitutionalizing, going the other way. I was most interested in that recent report by Nathan and Roberta Marcus—I'm sure you've read it—produced for Canadian Pensioners Concerned Incorporated and the Association of Jewish Senior Clubs. I was particularly interested because Peterborough was one of the areas they studied. They looked at the waiting lists for nursing homes and senior citizens homes in Thunder Bay and Peterborough, and the major thrust of the report was to try to find ways of reducing the time on the waiting lists, streamlining the process of getting people into the institutional beds.

Fair enough; that's a legitimate project to undertake—to cut down the time, cut out the duplication, get people into beds. But what I find so interesting about that report was that in nearly every case documented, the people didn't need institutional service. The problem for them wasn't the time on the waiting list. It was that they were in a sense being forced into an institutional setting and therefore onto the waiting list, for various reasons.

I looked at the Thunder Bay case. Case number one in Thunder Bay: The fellow said he liked being independent, would like a room with hot and cold running water, and had no desire to enter a senior citizens home. But because he didn't have hot and cold running water, he'd been encouraged to put his name down on the list for the senior citizens home. You know, that's thinking backwards. What that guy needs is hot and cold running water and his independence.

Case number two had to retire unwillingly at 65. The financial burden is what's driving him towards a senior citizens home because of the high cost of rent. He's applied to the senior citizens home only because there's such a long waiting list for Ontario Housing, and a senior citizens home would be cheaper; he considers it the least desirable alternative. The problem for him isn't how long he's on the waiting list for the senior citizens home—it's the fact that he can't afford to live where he is now. Ontario Housing doesn't have enough subsidized units, so he's forced into an institutional setting.

Case number three: The lady lives at the CNIB residence although she is not blind and

her daughter says: "What else could I do?" Well, there has to be something else that could be done.

Case number four: A confused and irresponsible old man who's a burden on his family and making great pressure on the marriage of his son, I guess, and daughter-in-law. One doesn't know the details of the case but one suspects that with good support systems, perhaps a day centre for that old fellow and some weekend support, he could stay at home.

Case number five: Geriatric patient in the hospital. She could manage to live on her own, the doctors say. She's been waiting for over 11 months for accommodation she can afford. Again, the senior citizens home is the only alternative.

I don't want to go through all these cases, but it seems to me that the Doctors Marcus have been blinded again by the institutional ethos. It's legitimate to want to try and cut down duplication pressure on the waiting list, but that isn't the problem for these cases they're documenting. The problem is that the institutions are just irrelevant, really, to their situations.

I was disappointed to see that Thunder Bay had more cases than Peterborough. I felt that that wasn't fair. I should have had a chance to look at more of Peterborough. They did comment that the waiting lists were inaccurate and incomplete. They had some good things to say about the waiting lists, and they decided that the high demand for residential care in Thunder Bay was mainly because of the shortage of adequate housing, the high rents, and the shortage of subsidized accommodation.

This brings us back once again to my first point about the real necessity for a decent income and decent housing being basic to all of us, and particularly for senior citizens. The institution, really, has been an expensive and unnecessary escape hatch. People in Peterborough apparently had problems not so much with the high rents but with maintaining their homes. Again, we're back to keeping going the accommodation that's available. Problems with transportation—and I would have expected that, having seen that 33 per cent without the use of a car figure that our students produced in 1975. Dr. Marcus just reinforces that. And social problems—people lonely, needing human contact and thinking they can find it perhaps in an institution. People needing assistance with housework, gardening, snow shovelling, and human contacts quoted again.

The conclusions included the fact that the Doctors Marcus found inadequate counselling services for the elderly person and his family, insufficient social and recreational outreach programmes, and acute need for nursing care for people who need heavy nursing and special care. So really we've got an oddly ironic situation. The people who desperately need heavy nursing care are unable to find it, and people who don't need to be in institutions are being forced through financial exigencies to go there.

Somehow we have to reach the point of a co-ordination of transportation, housing, social and health services for the elderly. Maybe we have to get at it through a green paper. I guess I just get a little impatient—we all do—with the studies and the—I'd like us just to take hold and start doing it.

I was looking at some figures. I think I'd better stop here.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If I could just make a comment on that "beautifully written profile," as it's been referred to. The profiles are really composite.

Ms. Sandeman: I know.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This makes it a little fictionalized, which is unfortunate.

Ms. Sandeman: It's fictionalized, but it's composite and presumably therefore reflects the reality of what they found.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I have a rebuttal from the people who are involved in Thunder Bay which I would like, if you're not aware of it—

Ms. Sandeman: Yes.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —in response to this. Have you seen it? "A report prepared by University of Toronto researchers on elderly persons waiting for institutional care in the city has been criticized by city officials as inaccurate. Roberta Marcus was commissioned last spring to interview persons on waiting lists in this city and in Peterborough. The study was ordered by Pensioners Concerned and the Association of Jewish Senior Clubs' Co-ordinated Services to the Jewish Elderly. In the study, Mrs. Marcus said that elderly persons in Thunder Bay wait eight months to a year for normal care in homes for the aged and from one to two years for nursing care.

"Both Don MacLeod, director of social services, and Dan O'Gorman, administrator for homes for the aged, said entrance into the homes for persons requiring normal care

is almost immediate. Persons requiring extended care usually wait four to six months, according to Mr. MacLeod. He said her conclusions implied that most persons on the waiting list were extremely poor, but a survey of persons entering city institutions showed that only 10 per cent had liquid assets of less than $1,000 and 28 per cent had assets of more than $10,000. Mr. O'Gorman said the institutions are paid by the clients as means permit and the deficit, whether in normal or extended care, is made up by provincial and municipal governments." Which seems to me to be an indictment of the report.

Ms. Sandeman: I read that, and I was interested in that, because in a sense it bears out my thesis. We had the same kind of comment—and I've got the cutting from the Peterborough Examiner—that questions the time on the waiting list. But do you see what has happened? A part of the report that everybody is concerned with is whether or not people have to wait the length of time to get into institutions. Neither the original report, nor the people providing a rebuttal, really gets at alternatives, at the kind of thing that the profile suggests.

There was a report in the Peterborough Examiner, saying, "People on the list often find beds in larger nursing homes before they're offered places in the small homes. Average waiting time to enter the home"—this is our senior citizens home—"is six months. Many of those on the list will have found places elsewhere or may have changed their minds." They take issue with that, but that's the institutional point of view.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's right.

Ms. Sandeman: All the people who were interviewed—and I know them all; Mr. Lovelady, the fellow who runs Fairhaven, and Marg Purtell, who is the discharge officer at the hospital—were institutional people talking about the waiting lists to get into their institutions. They're doing a fine job; there's no doubt about it. But we're obsessed—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: With institutions.

Ms. Sandeman: —with institutionalization.

Let me finish by trying some figures on you. We could argue about these, but it has been suggested that an adequate ratio of home helps—that's not home care but your home help personnel—would be a guideline of 12 full-time home helps per 1,000 of the elderly population. If you extrapolate that to Ontario, we would need 8,500 full-time home helps. I don't think we have that many. I don't think our $100-a-week programme is going to do that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think it was ever intended to provide that.

Ms. Sandeman: No.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that's unfair.

Ms. Sandeman: I'm suggesting that if you take a ratio which other communities and jurisdictions are working towards to keep people out of institutions, we're falling very far behind. For instance, look how far behind we are in housing. It has been suggested by CMHC that a proportion of 15 per cent of all housing for senior citizens should be co-operative, non-profit or geared-to-income housing. We have less than five per cent of that kind of housing for our senior citizens. We're way behind in housing. We're way behind in providing home help.

There was a suggestion about the number of meals on wheels you might need. Given the fact that so many people in Peterborough, and I suspect in other centres, are not getting proper nutrition, it has been suggested that an adequate guideline for meals on wheels is 200 meals per week per 1,000 elderly. My arithmetic has never been my strong point, but I figure if that's true, then in Ontario we should be serving about 142,000 meals a week. I don't think we are. One could go on. We don't begin to meet any of the basic guidelines that other jurisdictions are working towards as a minimum.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: May I ask what other jurisdictions?

[3:00]

Ms. Sandeman: I'm taking these figures from The Priorities for Health and Personal Social Services in England: A Consultative Document, published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office at £1.60 net. It's a 1976 consultative document, the kind of thing you are talking about. Let's set our priorities. Let's set up guidelines. Barbara Castle's guidelines are for a ratio of 12 per thousand home helps and 200 per week per thousand elderly meals on wheels. For home nursing the guideline is for one per 2,500 to 4,000 elderly persons according to local needs of home nursing. For day-centre places the guideline is three to four places per thousand. I don't think we are into the day-care concept for elderly people except in a very minimal way.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We do have some outreach programmes and centres for the aged.

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, we have outreach programmes that you can count on the fingers of one hand. In chiropody services, we are woefully lacking in foot care for elderly people. The last figure I saw from Britain suggested that 14.9 per cent of the senior citizens are receiving regular chiropody care and they still feel that they are not doing enough. In 1974 they had in Britain 1,400 whole time equivalent chiropodists. Their population is larger, but if you break that down it's about one per 5,000 elderly. We are very low on all of those. I could go on. They've got criteria for residential placements.

It is not always fair to compare one country with another because our economic, social and geographic needs and so on are different. But it's very interesting that their minimums are so far above anything that we have now. I think we've been very slow in looking at co-ordination of care for the elderly. I just hope that year after year when the advisory council comes and talks to you about housing, income maintenance and transportation that we don't get replies that say we didn't get the income maintenance response in time to take it into account—I know that wasn't your fault —and then ignore it.

When we talk about housing, I hope we are not fobbed off with saying they could work through the OHRP programme and when we talk about home care, we are not fobbed off by being told there's a $100-a-week make-work programme for unemployed young people. The care for any of our citizens is too important to be dealt with on an ad hoc piecemeal basis like that, particularly for senior citizens who have given so much to the community and somehow feel now that they are being sloughed off in return.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think in all fairness you are talking of a small percentage of the senior citizens of this province who would fall into that category of needing so many of the programmes that you are talking about. By and large, the senior citizens in this province either are recipients of the many programmes that are available to senior citizens—

Mr. McClellan: Institutional programmes.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Not necessarily, not all of the senior citizens of this province are in institutions by any stretch of the imagination. The larger percentage of them are very independent and doing very well. But there is that minority number who do need the very things you are speaking to. I don't deny that at all.

Mr. Grande: That they are doing well? Where do you get that information?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: One only has to visit as many senior citizens as I do and one only has to receive the delegations that come in from the United Senior Citizens of Ontario and the Pensioners Concerned. I receive the delegations twice a year. I speak with them and I take their recommendations. I would say over the past two or three years the recommendations they have been putting forward are in the areas of—I can think of one area where they would like to have free prescription glasses and hearing aids. But when it comes to the other areas, there is very little they are saying about the needs of senior citizens in the way of many of the programmes you have been suggesting.

Mr. Chairman: Ms. Sandeman, are you through?

Ms. Sandeman: Yes, temporarily. I guess I've had an hour. We seem to be splitting it up an hour at a time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Conway, did you wish to comment or ask some questions?

Mr. Conway: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but I shall try to confine my remarks to two or three topics and perhaps we can revert because I know other members are anxious to offer some comments and judgements.

Did I understand earlier from the Chair that we have decided to take the vote in its entirety and not to distinguish items? Then that really makes me want to ask in very general terms some basic questions and to elicit, if possible, from the minister particularly some comments on what I would determine to be two or three major questions in today's Ontario community on the matter of social policy. I think there are two or three things that are reasonably current and two or three things about which at least some members of the government have made some rather interesting pronouncement.

I can't resist the temptation, although many others may have mentioned this in earlier deliberations—and I apologize for my dereliction in not having been present—but I was just noticing in the representative list of policy items reviewed by the secretariat staff, page 2-1, that couched in the second column is an oblique reference to the OECA network expansion. Having regard to some of the earlier things we were encountering this week I just wondered whether or not you would care to

offer from the point of view of OECA any comments on what we have discussed and what we have learned as to what some of the inner workings of that body have been, and whether you as a minister had any concern about the kinds of things that emanated from within that particular, if peripherally, related body to which this particular page makes some reference. What did you think of the internal report of OECA this week? Did you have any comments you wanted to make?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: My own personal comment would be that there was a serious lack of judgement.

Mr. Conway: Right. Well, that's kind of unfair. I just thought I would perhaps be picayune. There are two or three items that have been quite front and centre and I want to get some judgement from you, not as to what you as a minister think we might do or what you as a minister might think the government might do, but what you as a minister and as a member of a government think we can as a society and as a government do about items that are often referred to in here, areas particularly relating to pornography and racism. I wanted to get at the outset, because I wanted to keep my initial comments very general, what you think in the area of social policy a government—any government, but this government is a good place to start—can do about the growing tendency, at least the growing concern, in the area of pornography as an apparent evil in our society. What do you think you can do about it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: For one thing I think it would be very difficult to stop it from coming on to our bookshelves and into the bookstores. Everyone's assessment of pornography certainly is not the same. What I might consider very distasteful you might condone. I didn't mean that to come out exactly the way it sounded.

Mr. Maeck: Probably true though.

Mr. Conway: I shall let the archbishop decide.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would hate to be put in the position as a government of having to censor and make decisions on what I felt was pornography and what I thought should be done about it, but I certainly have a very strong feeling about its accessibility. I have a very strong feeling that it should not be permitted where young children might have access to it. I guess that gets down to the distribution of those kinds of questionable materials that are abroad throughout the province.

Mr. Conway: All right. To carry that just a few steps further, you have landed, I think justifiably, at the area of distribution. We found a month ago the federal Minister of Revenue stopping distribution of certain materials in this area. What do you think the government of Ontario can do or should do in that regard? You have identified the area as distribution. Do you think it's the function or the role of government, as you see it, to get involved and how do you control that kind of distribution effectively?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The entrance of it into Canada is a federal responsibility and so that determination would have to be made at that level of government as to what they thought appropriate to enter the country and what they didn't. I never happen to have seen a copy of that particular magazine that was stopped, so I couldn't really comment on whether or not I would consider that pornographic.

Mr. Conway: But to the extent that any of this circulates internally, have you regard to the fact that it may actually have entered the country? Let's just suppose that it is circulating internally; what do you suggest that we might do, if the government pursues the line very avidly articulated by the Attorney General? What can you do?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think it would be very difficult to introduce any legislation that had to deal with it because of the whole difficulty of censorship, where it begins and where it ends. I think you have to leave it up to local people to make the decision about the accessibility of all kinds of literature that might be classified as pornographic and as to where that should be displayed.

Mr. Conway: So then you are essentially saying that in this area about which there has been considerable provincial government pronouncement there is nothing really that we can do as a government.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that individuals have to start taking exception and making their wishes known, if they do business in stores where it is displayed. If they would like to have it removed, I think it's up to individuals and communities to make those wishes known to the proprietors of stores that they don't approve of it. I think that that's where the pressure should be. I just don't see that we could introduce legislation and I don't think we could enforce it.

Mr. Conway: All that you have basically said and concluded is that in this area—and I am not disagreeing with what you are saying, I just want to clarify it in my own mind—there really is nothing the Ontario government can, in your estimation at least, effectively legislate.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Those are my own comments. I don't know if legally there is anything else that the Ontario government could do. I just think it would be very difficult to enforce something that has to do with censorship of what one person believes to be pornographic and someone else might not. I just feel that it should not be so readily accessible to young people.

Mr. Conway: In a related area—and I notice there's considerable reference to it in the areas of multiculturalism that have come forward, certainly in an ongoing debate and particularly in Metro over the past year or two—is the whole question of racism in our society and how that bears upon social development in government. What do you think government might do there?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't know about government per se again, because you can't impose legislation and make people like one another and make people stop making rude remarks and making life difficult for those they don't agree with. I think if more communities across this province were doing some of the things we are doing in Scarborough, perhaps that might be helpful.

We have a programme in Scarborough whereby new immigrant children who come into our school system are encouraged to share with fellow students their culture, right to the point of having the families come in, cook a meal of their own culture in the school, talk about the history of their country, get to know everything they can learn about the other person's background and have those people take pride in sharing the culture of their own country with children from other cultures.

I think racism, really, when you get right down to it, is based on ignorance. It's based on ignorance about how other people feel, think and live. Unless we can get to young children and get them to understand what it's all about and how to live with and understand and respect other people, then we can never hope to overcome it. I think it has to start within the school system.

Mr. Conway: Aid to the Third World is a topic of some priority in this building at least, as indicated by the Premier (Mr. Davis): I realize again it doesn't have a direct bearing on domestic social development policy, although I think many of the councils and the related agencies of this secretariat have a very deep concern and an ongoing interest in and about aid to the Third World.

[3:15]

If you were being hypothetical or perhaps otherwise advising the decision-making authority, wherever that might reside in this province, what would your advice be on the recommendations that are presently before your government?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Obviously it's under consideration at the moment, so I'm not about to make any comment.

Mr. Conway: Is there no judgement? It has been under consideration I suppose since at least the Hilliard report was offered.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, there's been a recent meeting at which I attended with the Premier and Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). At that time, a commitment was given that we would look at some of the new proposals they had brought forward and that there would be a follow-up meeting within the month.

Mr. Conway: In general policy terms, does a province have a role in the federal community? Does a province, in your estimation, have any role in that international area?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again, with respect, I think for a policy that is under discussion at cabinet it is not appropriate for me to say how I feel at this moment.

Mr. Conway: All right, I'll presume that we'll know in the fullness of the first week of the election campaign.

Not too very long ago our good friend the member for Eglinton (Mr. McMurtry), in a much-publicized speech in my part of Ontario, in the Belleville area, offered some interesting comments about another general area.

Mr. Chairman: Would all the way down to Belleville be part of the member's area?

Hon. Mr. Birch: I think it is.

Mr. Conway: Eastern Ontario, while ignored by the government, still exists in its own right.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's a little unfortunate because it certainly isn't ignored.

Mr. Conway: The minister made a statement in the Belleville area as to what he thought might be a new relationship between young people particularly and marijuana. When he returned to Toronto I think he amended that. In general terms, the position he took in Trenton or Belleville was a basically soft position, that we should be relaxing our attitude to the whole business about marijuana particularly. There seemed to be a great deal of consternation among certain elements of the government when he returned to Toronto that night.

I wondered in the area of social development and policy relating thereto, how you and your ministry felt about something which I think is pretty relevant to people of my generation? Do you share in any way, shape or form the views of the Attorney General which were essentially that we should be relaxing our traditional approaches and views?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: To be perfectly frank, I think we're straying far away from the estimates. As to policy, that is a federal responsibility, as you are well aware. We can make all kinds of comments about what we feel, but when it gets right down to it it's the federal government's responsibility to make those determinations.

Mr. Conway: It seems to me there's a considerable reference in some of this to drug abuse, and I presume that that might have some relationship. I appreciate what you're saying. Some of these questions, I hope, bear some relationship. What you're saying, if nothing else, is that our much-publicized Attorney General in terms of his own jurisdiction is largely irrelevant, because he's making and being widely reported on statements that deal with materials over which he has absolutely no control. I think we'd want to put that on the record.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If we went back—and I think this should also be indicated on the record—he was speaking to a group of young people. My understanding is some of his comments were taken out of context in the follow-up newspaper stories.

Mr. Conway: Am I to conclude from what you say that you really think the whole business of marijuana does not have any bearing on the social development policy for the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I didn't suggest that.

Mr. Chairman: In relation to this, Mr. Conway, if I can intervene as chairman, the area we are dealing with is estimates, not necessarily the philosophy of the policies of the minister.

Mr. Conway: I just wanted to ask—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me, if the minister wishes to editorialize some of her personal comments I have no objections. But I think in fairness we're dealing with the estimates.

Mr. Conway: Just on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I well appreciate that. I look at the vote, particularly item No. 1, which says "social development policy." I always assumed this secretariat was to determine in general and overview terms the reaction of the community as expressed to the government on such general questions as drug use in our society. I just wondered if the ministry or the secretariat had a point of view on the whole question?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Conway, as far as I'm concerned if the minister has a point of view she is more than able to respond. I'm just saying that we're dealing with the estimates. Does the minister want to give a point of view?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm quite prepared to give my own point of view, but I'm not prepared to comment on the Attorney General's point of view, which was his own personal point of view.

Mr. Conway: All right, your own personal point of view.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would be adamantly against legalizing marijuana. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Conway: Would you care to embellish that or amplify that as to reasons?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Just as simply as that. I see no reason to legalize marijuana.

Mr. Conway: I'm not saying necessarily legalizing it, I'm suggesting that perhaps taking away some of the really stiff penalties that may not be relevant in this day and age.

Mr. Chairman: Have you any observations you wish to share with us as to how you feel about it?

Mr. Conway: I think it is the prerogative of government to explain the position that only they, as the executive council, can offer, as the Premier tells us. I am not here to philosophize, I am here to ask some questions.

Mr. Chairman: The government's position is that they are not in favour of marijuana right now, are they?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's right, absolutely, that is our position.

Mr. McClellan: You're supposed to be neutral.

Mr. Conway: You've taken, I think, a very justifiable position. I'm just interested in hearing some of your own personal justification. You believe we should basically stick to a pretty hard-line position on the whole marijuana question, and that in fact any effort to decriminalize it would be met by you personally with a strong reaction in the negative.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I pointed out to you before, it is a federal decision.

Mr. Conway: But you indicated just earlier that—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: My own personal view. I didn't say that it represented the view of the policy field, the secretariat or anyone else. It's my own personal view, from being involved for many years in the drug problems back when I was a member of the board of health in Scarborough and seeing some of the victims of both soft drugs and hard drugs. There's just no way that I would feel comfortable in being party to legalizing it.

Mr. Conway: The question then, of perhaps more immediate and direct relevance, because I would be the last person to stray from the topics at hand, is the question of youth and alcohol, alcohol advertising and the like. I think, specifically, of sections 4-9 and 4-10. I wonder if you have anything of an update to offer to us at this time on the whole matter of where the government stands on that very interesting question of youth and alcohol?

Mr. McClellan: You are obsessed with drugs today.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm having difficulty finding the section.

Mr. Conway: I'm looking at section 4-10—Subject: Youth and Alcohol. I'm just going to keep it general. "The recommendations contained in the youth secretariat report on youth and alcohol required a co-ordinated response from a number of government ministries." Well understood. I wonder where we stand with that co-ordinated response? Perhaps the member for Mississauga North (Mr. Jones) might comment on where we stand right now with that proposal and with any legislation that might be forthcoming.

Mr. Jones: I am happy to comment. There were 32 recommendations in that report, as you well know. Some seemed to have the most focus of attention, some of them almost, unfortunately, to the exclusion of some of the others that we felt very strongly about. The report, as you may know, came to the cabinet as a whole and my minister, of course, co-ordinated an ad hoc special committee of cabinet. A lot of those recommendations—you mentioned one specifically; the advertising side of it is presently, as you may know, in front of the select committee on highway safety, which I understand, and I am a member of that committee, is about to bring down its first paper for tabling in the House. I think they expect that within a week or so. Some of your colleagues had a lot to say about that. I know your former leader has had some comments about the advertising, so I think it's being well discussed in a lot of appropriate areas, as well as the justice field, social development field, and the others that apply.

So I would think we are on the doorstep, as far as some of the major recommendations are concerned, of seeing comment not just by government people who have been studying it but also by the House as a whole. The select committee has touched on no less than about seven of the major recommendations including age, including lifestyle advertising, the driving, the whole issue of penalties, spinning out of the driver safety side of the alcohol problem.

Mr. Conway: You say we are on the doorstep of some government responses. Does that mean that we can expect, let's say, a position on the drinking age, which is, I think, probably the most high-profile of the decisions that will ultimately have to be made on that whole report?

Mr. Jones: It may be the most high-profile of them but we never did pretend that it was the number one issue. What I'm saying is not necessarily at this stage the government view, because here the select committee is taking a rather realistic and non-partisan look at it and it has the latest information. The youth and alcohol report did open some important doors, to my way of thinking, for communities to be discussing it, young people to be discussing it.

I can tell you now as the youth secretariat continues its visitations to high schools for one, where it is a big topic, as you know,

as well as a big problem, they are lifting the blinds on the subject. They are making a lot of comments to us. Yes, it's true, they sometimes talk about marijuana and some of the other side issues to it, but they recognize that as the other drugs have abated somewhat, alcohol has been the one that has filled that gap. They have had a part in some of those recommendations, as you well know, and there has been a specific government response to some of them.

You will note that young people said at the very outset that we should have tougher control over the availability. That's where age popped into the subject. One of the ones they felt very strongly about, those of the under-18 group as it stands at present, the illegal drinkers who have now moved in in advance of the legal age, they need some kind of a picture identification, as you may remember. You will notice that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) responded by making the age of majority card the only acceptable identification at the liquor outlets. That has resulted in quite an increase. About 20,000 of those cards were out the last time we heard from the ministry, whereas they had been available for two or three years before that and they only had 3,000 out.

That was a response by the government to something young people thought was really important and that had to happen. You'll note that the select committee is carrying forward further our other recommendation that ideally, rather than select just an age group, a picture on the driver's licence was something we wanted the government to look at. You've probably heard comments by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and you'll notice in the select committee that there is a recommendation coming forward. I think that was pretty well open to the press. Your colleagues would know, they voted on it.

Mr. Conway: As for the select committee, this is what I would expect. As you say, I think it has been very positive in its deliberations, and extremely divided along the lines that only the personalities, I suppose, would explain it. It was my determination—

Mr. Jones: No. I don't think so.

Mr. Conway: Well, it seems to me that, at least from the cosmetic point of view, the drinking age certainly may not be the number one priority, I'm not saying that, but it seems to me it is probably the most talked about, if my experience in an obviously non-drinking part of Ontario has any bearing on the topic.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Why is that so? In Ottawa?

Mr. Conway: The Ottawa Valley is known for its historical temperance—by the Irish in particular. I wanted to know from the parliamentary assistant what his view is of the dilemma of the drinking age thing in particular? I have got a whole series of related problems, I think, of the hearings that were held in Pembroke, where the thing was discussed in a related way. As someone who's probably been far more closely associated with it in the last two years than any of us, what do you see as the real dichotomy, the real dilemma or problem that has to be settled?

Mr. Jones: I think we found rather early on that the youth and alcohol question was probably the most sensitive and the one the government should be addressing itself to the soonest. Nevertheless, it was all just a part of the overall increase in drinking by all age groups.

[3:30]

We found early on not only from the ARF and the other jurisdictions—and I might say the select committee that has done even more recent work on it—that it's an increasing social problem for all age groups. It's probably the most sensitive in the younger age groups and that's why we're addressing ourselves to some of those groupings. Some of the probationary licence proposals and other things that are before the select committee and about to come forward are a direct result of that.

We did find some of the things that we're seeing being done positively by the government have increased. Take our advertisements on the media, on TV, by the Ministry of Health. We're getting a very positive comment from young people. As I say, we're continuing our dialogues as part of our mandate as a youth secretariat on current issues of the day. You can understand about alcohol. Young people tend to be a little sophisticated about it. They get into some of the other root causes, such as youth unemployment, which the youth secretariat, as you know, is working full blast on.

As we talk to young people, we find they're actually applauding the government for telling of the other side of the story to help offset some of the heavy lifestyle, media advertising which they see as a very real cause

and effect, especially to the younger age groups.

Mr. Conway: What kind of a dialogue are you initiating within the government to resolve or at least to talk out the obvious conflict of interest that's involved? Clearly, on the one hand we recognize the social problem; on the other hand, we've got the situation where considerable moneys are derived therefrom. I think of some smaller communities in my part of Ontario where the most spectacular and the most recent new government building is a beautiful new liquor store. I'm just wondering has there been a discussion entered into by people like yourself with some of the people who depend on the revenue?

Mr. Jones: I've heard this comment before, that there's some great perceived wealth, and certainly there are dollars that flow into the provincial coffers. We're all aware of them. I don't think there's anybody on any side of the House that wouldn't get up and agree 100 per cent that he'd be happy to forego the money that might come from young drinkers, for example. I'll go for that very happily. As we found set out in our report, the dollar costs to the ministries just in the social development field were horrendous.

We found 10 per cent of the hospital costs traced back to it. I shouldn't say we did. The Addiction Research Foundation has articulated that several times, and they've updated it. Some of the other social costs all amounted to an awful lot of money, which is greater than what we've been taking in. We'd be happy to see the reverse. That's why the thrust is in that direction.

I think you were saying something about the different ministries, I guess that was what you were alluding to.

Mr. Conway: There's a public perception of government, whether we like it or not, as having an obvious conflict of interest in this regard, and I agree with you that many governments would happily forego their involvement with the liquor trade because of the social costs.

Mr. Jones: This one too.

Mr. Conway: I would perhaps retort to that that the costs involved are more long-term, more deep-seated and more difficult to quantify. The benefits are perhaps less, but obviously so. In other words, the dollars that flow in are needed, they're there and we depend on them in the very short term. That probably doesn't necessarily need to count for a great deal. But I was thinking particularly of someone the other day who was talking about the budget and saying that by dependence on the revenues gained from cigarettes, for example, we make it more difficult for us to make a social decision in another direction. Whether or not he was correct, I don't know, but he was making that position from a relatively informed lobby. I forget which one it was—the non-smokers perhaps. I think of that in a related way with the liquor business.

Mr. Jones: As you said, I've been very close to it, and I have. I've followed the recommendations as they went to cabinet and I was happy to see that my minister was co-ordinating those with the other ministries that are involved. We did in a report, as you remember, set out where we thought each of those recommendations should go, either to one or a composite of ministries. We've been delighted to see how they've made it a priority, and I can tell you they have.

I'm also happy to see—and I said it from the outset—that the age thing, for example, was an all-party decision. As it is being talked to now, I'm happy to see it's stayed out of the political football arena. People really have talked to it, as I've seen members from all parties do in this most recent occurrence of the select committee. But the government, be it any of the key ministries that are involved or those that had side effects to it, certainly hasn't thought in any terms about anything other than the big social cost as number one. I don't think the revenue that's taken from it, has ever been any factor in anybody's thoughts as I've looked at it. I know, unfortunately, that's perceived to be so by some people.

Mr. Conway: The question really was has there been any discussion with the other side in this whole debate?

Mr. Jones: What side are you talking about? The ministry that might take the money in.

Mr. Conway: No, the Liquor Commission, as to their thoughts on the whole problem.

Mr. Jones: The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has been very close to all the discussions that have taken place with the federal government, and some have about the advertising situation. Our minister, Mrs. Birch, has visited the other ministers from across the country, and Mr. Lalonde. All of the dialogue that has flowed from that report has had a sense of urgency about it. It's

moving carefully because we're all aware that some of these things could cause a reaction by young people. You're talking about their nature. A disrespect and kind of backlash to what we're out to achieve would be a wrong way of going about it, so we're going carefully in some things and yet with urgency on others.

Mr. Conway: Coming back just to reiterate what you said earlier, we are approaching the doorstep of decision.

Mr. Jones: I'm only talking about several of the key issues coming out of the select committee but they also happen to be key recommendations that were in our report. And we in the youth secretariat did pass our updated comments along to that select committee.

Mr. Conway: Finally, I have some questions on Experience 77 which may turn out to be an experience for us all.

Mr. Jones: Why do you say that?

Mr. Conway: I want to commend the ministry, because of experiences we've had in our area, for the collating of that booklet which is very useful from my own riding office point of view. I don't believe the federal government does it. They're quite inadequate in many areas and that's probably one of them.

Mr. Jones: They're learning from us in some of their reports.

Mr. Conway: Well, to be sure. There's nothing worse than the deficiencies of governments that are dominated by the same party for generations, quite independent of what stripe or colour.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Speaking federally.

Mr. Conway: Speaking governmentally. But I must say that I think that's very worthwhile. It's very useful and it certainly speaks well for some of the planning that goes on.

What reaction have you had from the private sector? I notice a lot of discussion about it in the last few days. Apparently there's a misunderstanding or a little bit of confusion about the Ontario youth employment programme since last Tuesday when it was clearly stated. What has been the response of the private sector to the offer that has been made?

Mr. Jones: It's excellent. At this point they're still asking for details of it, as you may guess. They are working through two processes. They're going to Manpower offices which are informed on the procedure. They're also coming directly to us. Yesterday, for example, I spoke with the president of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. They asked if we would supply to their offices copies of these applications in numbers sufficient so that their constituents could have them at hand. This apparently followed a discussion with their directorship where they think the programme is excellent to meet the need.

The number one need is youth unemployment. We've done admittedly a lot. As part of the budget, there was yet another increase in the Experience programme, bringing that from last year's $12 million to a total now of $15 million in that area. But we have to watch it very carefully. There's a line, as I'm sure you appreciate, where if it gets into the area of make-work per se, then young people naturally realize we're moving very much away from the Experience thing. This is why we had to move to the private sector because there was very much a need for young people to be harnessed into that. Young people have been telling us, as we go through the province on our career development programme, that they've had some of their expectations out of whack. Now they realize they're in a very tight market, especially students now coming on top of the normal unemployed. We hope this type of programme would help reduce the barriers to the private sector. We've had the argument, on the other hand, lower the minimum wage—and that's an answer —and then we'll hire many. This is the private sector talking to us from different quarters.

In this way, we satisfy the needs of the young people and they gain experience, that most important of all components, as you said was in this pamphlet, but it would be in the private sector mainly, where 85 per cent of them are going to work in the final analysis anyway.

The nature of the questions that we're getting from employers are such that, hopefully, this programme seems to be going in the direction that probably 75 per cent of employees are looking for people to become permanent employees. This is a help, to give them experience so that they can rationalize taking an experienced person with someone who didn't have the experience, which may have been a hangup for them as to why they didn't hire young people before.

We got a typical call yesterday from a woman who has just a one-person operation, her own little business. She's had extra work that she could take someone on, but she was unable to do it because the economics just didn't quite fit yet, until someone had experience. If she could have got a young experienced person to join with her she would have done it. This dollar bonus has caused her to make the decision she had been putting off and take on a young person and she will train her. Out of that, an ongoing job would probably evolve, because the normal process is working now. They're not going to endorse the young people in the normal way, but employers are putting cards in their windows and they're going to Manpower offices to get the applications in order to qualify to be eligible to hire people under this programme.

We were having an excellent response; and if that's any help, those are the types of calls we're getting, not only from people such as the Chamber of Commerce, who incidentally sent us a letter with an endorsation to it. Different chambers have had different opinions about it, as you get to a normal local board, but it's interesting to see the provincial ones.

Mr. Conway: You mentioned, of course, the reference to the permanent versus the temporary aspect of this kind of employment; its obvious to anyone who cares to look.

Mr. Jones: I'm not pretending to know that we know the answer.

Mr. Conway: We have a crisis, of what term is not yet obvious, in youth employment of the permanent kind. From the secretariat's point of view, what is your evolving response to what is going to be, I think, a situation of really grave seriousness before it is improved significantly.

It is my impression, in my own riding, and I have a lot of the Algonquin Park situations, there is a lot of seasonal employment being offered by major people of both governments, federal and provincial. This is going to be as bad a summer as I can recall, and only because it's been as bad a time for young people to get jobs. I'm wondering, is this the response of the secretariat for this summer to the temporary job situation?

Mr. Jones: No, that's not the government's whole response.

Mr. Conway: What's your response in policy to the problems of a permanent nature, that is permanent employment for young people who are unemployed at staggeringly unacceptable rates today?

Mr. Jones: One of the things is that these programmes, or a lot of them—and that was in the initial period of them—a lot of people thought they were only for students. For example, a lot of people tend to think that Experience programmes are just for students when in fact they're not.

But we also know, from some of our studies in the whole subject of youth unemployment, that exactly what you say is true. We're into a serious situation with it; and we can go back and chronicle that for you, the fact is it exists. We know that 50 per cent of all the summer jobs are taken up by the young unemployed; and if the young unemployed, whether it be in that summer period of the year or whatever period of the year, can get that magic component that they're missing, mainly experience, then they do become more worthwhile and productive for an employer, and then they are sought out as employees. We found that employees, in a study we did last summer, under the Experience programme incidentally, if the employer hired young people, whether of civic or whatever motivation, in the fall they're more inclined to hire a young person, to replace that student, for example, going to work. They have had the productivity proven by having the enthusiasm and vitality of young people working. Before that they were a little bit reluctant, always going with the experience if given the choice.

[3:45]

The types of employers we've heard from since OYEP has been announced, someone that will take on a contract, maybe, that they wouldn't otherwise have, it may mean shipping out of the country, which is a good thing with the balance of payments and all the rest of it, it's probably the magic combination. But even if they're doing summer employment to lighten the load of taking students out of competition with the normal young unemployed. I make that distinction: We are helping the young unemployed. And anything we can give them by way of experience, whether it be working for the summer, when there are so many in your area and other areas, where the students are young, jobs do open up in the summer. We have a $2.8 billion tourist industry, as you know, and we've got all these other activities that lend themselves to the summer months; it is a good time for students to be

working in certain types of jobs and freeing them up in the all-around.

Mr. Conway: What kind of career guidance are you providing, though, particularly to the people who might be coming out just in unprecedented droves from our post-secondary institutions with no hope of permanent employment along the lines for which they might be especially trained? There is really a problem there of grave seriousness for government, certainly not only provincial governments.

Mr. Jones: I agree with you; and we are working on it in the youth secretariat. As a matter of fact, this last six months, probably last eight months, one of the things we have been working on the very most—and it ties, I suppose in a way, back to the alcohol report. Because we said at the very start of the alcohol report—everybody looked and said, "Oh, increase the age," as you say it was very newsy—but we said we would address ourselves to some of the base causes. Some of them were the job-hop situations, unique to young people, or higher in young people; and some of the admittedly enhanced expectations that young people have about jobs. And that's society as a whole that has worked on them, and they are having to reassess them at this stage.

We have been involved in a process where service clubs and the career guidance people across the province, are joining in individual communities; because that is where it has to happen, it can't happen from Queen's Park or from Toronto or any other big city. We've had them in Ottawa, Kingston and Sault Ste. Marie, in Thunder Bay and London and Waterloo, and they are working very well.

We bring businessmen together—employers, professional people, unions—and they are sitting down with the career guidance people, in teachers' associations and federations, and they are bringing the students in with them, and the businessmen are analysing what job opportunities in that community are likely to be at the end of that educational tunnel, when the student is going to make the transition from school to work. Whereas in many cases the business people have admitted heretofore they built a big $2 million capital expenditure plant, and the last thing they think about is the work force in the area, now they are trying, with this combination of business people, professional people, the people who will be providing the jobs, going into the school system, identifying and helping to give some indications to the young people in the system what's likely to be the case when they come out on that market.

Now no one is telling them don't come out into that market as a nurse or whatever, but at least they will know what they are coming into and they can perhaps better make a directional change into another career area that won't be glutted, because we know from our studies that there are certain areas where there is a crying need for employment for young people coming out and we have other areas where there is a glut, just an absolute glut. A lot of it has been lack of information in what we call career development; which is, I guess, an extra component that we would like to see in the existing career guidance. Career guidance people are doing some fancy things with computers, as you well know, to help in that information process, but we think this is the best thing we've seen work. It takes different forms in different communities, depending on what the work force is for those young people.

Mr. Conway: I can accept all of that, but I just hope that what you are saying is that there is a positive ongoing dialogue taking place. But it just seems to me that the problems are really—

Mr. Jones: They are horrendous.

Mr. Conway: I just wonder what kind of guidance are you giving to the intake of the system. I don't get the impression that there is a great deal of slowdown, particularly in terms of post-secondary education systems, both in terms of numbers or emphasis; we are still processing people at a very accelerated rate with the expectations of the mid-1960s for job employment and all the rest of it. They obviously don't exist, particularly in areas like education—that is employment in education areas—and they are certainly not going to in the next 10 years at least.

I don't think maybe there is much more we can do today, at least that I want to do, than to emphasize, from my point of view, what I think is a real crisis developing. Society as a whole, I think, is going to be in a very indefensible position if we continue to produce, or if we produce a generation of people who are led to believe, as you say for good or for bad, that the community is going to provide a level of employment for which they are especially trained but then when they are on the job market they realize that that is not there and is not likely to develop. I think we are going to need more than simply a dialogue. I would have hoped we would have had, quite frankly, in the

short term a considerably larger allocation of dollars to this particular summer. What is it?

Mr. Jones: We have $68 million in that area. Take the Experience programme alone. We made about a 22 per cent increase last year, that is, 1976 over 1975. That was at a time of constraint when we were all familiar with the 5.5 per cent growth in budgets in various ministries and zero in others such as MTC and so on. I think the government proves rather clearly that it was dedicated to that because it was aware of last year's situation. As you will see in the capsule in the budget, we also made some rather major increases and some other ones. Not to be forgotten is the OCAP programme, for example, where we had a rather large increase in the budget. We are happy to see it is something like an increase of from $3.5 million to $6 million. That has been very successful. The policy design was assisted by the youth secretariat and now is being handled by Colleges and Universities, as you may know. We are running about a 78 per cent success factor in young people going out into work from that programme.

Mr. Conway: That's fine. I am not disputing that. I am just saying in general terms the proportion of government commitment may be greater this year than last but so too to an inflated extent is the proportion of young people unemployed. That's the only point I want to make. I am not saying that this year's allocation is not more than last year's. I am saying that this year, with all government programmes taken into consideration, I suspect figures will prove by the summer's end that we will have a majority of young people in Ontario without temporary, if that be the need, or permanent employment. I just wanted to say that.

Mr. Jones: May I just say one final thing? You are talking about dollars. We really believe all the answer doesn't lie in the dollars. That's why we have this career development. It may not have a lot of sensational appeal in that it isn't a mammoth, province-wide, one programme because it works best at a local level by the community where we actually find community leaders taking leadership and giving time. It's free time and it only involves a small amount of seed money to rent the place for them to bring themselves together. As we go back to these conferences in their second and third meeting stages, working with vocational schools and working with the post-secondary system area, we find they are really having some noticeable effects, but you can't force that from any direction.

We are sharing information from a successful one to another community where there are parallels in that new community to which we go. And they are really starting to work. We are getting rid of the mismatch of jobs and we are getting recognition of the fact that we have got a big youth unemployed. We are not alone in this. We are not an island as you well know. We know the situation in the States. We know for that matter that all the western world is having the same problems. We really feel that that is one of the major problems, and it is not a big dollar thing. We don't solve it with big dollars.

We are seeing young people themselves having a new sense of reality about their expectations and turning to the leaders in their community, in the educational system or to the people who eventually very likely will be their employers. Together they are looking at ways in which they can understand best where they should be going. In one case their productivity won't be lost. The community as a whole will benefit from that. In another case young people will know better what they are likely to expect when they come out of that tunnel.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Could I just add a comment to the parliamentary assistant's? I don't think we should lose sight either in this day of very high unemployment and all of our concerns about jobs for young people that in fact we are still going to bring into this province 7,500 offshore workers to work on the farms and the canning factories to do those other jobs our own young people are just not prepared to do. I don't think we should lose sight of that.

Mr. Villeneuve: A lot of farmers are looking for help in my area.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Farmers are looking for help and greenhouse operators are looking for help. In many areas of this province it is just impossible to get people who are prepared to do that kind of work which is so necessary to provide the taxes and to provide all of the other things that everybody wants.

Mr. Conway: All you are saying is that our education system has perhaps failed in the past 10 years, or at least in the last five years, to emphasize with my generation the reality of that kind of economic consideration.

I have a final question for the provincial secretary on the reorganization of children's

services. I presume you are proceeding with that at this moment?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Mr. Conway: Do you have legislation enabling you to proceed with that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, we have enabling legislation ready to go.

Mr. Conway: You are working toward a July 1 commitment.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The July 1 commitment is one at which time the minister responsible, the Minister of Community and Social Services, will have a timetable for the subsequent developments in this whole area.

Mr. Conway: As for the enabling legislation, you have got it. Are we going to see it soon?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I hope so, very shortly.

Mr. McClellan: In the summer session.

Mr. Conway: I just wondered, because I got the impression it was something of a priority, if in the order of things it was coming down the pipe fairly soon.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As you appreciate, under the new rules of the House there is very little time for introducing legislation. The time is taken up with many other things now. I think there is about a day and a half left now when we can actually bring in legislation, so we are really tied.

Mr. Conway: A day and a half left?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, a day and a half each week to deal with legislation. I don't want you to misread something.

Mr. Conway: I would be the last one to be so uncharitable as to misconstrue the minister's intentions.

I am quite fascinated because I think the initiative is quite a commendable one. But as I look through what you are going to be collecting under Judge Thomson, there are presumably a number of executive directors and executives that are presently in place. What is going to happen to that? There is going to be an interesting reshuffle, isn't there?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Not necessarily. Those entire departments will be moved under his control. It doesn't necessarily mean there will be any movement within that particular department.

Mr. Conway: Is there not a concern that we are really not going to change the deck of cards but rather just have a grand shuffle? It seems to me we are just making a cosmetic adjustment to a problem that is more serious than that. We are simply going to take the various substructures that exist today, add a new titular head and let it stand at that. I am not so sure that will effectively change very much.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't anticipate that will happen. It is going to be a major change.

Mr. Conway: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You have been very kind in your indulgence.

Mr. Villeneuve: I just want to ask one question of the minister. Have you or your department any way of indicating what the effects of liquor advertising are? I get several complaints from people who are serious about it. They are very much opposed to so much of this publicity, particularly on the television over which we have no control. Is there any way you can barometer or gauge that, whether it increases the use of alcohol or lessens it or what? I am asked that very often and I am not in a position to answer.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that would be very difficult to assess really. It is sort of a very subjective judgement that would have to be made. We have had some meetings with the industry. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and I have met with them. They are most anxious to co-operate. As a matter of fact, at our last meeting it was decided that there would be a committee established with representatives from the industry. It will have the opportunity to look at all advertising to make judgements on that advertising and to see if in fact it is what is so-called lifestyle advertising. Outside of that, I think it is very difficult to suggest that it does have an influence in this field.

Mr. Villeneuve: I for one, as a non-drinker, would hate to see sports programmes given a curtailment against this advertising because today it is all beer or something else companies that promote sports and one thing and another. Here in the rural areas in particular people who are real temperance people condemn it. On the other hand, they have every right to think as they like. If they feel, with youth drinking as much as they are, that there is an increased use of alcohol, then we are just doing another

thing to play into their hands and encourage it.

[4:00]

Mr. Jones: Mr. Chairman, if I may, Mr. Villeneuve, the things that the select committee are just now looking at—the one I referred to earlier, highway safety and accident prevention—they are attempting to define, as best they are able, what is lifestyle. I think for the most part most of the members probably feel that lifestyle tends to be —the ones they find objectionable and the ones they feel probably are the most harmful—are in the area of design just toward young people. Very often the dune buggy setting, the handsome, good-looking gals and fellows, having a beer in the hand. They are trying to identify just what is lifestyle.

As I talk with young people as part of our process towards bringing this youth and alcohol report down, there is always this argument that we should just ban it—that is, bite the bullet—and that would solve the problem. Yet young people themselves said: "Just a moment; before you lurch out into that, think for a moment. Everywhere we go, if we travel in Europe or we go anywhere on this continent, we are going to be faced with alcohol. Isn't it more appropriate that we should just have a proper balance?"

On the one hand we have the alcohol people telling us their advertising just causes people to switch brands. Well I think there's some doubt in some quarters whether that is quite the case. These people have a lot of expertise. They can—and you will notice it, you mention the sports situation—they can do some very novel advertising that shows their brand, if that's what they're out to accomplish, without the heavy lifestyle that I know we found objectionable as we made our report. Some of it was just blatantly designed not only to affect—I don't even think it affects the 15-, 16-, 17-, and 18-year-old as much as the 12- and 13-year-old. They learn the jingles very early and carry that forward.

What young people told us, over and over again, was, "Don't sweep it under a rug or perhaps you just add to the mystique of the whole problem. Rather, tell us, on balance, both sides of the story. The advertising people over there for the alcohol companies are going to be telling us about their brand, and so on. Do as your government is doing, and do more of it, telling the other side of the coin, in a realistic way, some of the social bad effects, abuse of alcohol. Tell us the difference between abuse versus just the use of it in society properly controlled."

The young people said that to us over and over, and they continue to do so. So for what it's worth, in the advertising side of things we are encouraged to see the alcohol companies starting to understand what they are being told. So we see some of them, on the back of major magazines, telling the story of Roger, or whoever he might be. On the one hand he has an exciting productive life ahead of him; on the other hand, if he does get involved in the abuse and isn't careful about it, or gets conned with some of the advertising, how he could lose all those opportunities.

That's what young people are saying: "Treat us like adults. Do have comment; and try to improve getting away from the heavy lifestyle, which is slanted too heavily in one direction, and tell us also about the other side of the coin so that we can make our choice." Which eventually they are going to have to do in all matters in life.

I would think we agree with that concept, basically. The lifestyle approach we certainly found objectionable; and there were some important comments being made in the select committee, which you will see when they table their report about it, because they dealt with it to a considerable extent as well.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think indications are too, in jurisdictions where they have banned alcohol advertising, it hasn't eliminated the problem.

Mr. Villeneuve: That's what I'm looking for pretty much, because I'm at a loss pretty well. I do know this, that anything that goes on in my community, if there's no liquor around you just don't get a crowd; so that's the problem.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I mentioned that committee that has been established. It has representation from the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the Liquor Licence Board, the social development secretariat and the justice secretariat. The functions, put down in the terms of reference for the committee, are to review the new draft of the advertsing and promotion directives prior to their promulgation, to assemble and analyse the available evidence regarding the effect of alcohol advertising and promotion, and to assist the Liquor Licence Board staff on an ongoing basis with the evaluation of advertising copy and promotions which do not clearly satisfy the intent of the directives. So I'm expecting that this

committee will be kept very busy looking at all future alcohol advertising.

Mr. Villeneuve: Well, I appreciate that item. You at least answered some of my problems now.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, it's impossible to know where to begin in this particular area, but I would like to focus my remarks on the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. I want to zero in primarily on the philosophy which this particular ministry seems to be embarking on.

Before I do that, I would like to ask a few questions. In terms of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, what have been the expenses for 1973, from the time that it was initiated, through 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977—given the fact that the order in council recommends that the members of the council shall receive renumeration at rates established by Management Board, plus reasonable travelling and living expenses incurred while engaged upon the business of the council. Would you have that information readily?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'll have it.

Mr. Grande: All right.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If you'd just like to carry on we'll get it for you.

Mr. Grande: Certainly. The second question, as far as you're concerned what is a definition of multiculturalism?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's a very difficult interpretation to really come by. Everyone seems to have their own interpretation of what it should be.

Mine is, it's many, many cultures, people from different parts of this world who have their own lifestyles, their own—and culture too is a very difficult thing to interpret and to explain, but it is a diversity of backgrounds, including language, lifestyle; I guess that's about the best that I could do for it.

Mr. Grande: Okay. Could you now enunciate your particular government policy on multiculturalism, as regards a definition? Obviously you cannot have a policy unless you define it in terms of what you want and in which direction you are going as a government. What does the government mean when it talks about the multicultural reality? What does the government mean when it talks about multiculturalism?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The government, per se, has not to this moment introduced a policy statement on multiculturalism. There have been many independent assessments about what a multicultural policy for Ontario should be. But I can just say to you that there will be, very shortly, a government policy on multiculturalism and what it means to Ontario.

Mr. Grande: Madam Minister, I see that since 1973 you have had this Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. Obviously the government intended, or had some kind of direction and some kind of terms of reference, some kind of work, that this advisory council was supposed to be doing. I've read the terms of reference in the order in council, I've read the report of the advisory council of 1974-75; we don't have any other report for 1976 as of yet, at least it's not been made public. What does the government mean, what does the government want?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The whole intent of having an Advisory Council on Multiculturalism was to bring together those people with different backgrounds who have made Ontario and Canada their home, and ask for their advice on just how they felt they could become part of the overall population here in Ontario. We look to them for many areas of advice and look to their recommendations on just how they see a policy on multiculturalism.

Mr. Grande: I suppose that answer has to suffice for the time being, even though it's just as confusing as the many thousands of different definitions of multiculturalism.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm sure your definition would be quite different from mine.

Mr. Grande: I can assure you it is.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'd be very interested to hear what yours is.

Mr. Grande: For one thing, I don't think we have time here to go into a particular discourse on what multiculturalism might mean in this society in Ontario, when we have approximately between 20 per cent and 25 per cent of the people in this province who have neither an English nor a French background. Nevertheless, those particular 20 per cent of the people have found themselves at all times, as far as their culture and as far as their language are concerned, at the margin, in a sense outside of the circle of this particular province and the modus operandi of this particular province.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: One of the basic reasons for having an Advisory Council on Multicul-

turalism was to make sure that those very people did become part and did have an opportunity to express their own cultural backgrounds, and this is happening.

Mr. Grande: The problem I have is that we've had enough studies. We've had enough advisory councils. We have the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism which has come down with very definitive types of recommendations, and what we find is that the federal government dismisses it. We find the parallel here in the province of Ontario with the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. The province is dismissing it.

Let me suggest to you that those particular people on this advisory council—and I know the chairman of the advisory council very well—find themselves totally frustrated. I monitor this council very closely. The council members on many occasions—as a matter of fact, in 1976—came to the particular point that they did not know what on earth the government wanted them to do. If you recall, and I'm sure you do, the council under the leadership of Mr. Chekeris sent you a letter, sent the Minister of Health a letter and sent the Minister of Community and Social Services a letter in terms of saying, "What are we supposed to do here?"

The answer that comes from this particular ministry is, "Whatever you're doing is in line with our thinking." This suggests to me that this particular group of well-intentioned people supposedly should be there as an autonomous body, supposedly should be there to make recommendations to government and then government should decide whether those recommendations should be accepted or rejected. But what they're finding ultimately is that those particular recommendations that they made—and I can read the particular recommendations in 1974, and they were explicit in those recommendations—have been completely unheard by government.

What you find in the 1975 report is that they've watered down those particular recommendations, you know, or I hope you know, as far as multiculturalism is concerned and as far as a policy for multiculturalism is concerned, unless you take seriously the language of the particular cultural group and the culture of that particular cultural group and encourage it, then you really have no multiculturalism. What you have is nothing else but an assimilation process, and that's all there is to it.

As a matter of fact, I was very interested in hearing you, in terms of your definition, because it implied nothing else but an assimilation process.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think you were listening very carefully because I too expressed the feeling that language was very important.

Mr. Grande: Oh, you did. But then when you spoke in terms of what this particular group or advisory council ought to be doing, you said in hearing from the cultural groups that they should do what they think they ought to do to become part of this total picture that is Ontario.

[4:15]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: In sharing their cultural backgrounds with the rest of Ontario.

Mr. Grande: Well, may I suggest to you that I cannot share my culture and my language with you until you begin, and I don't mean you in specifics, to treat my culture and my language on equal terms. Until that happens, and I hope that it will happen, at least I am committed to be working toward that, until that happens I cannot share my culture with you.

The interesting thing was that when that member on the other side, Mr. Conway, was talking about what multiculturalism means, you talked about your experiences in Scarborough. I appreciate the fact that you are from Scarborough so you know that particular area much better. You talked about sharing of cultures. Do you understand, or do you know, that 90 per cent of the kids, of the students in the elementary schools who are in schools right now, were born in Canada and know no other country other than Canada? What kind of culture could they share other than the culture that they have around them—which is not the particular culture of their ancestors; as a matter of fact they have lost that totally, completely.

Let me get into this field. I would like to make some observations and the observations stem from the federal government, and they go to the provincial government and they go to the local boards of education. As you recall, in 1969 the bi-bi- commission came out with a report, the fourth report on other groups in Canada, which suggested that the language of the cultural group has to be taken seriously into consideration in the school system. They made that recommendation very explicit.

The federal government was not willing to go with that kind of recommendation. So they set up this Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. Two years later the Consultative Council on Multiculturalism came down with exactly the same recommendation which said language is very important, and anything less than that is nothing else but truncated multiculturalism. The federal government disbanded, or almost disbanded, the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism; and the ministry of multiculturalism, as you recall under the minister Stanley Haidasz, was completely disbanded. They had no need of it any more, their political objectives had been reached and had been achieved. Because really, what the federal government set up, and you know it and I know it, was a grant system to encourage folklore, nothing else. Folklore is the most superficial part of language; it's vestiges of culture, that's what it is, vestiges of a culture.

Now the provincial government follows exactly those same steps that the federal government followed. I have a mass of information here; but anyway, taking the annual report of the council in 1974, they said: "The unanimous decision of the committee was that the encouragement of a knowledge of a third language would not only benefit the individual but would benefit Ontario and Canada."

Now what has your government done in terms of making sure that this particular recommendation and this particular policy took effect in the school system? I know about 1972. I know Mr. Davis, and who was the other minister, Mr. Welch, talked about the introduction of these courses in the high school system, and that's where they left it.

Whenever we talk about the public elementary school system, the government goes completely apoplectic. They just don't know how to deal with it. Somehow it would destroy society if we ever allowed that kind of thing to take place. I suggest to you that the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), in this multicultural policy report, or multicultural policy that he is going to be bringing forth— in two weeks or one week or a month or three months, or whenever he's going to bring it, because he has been talking about it since 1975.

In his estimates of November 1975 he said: "Look, if these estimates had been in two months we would have this policy ready." In June 1976, when we had those estimates: "We still need some more time. This particular internal committee is working, we still need some more time." And in December 1976 he still said he doesn't have it ready.

What I suggested at that particular time —and I'm sure I won't be proven wrong— is that that particular policy is going to be announced during an election campaign in this province; and that multicultural policy is going to take the place of the Hon. William Davis' trip to Italy in 1974-75. This is going to be a policy of the Hon. William Davis going around the globe.

It just bothers me a bit; it bothers me a bit because if you really, as a government, believe in this kind of direction—look, I understand the politics of the thing, I really do—but if you really do understand it and do want to move in a different direction, then for heaven's sakes you've got it ready, it's at the printer, it's been at the printer for a month. I know that, and you know that. Why is it that you're holding it off so that just when the election is called the big announcement comes of this multicultural policy?

When you take a look at that multicultural policy—I haven't looked at it, I did not get any brown envelope from anywhere —but when you take a look at that multicultural policy, you know what it's going to have? It's going to have just empty words, just empty policy. Just like the minister said yesterday in the House: We encourage the schools to do this, but in no way are we going to give the schools the funds with which to do the work.

The minister talks about this province spending more tax dollars on education than any other part of the globe or any other part of the world. Yet privately he has been talking to me and I've been talking to him and he knows that until he puts some funds in that particular development, in that particular direction, the school boards ain't going to move, in the very colloquial. They're just not going to move, they're not going to do a thing. So whatever policy the minister might have or the minister might develop, the school boards certainly are not going to be doing a thing.

The most important thing that is disturbing is that in December 1976 this internal multicultural committee that exists in the Ministry of Education has gone to the federal government to negotiate the old federal-provincial—what is it, regarding textbooks, regarding adult education, where the federal government provides 50 per cent of

books and instruction in third language for adults?

Now at that particular time, and the document is right here, at that particular time what the minister was talking about to the federal government was: Look, we have so many of these children at the elementary schools, as a matter of fact we have 24,831 who need English as a second language course in the schools. And what happened? They figured out the costing, the whole thing, they figured out that the federal government should be turning over to the province $10 million in order to do an adequate job.

That was in December. Mr. Fisher, in the Ministry of Education, was saying to me months ago that this was in its state of finality, coming close to the state of finality. Now I suspect, and I suppose you will say that I'm wrong, I suspect that what happened is that the federal government turned over this $10 million to the province (a) to increase English as a second language, (b) to increase special education classes in the schools, in terms of the compensatory education component in the weighting factors, and (c) to begin the work in the schools about third languages.

Why is the minister holding back? The funds are there. The federal government has given them the funds. Do you know why the federal government has done that? Because the federal government last week initiated once again a ministry of multiculturalism. For heaven's sake, I don't think the federal government would make such a move unless it could spell out that that's the kind of thing it is doing for the provinces for multiculturalism. The policy has been written up for a month, to say the least. The money has come from the federal government. Why is the minister holding back?

We know why the minister is holding back. If during the expected provincial election, the Minister of Education is not going to make that kind of a statement in a fanfare, that he has some money to set up pilot programmes in certain of the schools and that there is some money that the boards of education can avail themselves of in some of the schools to initiate these kinds of programmes, then when we come back to this House I would like you to prove me wrong.

Three days ago I had the really fantastic experience—it was a treat for me—to be sitting with a group of people at a conference on multiculturalism in education at one of the hotels here in Toronto. The incredible thing is that we started to talk about philosophy and what multiculturalism is. The leaders in those particular groups wanted to deter the group completely from language learning in the schools.

I don't know what you're afraid of. I don't know what they are afraid of. That's exactly the intention they have. Finally, some of the people just became frustrated and said, "Look, I would like a vote in this particular group." The vote was on, "Do you think that both the federal government and the provincial governments are paying lip service to multiculturalism?" Ninety-five per cent of those people believed that that was so—lip service and nothing else. As a matter of fact, it is lip service for political expediency.

When that kind of policy is needed for political gain—and you have that policy and the federal government has that policy—then after the political gain has been gained—and, by the way, I don't think that you will, but that's an aside—when that political benefit has accrued, then you say, "Now we can rest assured. We can forget about it. We can set up another advisory council or some form of council on multiculturalism and say to the people out there we have something going. We have the advisory council. We have the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism. We're going to come in with a policy," and in three years time the policy is not going to be in place.

I can go on for about two or three hours on, as far as I'm concerned, this very important subject. The provincial government as far as a multiculturalism policy goes is a complete wasteland. That is the only way that it can be described. And do you know why? Because you don't believe in it. You really don't believe in it. If your people look at this document—by the way, the person, as a matter of fact, was one of the higher people in the Ministry of Education that sent it to me just for information purposes—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: In a brown envelope?

Mr. Grande: No. It's not a brown envelope at all. Right at the top it's scratched out, put out with invisible typewriter ink. It was "Government of Ontario." The gentleman was very careful in saying to me, "This is something we're doing in terms of negotiating. It's not the policy of the government." I know differently. I know this is the policy of the government. What it says at the end sums up the whole philosophy of the provincial government in terms of multiculturalism. And do you know what it says? "Efforts should also be undertaken to publicize our ac-

tivities in the field of immigrant assimilation so that maximum benefits can be derived from our efforts in this activity."

[4:30]

Immigrant assimilation, and the hon. Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch), and the Minister of Education, and you yourself can say you really don't mean assimilation but, deep down, that's exactly what you want. Deep down, your whole philosophy is geared towards the cultural destruction of the different cultural groups in this province. You prove me wrong, because I've seen it taking place over and over again for the past seven or eight years in the educational system. I could document these cases.

As I said in the Legislature about rent control—and I'm not getting off the topic, Mr. Chairman, at all—this government doesn't believe in it. Why bring it in? Why aren't you honest—and I don't mean to say that you're not—why aren't you honest and say assimilation is really what you're talking about, assimilation is the goal? Because in reality it's happening and the only way that you can solve this particular—I don't want to call it a problem because it isn't a problem; because you know what it is, it's an enrichment of Canadian society as far as I'm concerned.

The fact that I'm here, Madam Minister, enriches the Canadian society. Not that I'm in this Legislature but I'm in this country, it enriches Canadian society. It enriches Canadian society in terms of cultural enrichment and in terms of linguistic enrichment. Don't say to me that the mother tongue of a child is encouraged in the schools. You know it isn't. You know it's never meant to be. All I'm saying is, just say it, say that's what the provincial government's decision is in terms of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is nothing else but some kind of a theoretical concept which will stay suspended in mid air for a long time and we'll begin to pull it down a little bit when it's politically expedient for us, because you don't believe it.

So this Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, as far as I'm concerned, is just another means for you to be saying: "We are working on the problem." The internal committee of the Minister of Education is nothing else but a tool to say, "We are working on your concerns. We're going to do something about it."

Hon. Mrs. Birch: If I could just make a comment on that—

Mr. Grande: I promise I will give you the time.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Fine, because there's something you have said that I just can't let pass.

Mr. Grande: Sure, certainly.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I mean there are several things you said that I can't let pass.

Mr. Grande: I'm sure there are quite a lot of things I've said that you will not let pass, but you will have your opportunity, I'm sure.

In the Speech from the Throne, Her Honour said: "Increased emphasis on language opportunities will be reflected in innovations that recognize the multicultural nature of our population." They are beautiful words. "More resources will be available for intensive English-language instruction for children of recent immigrants. At the same time, while recognizing that French and English are the languages of instruction in Ontario schools, our heritage language programme will be supported as a continuing education offering."

There are the key words—"a continuing education offering." That triggers my mind to think: "Ah, the federal government has given the province of Ontario the $10 million and they're going to be making use of that $10 million to improve the ESL programmes and to provide for the third languages in the schools, these pilot programmes." In other words, the province of Ontario is not going to be spending a red cent. It has been waiting a long time for the federal government to give it the money and then it will have the political splash, saying: "Look what we are doing."

Never in the history of education—I don't know if it's in the history of education; I want to take that expression or that phrase back—never as far as I am aware in education have any programmes in the elementary schools been financed by a continuing education function; never. Because they are two different and distinct types of education; one is for adults, for which we know the federal government gives this province 50 per cent of the moneys, and the other one is for education, for which we know supposedly the federal government gives no money to the province because it is a responsibility, according to The British North America Act, of the provinces.

Yet the minister in a very creative way, may I say, is using the federal money for the heritage language programme and paying it with continuing education funds. It's a fantastic piece of work. I don't know whether the federal government, as soon as it hears of

this kind of thing, is going to be saying, "Hey, look, what's going on there?" I guess that remains to be seen.

The Minister of Education yesterday in the Legislature said a few things to me to indicate that not everything we do in this province requires money. I hear the same thing from the member for Mississauga North—"Not everything we do in this province requires money. We just do the policy and then let the educational system take care of it." Yet in the budget—and I don't remember which page it is—the Treasurer of this province said it is because of the schools that the property tax increased so much last year. In other words, on the one hand you give more functions to the educational system to perform, and on the other hand you put the educational system down by saying you are spending too much money. You are trying to get out of that kind of discrepancy in the thinking of the Treasurer.

It's fashionable, though, to just hit the educational system, to be hitting the teaching profession with all kinds of functions that they should be performing; very fashionable. It might be politically astute too, because the educational system is not well liked by very many people in the province. I think you are wrong.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I wouldn't say that.

Mr. Grande: I think you are wrong that one day those particular things you are saying are going to be proved correct. On one hand, you say to the educational system, "perform this task, perform this function," and on the other hand you slap the educational system for increasing the property tax. How do you get away with that? Don't the people of this province understand it? I believe they do. Do you think the schools are just going to take that kind of statement lying down?

I leave that as it is, but please, whenever you ask the schools in terms of either fighting racism which is one of the things that really we should all be concentrating on, but you know racism is nothing else but a symptom of this society; racism goes down deep into the economic factors of this society; racism begins and shows its ugly head when the economic conditions—like unemployment, like housing, like all of the economic factors that go into making this society—have not had proper direction from the business community or proper direction from the government here. In other words, don't say we must tackle and we should get the schools to tackle racism and then turn around and say 200,000 people are unemployed in this province but it's okay for the government. As a matter of fact, we don't even count those 200,000 people as being not unemployed.

It reminds me of the French lady, Marie Antoinette, when at one particular time when the people were banging at the door of the palace, her advisers went up to her and said, "The people are asking for bread," and Marie Antoinette said, "Give them cake. Let them eat cake." That showed that Marie Antoinette just did not understand the reality of that particular country at that particular time in its history.

I don't want to get off the topic and I promise I will go back to multiculturalism as soon as I make this comment. When the Treasurer says that as far as he is concerned having 200,000 people in this province unemployed is full unemployment, that's exactly what the Treasurer has done. He has misunderstood the mood of the people and misread reality.

I suggest to you that in terms of your policy of multiculturalism, you really misunderstand; perhaps you have never understood the reality of this province.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: There is no point in trying to get into a point-by-point reply to the comments of the hon. member but I would just like to suggest that I think he does a disservice to the members of that Advisory Council on Multiculturalism.

Mr. Grande: I said initially that Dr. Korey is a fantastic person. I said initially, if I may, Mr. Chairman, because I just don't take that kind of remark too lightly, that those people are well-intentioned people. I did say that and you can look back in Hansard and find that out.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think your comments about the fact they didn't know what they had been appointed for to the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism is a disservice to that group because these are leaders of different ethnic groups throughout this province. These are very well qualified, intelligent people who wouldn't undertake—

Mr. McClellan: Why do you ignore their recommendations?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think we have ignored their recommendations.

Mr. Grande: You are getting me to go on for another half an hour.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Good. I would like to point out to you that I think the Advisory Council of Multiculturalism is made up of

people of great understanding of the needs of the ethnic community.

Mr. Grande: I will grant you that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think that they are providing very excellent recommendations and advice to this government.

Mr. McClellan: You are the ones who don't understand.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think we understand. I think the misunderstanding comes from somewhere else. I would just like to point out you did read from a paper you said had been given to you from someone within the Ministry of Education. I would like to remind you that papers and memos given to you by civil servants within this government do not necessarily mean they have anything to do with policy. They are discussion papers. They might have taken place at some staff level between this government and the federal government. I don't know, but I would just like to underline the fact that that doesn't mean it has anything to do with the policy that is about to be announced.

You asked for some figures on the expenses of the multicultural council. In 1973-74—it commenced during the year—the actual expenses were $26,000. In 1974-75, the estimates were $113,000; the actual, $106,000. In 1975-76, estimates were $113,000; actual, $99,000. In 1976-77, estimates were $113,500; actual, $108,000. So far this year, 1977-78, estimates are $131,000. I would like to point out that the increase in the estimates is due to a new staff member and a larger number of members on the council.

[4:45]

Mr. Grande: I realize the time constraints, but as to the kind of thing that you were saying about me doing a disservice to these people, I guess Hansard will prove whether I have done a disservice to those people or not. I firmly believe that I said those people are well-intentioned people doing their work. But what happens is, because you do not take into account seriously their recommendations, they are becoming frustrated. They don't know in which direction to go. As a matter of fact, let's take a leaf from the report of particular monthly meetings, which say: "Future directions. Hon. Margaret Birch and four related ministers have been asked to supply the council with lists of major concerns to assist the council in determining priorities for the forthcoming year."

Hon. Mrs. Birch: And does it state in that paper what my response was to them?

Mr. Grande: It certainly does. There is a letter in the addendum of your response. As a matter of fact I give you credit for saying, "Look, this is your work."

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's right. Why don't you read that into the record?

Mr. Grande: I could very easily read that but—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This is an advisory council made up outside government. If we wanted information of this kind to develop policy, we have it. We have it available within the ministries of this government. But because we want to involve people outside government, because we want the recommendations to come from them, from the people involved, we have advisory councils. They are at arm's length from government. We do not interfere. We do not direct them. We ask them to determine their own priorities and to establish their own recomemndations. I do not interfere with any of the advisory councils.

Mr. Grande: In 1976 this group of well-intentioned people—and I repeat that phrase—got together at one particular meeting and they said, "Look, we don't know which direction we are going. We really don't know which direction we should be going." So therefore they decided to break down into four different groups, and they had phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3. This is what one of the groups decided—group 2. It says, "Concern: Where the council is going and what we mean to government. Are we a token?"

Hon. Mrs. Birch: But that is a legitimate concern of an advisory council.

Mr. McClellan: Especially this government.

Mr. Grande: But you see, Madam Minister, that was in 1976—three years after this council was set up.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think you should appreciate too that there are new members coming on to that council; there was a new chairman. Each individual person has a different approach to what he is expected to do; their priorities are quite different. There is a turnover every year of members of that council.

Mr. Grande: I understand that you are misunderstanding what I am talking about. I understand it. After a group of people meets from 1973 to 1977 to determine multicultural policy for this government, in 1976 this group says, "We don't know which direction we should be going. Let us send letters to the

different ministries so then the different ministries will tell us, will give us some direction." It is not those people in that particular group who are saying, "We don't know in what direction we should be going." They are saying, "We gave the minister recommendations in 1974 and they have been completely avoided, so what is the point of going through that exercise again?"

Really, when you talk of multiculturalism—and the evidence is so thick, coming from the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Quebec, many different states in the United States, South Africa, Sweden, all over the world; the literature is so thick on bilingualism and multiculturalism—these people are saying the fundamental things that should be tackled are culture and language, and let's not fool around about it. Let us not go around in circles and come to it 10 years from now. Those are crucial things that we have to tackle and we have to tackle now, and we have to get this government to understand it.

Up to now you haven't understood this. I think maybe the Minister of Education is going to be throwing out this multicultural policy for the wrong reasons. If it might mean one or two or three or 10 seats for you after the next election, as far as you are concerned you have accomplished your reasons, you have accomplished the reason why you are putting forth this multicultural policy. I repeat, I cannot understand why a policy that has been ready for at least a month—it's been at the printer and is ready right now—why a policy that you've had an advisory council on since 1973—the Minister of Education has had an internal committee on multiculturalism for the last two years—why is it that policy comes at this particular time in Ontario? Why did it not come last year? Why did it not come in 1975?

I leave it up to you to determine the motivation behind why that policy is coming now.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I guess it's very difficult for you to understand, perhaps, the introduction of new policy—

Mr. Grande: All too well, as a matter of fact.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —because you have never been a member of government responsible and, you know, I don't expect you will be for some time. There's more to just introducing policy. There's a long series of determinations that have to be made.

Mr. Grande: You introduce direction, then you let the boards of education across this province determine their priorities, but at least there is intent from this government in which direction education ought to be going in this province. The problem has been, as I said before, it has been devoid, it has been a wasteland in this province in terms of a multicultural policy, and you know it.

You said that the New Democratic Party will not likely form a government. Hah, perhaps you're right, I don't know.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It's just an observation.

Mr. Grande: Sure, sure, and you're entitled to that observation, as I am entitled to my observation, which is that it might not be this time that we form the government, but we will form the government in this province.

As far as I am concerned, as far as the New Democratic Party in this province is concerned, there definitely are certain things that the government ought to be doing and the government ought to be encouraging. So I am going to put to you the educational policy and the multicultural policy of the New Democratic Party. Some of it has been enshrined in resolutions and it is policy of the party. Some of it is not, I admit to you.

The kinds of things we have to consider in a multicultural policy are these: Immigrant parents want the schools to teach their children English; teaching English as a second language must be expanded; the school board must have the funds for those programmes. The school boards right now, even though they want to increase or expand the English-as-a-second-language classes, you know and I know that last week they had to let go 21 English-as-a-second-language teachers in the schools. They also had to let go 30 or 40 special education teachers in the schools.

The renegotiation of the federal-provincial programme: One of the definite things you must do is to increase the weighting factor, because the compensatory education weighting factor does not take into account only English as a second language. So you should have a different weighting factor for English as a second language.

The Minister of Education should research other programmes aimed at teaching students English. For many years we thought the direct approach—the English immersion approach—was the one that worked best. The Minister of Education is now beginning to see there are other alternatives that work just as well. I am referring to the mother-tongue-to-English programmes. There is a whole rationale and I am sure you can get that kind

of information if you look back in Hansard in November 1975.

Number two, immigrant parents also want their children to retain or maintain the language and culture of origin. Becoming Canadian does not mean and must not mean abandonment and destruction of the original language and culture. The wealth of languages and cultures we have in Ontario must be supported. And to this end, in order for that to take place, the Minister of Education has to provide funds to initiate pilot third-language programmes where the number of students is sufficient to make the programme feasible at the elementary level.

The Minister of Education should be moving with speed to amend The Education Act, to permit the teaching of languages other than English and French at all levels, particularly in elementary schools in response to community interest, as well as to permit their use by teachers for the purpose of facilitating instruction where it is in the best interest of the student.

I pointed out earlier that Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan have changed the Act. I don't have to go far afield, I stay within Canada; those three provinces have changed the Act to allow for that kind of thing to go on.

The next thing is the teachers' colleges. Teachers should be trained so that they are knowledgeable in the way of the multicultural makeup of their classes. One of the things that the Ministry of Education has to do is to initiate courses at teachers' colleges to begin to give prospective teachers an idea, an understanding, a respect for the cultural backgrounds in this province, in other words courses in multicultural education.

This particular summer the Minister of Education established that kind, of course. Many people were called from different boards of education to come to the Mowat Block I believe, and to give their input in terms of setting up these courses, what the course content ought to be. It was particularly aimed at giving this course as a summer course to teachers who were already in the system and working.

You know what happened? Seven of those teachers in the whole of Metro said they were interested in that kind of course—seven.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Out of how many?

Mr. Grande: Well, you know how many teachers are in Metropolitan Toronto. Seven of those teachers said they were interested, which seems to give me an indication of where multiculturalism is in this province and where you have placed multiculture.

Now if that kind of course, I say through you to the Minister of Education, is a valid course, why isn't it put into the teachers' colleges. At least there you have the teachers who are going to be going into the schools in years hence and they would have some kind of an understanding of what their classes would be.

So in terms of education those are the kinds of things that the New Democratic Party will be doing. There are many other kinds—

Mr. Bullbrook: You had me until that last line.

Mr. McClellan: He's just reading.

Mr. Bullbrook: I was on your side, I thought, until that last line.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: A bit of party doctrine there.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh this is the party doctrine.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh yes.

Mr. Grande: What is your problem?

Mr. Bullbrook: I apologize for interrupting you in full flight.

Mr. Grande: The Advisory Council on Multiculturalism has said to you over and over again: "Drop those particular laws and amendments in the province of Ontario that are discriminatory." Those are recommendations in their report, not necessarily in their report but in their month-to-month meetings. As far as I'm concerned you've got to drop the amendment that you had last year to the guaranteed annual income supplement. You've just got to drop that, because that amendment is discriminatory at its best.

For the time being, Madam Minister, I suppose I've given you some idea of which direction the New Democratic Party will be going, and in which direction I think you as a government should be going, at least until next week.

Mr. McClellan: I see I have 35 seconds. Was arrangement to adjourn at 5 o'clock because of considerations of the minister or of the chairman?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The chairman.

Mr. McClellan: Is it possible to continue or is that inconvenient?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It's inconvenient now because I have a speaking engagement to-

night and once he indicated 5:30 I made other arrangements.

Mr. McClellan: Are we going till 5:30?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't know whether it's 5 or 5:30.

Mr. McClellan: Can we go till 5:30? I wanted to make a few remarks, again in relation to senior citizens services, if you'll give me a second to shuffle my papers here.

Ms. Sandeman: Mr. Chairman, while he's shuffling his papers could I just have two seconds?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Ms. Sandeman: The minister's closing comments to me after our discussion on senior citizens were that she didn't hear too many people coming and saying they were unhappy. May I just read to you from the first report of the Advisory Council on Senior Citizens?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The first report? When was that dated?

Ms. Sandeman: It is 1974-75, on the income maintenance committee.

"To be old in the early 1900s meant that you had reached the epitome of life. You had earned respect, affection and were proud and welcome to share in the culture and activities in your community with children and/or neighbours. Many sought your advice, others were interested in your past experiences, your stories, your accomplishments and your failures. You had prestige. In a word, you were loved and respected, you had dignity and belonged.

"This is not the life of today's pensioners. Our image has changed. Many elderly today are cast aside, forgotten like a worn-out shoe, feel lost, lonely, degraded and afraid to spend those dollars saved for burial or that rainy day; afraid of the fast changing world, inflation, vanishing purchasing power, complex forms, means test, needs test, inadequate health services, waiting periods to obtain accommodation; afraid of being uprooted and institutionalized.

"Many of these fears might be eliminated if seniors had adequate income with the same purchasing power they had the day they retired."

I don't think we can discount that. That is from a group you have set to represent the feeling of senior citizens in this province. They don't put a number on it, they say "many"; and while that group is saying many let's not minimize the problem.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think we ever do minimize the problem. We're constantly aware and trying to make things better for that minimal number of senior citizens across this province who do require special attention. But I just don't want the impression to be left that every senior citizen in this province is depending on government or some agency of government in order to survive. That is just not so and I will not accept it.

Ms. Sandeman: Nobody has made that suggestion.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, but that is the general impression that some seem to be trying to leave, and I just think it's unfortunate. I think it is a disservice to the many senior citizens across the province who are able to remain independent.

Mr. McClellan: If you want to engage in that kind of complacency, I'll remind you again what's said in your interministry report on residential services, because that's what we're talking about.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That refers to the provision of services; it doesn't talk about income maintenance, it doesn't talk about a lot of the other programmes.

Mr. McClellan: I'm afraid it does talk about income maintenance, and let me just refresh your memory since you seem to want to forget what I can only describe as an absolute condemnation of Ontario's social policy with respect to senior citizens.

They talk, on page 50, of the wasteful competition that exists, about the jockeying for admission, about the institutional gamesmanship. They talk about the absurdities of present funding arrangements, they talk about the wide varieties of legislation, standards and so on. They go on to say: "Perhaps the most serious matter is the lack of non-residential alternatives. Despite the established trend away from institutional care, Ontario gives its seniors a strong financial incentive to go inside, especially those on extended care.

"Firstly, they are able to live in the style that they would be unable to pay for in the community out of OAS-GIA, GAINS, family benefits and pension. Secondly, many of them can save money while in residence. In Toronto alone, funds held in trust for residents of homes for the aged in extended care, saved out of comfort allowance alone, are estimated to be growing at over $1 million a year";

and so on. "In the meantime, the aged person in the community can barely make ends meet and has extremely little in the way of service to help him stay there."

If that isn't a total condemnation of Ontario's income maintenance programme, I don't know how you could express it any more strongly. What you have is the deputy minister of your Ministry of Community and Social Services and senior officials across five ministries saying the aged in Ontario can barely make ends meet.

They go on to say in the appendix on page 82; "A number of studies in Canada and observations of services actually established, particularly in the western provinces, suggest that services like visiting nurses, home help, handymen or women, meals on wheels, house cleaning, visiting, telephone callers, pension, legal and tax counselling could help many elderly persons remain in their own homes where the majority of them prefer to be. These services are poorly developed in some Ontario centres and virtually not at all in most."

That is what your own senior officials are telling you. So don't give us that kind of complacency. That's what we are addressing right now.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I am not giving it any indication of that.

Mr. McClellan: We resent very much attempts to distort what we are addressing ourselves to.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I have addressed myself to this very situation. I have indicated to you that we are concerned. We are concerned about the many inequities in the system of the provisions of services and the services that will give senior citizens alternatives of staying in their own homes. We have already addressed that. I have indicated to you that we are very interested and that we will be coming forward with some new directions for that whole policy.

Mr. McClellan: With respect, we have not seen any initiatives yet that make any sense in terms of an adequate geriatric care system.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: An increase of $10 million in home care over the last two years. Is that not an indication? There are many programmes of meals on wheels that are being subsidized by this government and the many, many programmes that I have indicated to you.

Mr. McClellan: If we had an adequate system of geriatric care in this province, we wouldn't have something like the interministerial report coming out with an indication that as many as 30 or 30 per cent of people in residential care need not be there, if there were adequate community-based personal support services.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think you and your party will have to share some of the blame for the way that many of the institutions have sprung up across this province. I think that you have to share with us the pressures of different groups to provide more and more institutional care for more and more people. Every time a problem is brought to someone's attention, it seems that an institution is going to answer that question. We are only beginning to recognize that that is not the way to do it.

Mr. McClellan: I invite you to run on your own record and we will run on the record of what we have said and what we have done.

Mr. Conway: Socialism.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Everything for everybody.

Mr. McClellan: Spit it out.

Mr. Conway: Red as red can be.

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't think Mr. Conway should be permitted to join the discussion on the aged.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I don't think so. He has had little experience.

Mr. McClellan: Since time is fleeting, let me try to spell out very precisely what a coherent geriatric service system might look like. If I can pass this on to the minister, she can have a look at it. It's from a study that was done by the provincial gerontologist for the province of Saskatchewan, Dr. S. L. Skoll. It is from a publication of the government of Saskatchewan called "Adding Years to Life". It presents all of the elements of a complete care service system for the aged. It is the kind of system that this society needs to develop, and develop very quickly, if we are to get away from the custodial bias that still dominates policy with respect to the elderly, if we are ever to get away from the remnants of a poor-law mentality that still governs policy in this province, in terms of the programmes that are available.

In my own riding of Bellwoods, it was only some three weeks ago now that Lambert Lodge fell to the wrecker's ball. You may

recall that Lambert Lodge was the original poor house for the corporation of the city of Toronto. When we moved beyond the poor laws and we no longer incarcerated the indigent in poor houses, it became the home for the aged for the corporation of the city of Toronto. It remained as a home for the aged for many years. It was finally closed because it was in a state of absolute dilapidation and an absolute disgrace. But it remained standing until three weeks ago as a kind of visible symbol of how our social policy for the elderly has developed.

We haven't really moved away from that yet. If you look in comparison terms at the budget of Community and Social Services, they spend something on the order of, just to round things off, $100 million for institutional facilities for the elderly, and something on the order of—you say $10 million; I can't find it in there but maybe we'll come back to that after I complete my remarks.

The material that I gave you from Dr. Skoll presents, under four categories, the kinds of services that need to be developed in order to keep elderly people in their own homes. He's ranged them under four categories—health, social services, community services and housing services. Each of these has to be available by way of support to an elderly person in his own home.

Our geriatric care service system needs to be based on three basic principles: First, the elderly require a multiplicity of services and facilities available to them in their own homes, in their own communities; secondly, joint planning and co-ordination at the local level, with input for the elderly, has to be the basis for the care system for the elderly; thirdly, the objective of social policy and of the programmes for the elderly have to be to maintain health and social well-being of the aged in their own homes and in their own communities for as long as possible.

That ought to be the basis, the stated basis, of government policy.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It is. We are very well aware of this report.

Mr. McClellan: It is not. With respect, it is not.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We're very well aware of this report.

Mr. McClellan: You may be well aware of it, but it has not been stated in any coherent way and in any public document as the basis of Ontario government policy for the aged, and more importantly—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I told you—

Mr. McClellan: Let me finish. You'll have a chance to respond. Don't heckle.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It's quite all right when the heckling comes from your side, is it?

Mr. Conway: With all due respect to the member for Bellwoods, it's the kettle calling the pot black I should think.

Mr. McClellan: I couldn't avoid it.

Mr. Bullbrook: This is almost a reverse déjà vu for me, you know. I don't want to dwell on my own age, but a decade ago your party spokesmen were decrying the lack of institutional facilities provided by this government. It's a no-win proposition, as far as you people are concerned, for this minister.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Absolutely. That's what I hoped that—

Mr. Bullbrook: I apologize for interrupting.

Mr. McClellan: I'm pleased to see that you haven't abandoned your position of apologizing for the government, even in the estimates debates.

Mr. Bullbrook: I find it an honour and a pleasure to be supportive of this minister, if that's what you mean.

Mr. McClellan: That's your privilege.

Let me go on to suggest that the minister should fundamentally revise the basis of elderly persons service policy and move quickly to match that policy with resources and dollars and structures that would make it possible to set in place the following kinds of services: the kinds of health services that would make available public health nurses and home care nurses to the elderly in their own homes; medical-social work staff and hospital services; assessment, diagnostic and therapeutic services that would be available on an out-patient basis for people who are able then to receive adequate medicare and still remain in their own homes; and, as has been mentioned as well, adequate chiropody services.

Under the rubric of social services you need to develop an adequate network of day centres and meals on wheels, luncheon clubs, home help services, residential homes, night-sitters, laundry services and income support services.

[5:15]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It's making more sense.

Mr. McClellan: Well, if you think that rattling radiator makes more sense than the listing of an array of personal support services for the elderly, is that what you're saying? Or an adequate network of community services, home nursing services, neighbourhood visitors, hobbycraft centres, volunteer activities, again chiropody services, adult education services, re-employment strategies for the elderly; under housing services, an adequate network of home aids, of home adaptations, of what are called in Dr. Skoll's schematic diagram neighbourhood wardens, shelter departments and sheltered housing.

All these things have to be available and I fail to understand the kind of cynical and smirky reception that this kind of presentation has been greeted with here this afternon by the two other parties. It's somewhat baffling. But nevertheless—

Mr. Conway: It's a figment of your own partisan imagination.

Mr. McClellan: I hope so.

Mr. Conway: Sure.

Mr. McClellan: That's not the gist of what the member for Sarnia was saying.

Mr. Conway: Well, we wouldn't accuse you of the same social tendencies or policies as the member for High Park and I think it's equally uncharitable of you to be so extrapolative in your own suggestions. It's quite undignified for a very good and honourable member.

Mr. McClellan: Well, for their lack of charity then. But none of these services is adequately developed in this province. None of these services is even minimally funded. When you talk about increasing the budgets of visiting homemaker services—I'm not exactly sure what you said, whether you said they had been increased by $10 million or to $10 million over the last two years.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Could I explain to you just exactly what I did say? Community and Social Services increased from $5 million in 1976-77 to $7,763,600 in 1977-78, an increase of $2,763,600. That was for homemakers of Community and Social Services.

Mr. McClellan: Where does that show up in the estimates book?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't have the estimates of Community and Social Services. That's something you'll have to look at in the estimates of the social policy field.

Mr. McClellan: How did you arrive at that figure? Which range of programmes is computed into those figures?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This is for homemakers and nurses services under that particular Act. Then in the home care programme of the Ministry of Health, which is an alternative programme to hospitalization, in 1975-76 the budget was $13,009,200; in 1976-77, including the supplementary estimates, the budget was $18,680,500. For 1977-78, the budget will be $23,700,000, an increase of over $10 million in two years for that particular programme.

Mr. McClellan: Why do you suppose it was that the interministry report on residential services was so critical about the lack of personal support services in Ontario, if everything is as rosy as you say it is?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Because that report was initiated in 1974-75 and so a lot of—

Mr. McClellan: So you say we have solved these problems in the intervening two years?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I don't suggest we've solved the problems, but I do suggest we are attempting to solve them. Certainly the funding has been increased, as I pointed out to you, a great deal over a two-year period.

Mr. McClellan: I'm disappointed that you think you're making attempts to deal constructively and adequately with this problem because I have every sense that you're not.

Again, the schematic diagram I sent over to you that Dr. Skoll developed, which is based on his observations of adequate geriatric service systems currently in place in Great Britain and most of the northern European countries, (a) stressed the need for that array of social services being available on a home basis, (b) assumes the need to integrate, in a structural way, health and social services, and (c) implies the need to have established, at the local community level, some kind of co-ordinating group that can hold the array of services together around the needs of each and every person, and do the kind of planning on a comprehensive basis for each community around the community-based geriatric services needed for the particular community.

We don't have those. We don't even have the possibilities, at this point in time, of setting up that kind of a service system.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think I did suggest to you earlier that we have addressed ourselves to this particular report, along with many

others, in looking to the needs of services for senior citizens in this province. I also indicated to you that there would be policy forthcoming. Consideration is being given at the moment to what direction that policy will take, perhaps in the form of a green paper but perhaps not. But to suggest that nothing is being addressed, that nothing is being done, is not quite true.

Mr. McClellan: You've had the interministerial report since April 1975. I wouldn't think it would take two full calendar years, given the severity of the condemnation—or the criticism, if you want to use a milder term—but given the severity of the criticism in that report, for you to have developed a policy and got the policy in place. It's not as though you don't have the staff available.

I worked with Lawrence Crawford when I was in the ministry. I know he is one of the most confident and knowledgeable gerontologists anywhere in this country and that he's done the work and has the knowledge and the capacity to advise government with respect to the establishment of an adequate geriatric care service system if that's what government wanted to do. The problem doesn't lie at the staff level because the staff has every capability of dealing with it; the problem lies at the policy level and the failure of government to set its priorities straight and to direct its staff to develop these programmes. So now we're floundering into a policy development phase two years after the overwhelming evidence of critical failure has been presented to you. If you think that's adequate, that's pathetic.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I obviously take quite a great deal of exception to the comments you've just made. I think that you, above all else being involved in the field of social work, would appreciate that many of the problems we are facing today in the provision of residential services for seniors and children are as a result of too much haste into getting into programmes. I think you would appreciate the desirability of being very cautious about the direction in which we go to ensure that same thing doesn't happen again.

Mr. McClellan: Two years is not unduly hasty to develop an adequate and comprehensive social service plan.

Let me remind you of something. The Seebohm committee in Great Britain, which presented a blueprint for the total reorganization of the social service delivery system, away from institutional care and towards personal and family support services at the local level, if I remember my dates correctly, was commissioned in 1968, reported in 1969, by 1970 the implementation was well under way, and by 1972 and 1973 the main components of the system were in place. That's for an entire nation.

We're talking about a province of six or seven million people. There's absolutely no excuse for this kind of idiotic delay process. So don't ask me to be sympathetic at this point in time because it's not warranted. You have delayed and procrastinated. You have sat on this report. You have suppressed this report. It has now become available and we have the testimony of your own officials to bear witness to our own intuitions and concerns that we pick up as representatives and from people who are working in the field. It's not good enough. I'm not reassured by the process that has been initiated with respect to the other major critical area, which is the area of children's services.

We haven't had a coherent presentation of social policy with a series of coherent options that might be available to us. What we have is an exercise in flying by the seat of our pants and some nice public relations initiatives. I expect that with respect to services to the elderly we'll get the same treatment. We'll get a lot of high-flown rhetoric about the need to move away from residential and institutional care and towards adequate personal support services. But we won't have the kind of coherent planning document that can then be used as the basis for the development of an adequate network of services and the development of adequate programmes, and of adequate funding arrangements so that we can get an adequate social services system for the elderly in place.

We'll get more of these election gimcracks, like the home help employment service, which outrages me. It outrages me that you can talk seriously about setting a home help programme in place piecemeal, ad hoc, as part of a temporary employment strategy paying $20 a day. If that's the kind of priority you accord to the vital work of providing essential services to the elderly, a kind of hastily conceived and inadequately funded home help employment programme for the youth, it is tragic. What it means is that we are locked into further years of unnecessary institutional incarceration of the elderly.

Nothing can be more brutal because of inadequacies in income maintenance and social service programmes, than to force people into institutions, force them out of their homes, force them to break their ties with the community and force them to go behind the cold and inhuman walls of institutions.

It is all so unnecessary. We know what to do. It's been done in other jurisdictions. Dr. Skoll has given a skeleton outline of the kinds of components of a care system that already works. It is already in place. It is already keeping people out of institutions. Ontario is still looking at policy alternatives and looking at maybe producing a green paper, and maybe nobody will ask too many questions about the home help programme and the $20-a-day service. It just won't do. It's just pathetic. It's a real disservice to the people of this province.

Mr. Chairman: Does anyone else have any questions to ask?

The committee adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 27, 1977

Social Development Policy programme: Social Development Policy, Social Development Councils, Youth Secretariat and Youth Experience S-55

Adjournment S-92

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Maeck, L. (Parry Sound PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M.; Chairman (London North PC)
Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)



No. R-1

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Resources Development Committee

Estimates, Ministry of Housing

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament

Wednesday, April 27, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

STANDING RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Chairman: Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel, PC)
Vice-Chairman: Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex, L)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming, NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton, L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex, PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South, NDP)
Hodgson, W. (York North, PC)
Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin, PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt, NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East, NDP)
McNeil, R. K. (Elgin, PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington, L)
Rollins, C. T. (Hastings-Peterborough, PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing, L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South, PC)

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1977

The committee met at 9:10 a.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HOUSING

Mr. Chairman: We have a quorum for the committee, so we might as well start. For the benefit of the members who were not in attendance at the last organizational meeting, I'll just take a minute to outline our proposed procedure. The minister will lead off with his opening statement. The critics will then follow, the NDP critic first and the Liberal next. The minister, if he so desires, may respond to both critics and we'll then proceed with the estimates of the Ministry of Housing, vote 2101. Are we all in agreement? Agreed. Mr. Minister, it's all yours.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the members of the committee, first of all, I will start off on a rather negative point by apologizing to you for not having copies of the statement I am about to make, in that there were some typographical errors in it. Corrected copies should be here probably before I complete delivering it. I will advise you now that it is a very concise document, but lengthy, not unlike some of the speeches you have heard in the past.

Mr. Martel: From me?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: From you.

I believe some members will recall that in last year's opening statement I dwelt at length on the complex interplay of roles which are required to put housing on the ground, and they may be glad to know I don't intend to do that again.

I merely wish to remind members that all the players are alive and well—three, and in some cases four, levels of government, the private construction and development industry, the private mortgage market, other provincial ministries and agencies, and the general public.

I allude to this because today I would like to give members a progress report on the developing policies of the ministry. I have been Minister of Housing now for approximately 18 months and this is my third set of estimates. So it seems to me that interest in why we are spending money in a particular way is rather high.

[9:15]

Of course, it's too early for us to table the 1976 annual report as the fiscal year has just ended, and I am therefore taking this opportunity to so inform you in keeping with the new House rules.

To set the framework I propose first to touch on what I see as the main similarities and differences in the present situation from that which faced us a year ago. Unchanged is the continuing role of leadership which is the prime responsibility of the Minister of Housing. We are facilitating the provision of adequate housing at affordable prices and within a sound planning framework; actively advocating ways in which house prices might be reduced; working towards a clear understanding and acceptance of federal, provincial and municipal responsibilities; facilitating the role of the private sector; conserving existing housing stock; and requiring that all resources of funds or staff allocated to housing be demonstrably used in the most effective way.

Also unchanged is the general environment of limited government spending. This must be so. The inflation rate has been moderated but we have no cause for complacency.

Government spending must be avoided where it is apparent that private sector funding is available. Programme initiatives and spending allocations should improve the effectiveness of every administrative and every programme dollar spent.

I'm only too glad to add that as I look over what is changed and unchanged from a year ago, I can see at least one continuing trend that is most encouraging. That is society's interest—I think it's a growing interest—in conservation. Interest in the rehabilitation of existing housing stock and in the preservation of the downtown core areas of

small and medium-sized towns is where this trend affects my ministry with most immediacy.

It also seems to me that the trend is apparent in the increased interest of home buyers in low-rise, multiple units. Clearly these consume less land than the more traditional forms of single family dwellings. I think that one aspect of this interest is a growing realization that difficult trade-offs are often required in curbing housing land use so that sufficient land will remain available for other and equally important uses.

The other important aspect, it sems to me, is the more realistic expectations of house buyers, particularly young, first-time home buyers.

I take justifiable pride in pointing out to members the leadership role which my ministry played in helping to bring about these more realistic expectations. Through our programmes we pushed consistently for and actively facilitated the provisions of lower-cost housing for moderate-income families and for "starter" homes for young couples. By getting this type of housing on the ground, we demonstrated that there was a need for it and an interest in it. We also, I think, broadened and increased that interest by letting people see that a good house of adequate size and convenience and with the privacy a family needs, could be had for a reasonable price. In fact, we were so successful that the federal government followed suit with its Assisted Home Ownership programme.

Then shortly before last year's estimates debate, my ministry produced the urban development standards report, which demonstrated that potentially significant savings could be effected by reducing the size of lot and by moderating some engineering standards. The bulk of the saving was to be had by reducing the lot size. This of course, is one of the major advantages of the higher density units that I've been discussing.

I would have to say that I am less gratified with the response so far to the moderation of some engineering standards which the report proposed—not that this is an easy thing to do.

The report has been discussed on several occasions with the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee and these discussions have taken into account the response to it which was prepared by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.

I am also glad to say that in their December 1976 statement of housing goals and objectives, the Association of Counties and Regions approved many of the report's recommendations and we have already had several discussions with them.

Because of the technical problems involved, as well as for the sake of local autonomy, I have no intention of trying to force these standards on municipalities. But it is with great seriousness that I say the problems we are encountering in this area indicate how far we still have to go to develop a true conservation ethic. In my opinion a strong conservation ethic will be one of the prime needs of our society in the years to come.

Most commonly we hear it discussed in terms of energy conservation. It's a matter of vital importance and bears directly and indirectly on the provision of housing. It bears directly through the consumption of energy necessary to produce housing and the services without which housing is scarcely possible; through the types of housing and construction best designed to conserve energy needed to produce heat and light; and through the steady search for ways to incorporate heat and light production, using energy forms other than our depleting oil and natural gas resources.

It bears indirectly because the whole economy of the province is highly dependent on energy. We must learn—in the real wealth-sense of goods and services produced —to meet our needs with the least expenditure possible. In money terms, this may cost us more, so least-cost production becomes doubly important.

It is not an easy transition to make, but we have begun well and we have a little time in hand.

One apparent change from last year in the overall situation may ease this transition. Our population forecast has changed and, seemingly, we can expect some moderation in the high rate of development pressure which all urban centres have been facing. My interpretation is a little cautious because population forecasting is a notoriously difficult art, but there is no doubt about the fall in the birth rate, the shift in some internal migration patterns and the slowing of immigration from abroad. These have been documented in the 1976 census.

Since that time, my ministry has published a study entitled Ontario Housing Requirements 1976-2001. It seems to me important to be as well prepared as circumstances will permit for long-run as well as short-run planning. The study used popula-

tion forecasts prepared by the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs to develop household projections and, therefore, expected housing requirements to the end of the century.

This study does not anticipate much change in overall housing demand until about the mid-1980s, although short term fluctuations could easily occur within that time frame. The reason for this expected stability is, of course, that many of the so-called "baby boom" generation will still be of an age when they are forming new families and new households. After that, assuming the birth rate doesn't go up again, there may be quite a dramatic decrease in the demand for housing, followed towards the end of the century by a less dramatic increase as the next generation grows up and needs housing.

Of course the birth rate may go up again. Another "baby boom" is improbable, but we may find that the generation presently in its 20s and 30s is postponing and spacing children, rather than limiting them as much as the present figures might indicate.

Additionally, the very fast rate of urban development with which we have all been endeavouring to cope, has been influenced by economic factors. In the roaring sixties, when we were producing wealth at an unprecedented rate and when expectations were rising even faster than incomes, we experienced a very high rate of so-called "non-family household formation"—young people whose first job paid enough to enable them to leave home and have their own apartment, or share one; even students who didn't yet have an income; older, single people who could now afford separate rather than shared accommodation; and seniors who didn't have to live with in-laws, as many of an earlier generation had to do.

There was also quite a bit of "undoubling"—related families who could now afford separate rather than shared accommodation—and, of course, a good deal of replacement, higher-quality housing was built.

I have no doubt that we shall solve our present economic problems, but I do not think the roaring sixties will come again. We know now that we simply cannot make such profligate use of our resources. I think that as a society, our expectations are becoming more realistic and so is our preparedness to conserve, to get the best possible use from all our resources, natural and man-made, to be flexible in using what is now available and in putting resources to changing use, as this seems appropriate.

One of the reasons I'm making a point of this is that the report to which I referred, suggests a resurge of interest in the older style of single-family dwellings. That's based largely on the fact that in the past, as families became better established, they did want this kind of accommodation; and there is no certainty that this won't happen again. But at least we have forewarning and a reasonable time to continue strengthening our conservation ethic.

The major conclusion the report provides for me is that the certainty of the earlier, very high population forecasts has gone. It is almost certain that for the rest of this century, we can expect to develop in a somewhat more deliberate way.

But the exact pace of development in any given time period is quite uncertain. Therefore, we must be flexible. Short-term problems must be tackled as they arise. We must be willing to change and then change again—that is the way to make the best of what we have now—and to meld the need for meeting known and immediate requirements with the greater uncertainty of what our long-run needs will be.

Another factor which quite sharply contrasts this year's situation with that of last year, and is more obvious and immediate than the changed population forecast, is that we have an inventory of unsold housing and that about one-third of it is priced below the AHOP ceilings, which form a rough benchmark of affordability for families who are not in the high-income bracket. Partly this may be due to overall economic conditions. People are somewhat uncertain as to when the inflation rate and the unemployment rate will be reduced; as to when wage and price controls will be lifted and what will follow them; as to whether the bank rate, and therefore the mortgage rate, will drop any lower.

At the high end of the price scale, there may be consumer resistance to asking prices. Certainly we have seen this in the market for existing housing and some consequent differences between asking and selling prices. But I don't think an absolute fall in the price of housing is to be expected: Too many people own dwellings, the price of which has greatly increased; and, as you know, the price of existing housing has a major influence on the price of new housing.

Also, the composite price index for residential construction continues to rise—by 8.8 per cent in February of this year over February of last year. There may also be some

mixed motives—people unwilling to purchase housing designed on less expensive lines but equally unwilling or unable to purchase luxury housing. I would hope that people in this group will reassess their position and their expectations very carefully.

There may be others who, as a result of rent review, have stayed in rental housing longer than would otherwise be the case. If so, this may be producing the undesirable side effect of making rental housing less available. I think there are people who would like very much to buy a house but who, on their present income, cannot afford to purchase the non-luxury housing suitable to their needs. Other factors could be at work as well. It's a complex situation and I'll be interested to hear members' views on it.

The last matter characterizing this year's situation which I want to mention is the reduced construction of rental accommodation. Again, there are several factors accounting for it. Because of escalating costs and the indirect effect which the review process has had even on the market rental for new apartments, the rate of return on apartment construction is still too low to attract investment without government assistance. At the same time—and this helps to keep the matter in perspective—the trend towards home ownership continued through 1976. The changing age structure of the population seems to be largely responsible for this. Most home ownership demand comes from the 30-to-64 age group; since the early 1970s this group has been steadily increasing in proportion to the population and it will continue to do so until the end of the century and will probably result in a slower rate of increase in the need for rental accommodation. Nevertheless, some increase in rental accommodation is required, chiefly to serve the needs of the under-30s and the over-65s who, by and large, tend to have less income than the middle age group. It is not surprising, therefore, that virtually all new apartment construction last year was initiated directly or indirectly by the public sector.

In summary, the general framework within which I wish to discuss my present policy stance is still one which requires responsive leadership from a provincial Ministry of Housing at a time of both economic constraint and social and economic transition.

Some of these things I set out to do when I accepted the portfolio and they have been accomplished; others are still in progress. Some of the general conditions within which further accomplishments are necessary remain substantially unchanged, some are in the process of changing and some appear to present quite radical changes. In these circumstances my effort is to blend necessary short-run adjustments into the long-run housing policy requirements of the province.

Before beginning the discussion proper of policy initiatives, I should like to say in parentheses that in this opening statement I do not intend to deal with the reorganizational changes in my ministry. I appreciate, of course, that reorganizational changes make it more difficult to compare, in a detailed way, last year's expenditures with this year's estimates. I trust that the written explanation of these changes, which we have already distributed, will go some way towards easing the problem. In addition, if it is the wish of members, I should be glad before we begin the detailed debate on the estimates to go through with you verbally which items of programmes have been moved from where to where. Perhaps members would let me know, Mr. Chairman, if they think that would be a useful exercise.

[9:30]

Having mentioned the information kit, I might add that it also contains detailed descriptions of the new programme as well as information on some films that are now available. Last year several members asked to see the film Canwell, which unfortunately was not then available. We have that film this year, as well as several other films about planning and housing, including a number from Habitat. If members would like a screening of one or more of those, I would be glad to arrange for it. Perhaps the committee would also let me know about this, Mr. Chairman.

The first policy initiative I would like to discuss is the recently announced integration of the province's former HOME programme with the federal AHOP programme. I state quite frankly that I know reservations have been expressed about the federal AHOP programme and therefore about the wisdom of integrating the HOME programme with it. I have considered these reservations very carefully.

The AHOP programme provides a loan to make the effective mortgage rate in the first year eight per cent. In addition to the loan, eligible purchasers may also receive a federal subsidy of up to $750 in the first year so that they would not be paying more than 25 per cent of household income on mortgage payments and municipal taxes. Decreasing loan and subsidy payments are then made in each of the four following years; and repayments of the loan portion only begins in the

seventh year of the mortgage. If the federal subsidy would still leave eligible purchasers paying more than 30 per cent of household income on mortgage payments and municipal taxes, then they may receive an additional provincial grant of up to $750 in the first year, designed to reduce those payments to 30 per cent of household income. Consequently, the integrated AHOP/HOME programme is available to lower income groups. I repeat, neither the federal subsidy nor the provincial grant need be repaid. Only the AHOP loan is subject to repayment.

The major concern is with the repayment of this AHOP loan portion and I gather that, in some quarters at least, this concern is deepened because the integration of the HOME programme with AHOP does lower the income group to which the joint programme now becomes available. The practice of reducing initial mortgage payments and then letting them increase over time as income increases is relatively new. It was introduced when the federal AHOP programme began in July of 1973. Some uncertainty about it is, therefore, to be expected.

However, I would remind you that incomes do rise over time. In 1965, the lowest third of Ontario's families in income terms had less than approximately $5,200 a year; the middle third from about $5,200 to approximately $8,200; and the top third was above $8,200. In 1975, the corresponding figures were $13,000; from $13,000 to $20,000; and above $20,000. In all cases, incomes increased approximately two and a half times in 10 years, and the lowest third did even a little better. For your interest, the estimated 1977 figures based on CMHC 1975 actual figures, adjusted by 10 per cent for the first and eight per cent for the second year, are, up to $15,500, from $15,500 to $24,000 and above $24,000.

Since we are talking here of both incomes and house prices in money terms, the inflation rate is marginal to the argument but, as you know, for most members of the labour force 25 years and over, and this is the group most likely to be in the home buying market, real income has kept pace with and, in many cases, exceeded the inflation rate. The problem is to meet the need for housing when this arises a few years sooner than sufficient income to support a house can be earned.

I said earlier I didn't think the roaring sixties would come again, but I certainly think real income will continue to rise in realistic proportion to the production of real wealth, and the twin problems of inflation and unemployment will be solved long before the seven years are up. You will recall that repayment of the loan portion of the integrated programme does not begin until the seventh year.

There may have been more cause for concern a little while ago when mortgage rates were very high, because obviously the size of the loan needed to bridge the gap between the current mortgage rate and an effective rate of eight per cent was greater. Now that mortgage rates have moderated, this concern should also be reduced.

As for the integration effect of making the programme accessible lower down the income scale, I have never assumed that because a family has a fairly low income now it will always have a low income, especially if it is a young family—and many of the families with immediate housing needs are young families. Rather, I assume that with increasing experience and hard work they will work their way up the income scale.

Unfortunately this won't be universally true. For any one of a number of reasons, there will always be some families who require housing assistance and it may be that ownership is not a suitable form of tenure for these families. But merely because the programme is now open to upwardly mobile, but presently low income, families it does not mean that all low income families have to take it up. I think we can rely on most people having the judgement and common sense to assess their own position. I think we can rely on the private sector, which would be selling the housing and arranging the mortgages, not to seek as clients those families for whom ownership is not the most suitable form of tenure.

I would also remind you that the programme clearly states that at the end of five years, when the grant and loan payments would normally be terminated, the financial arrangements can be reviewed and if warranted the assistance may be continued. Like everyone else concerned with public issues I try to steer a reasonable course into an uncertain future, and I find hedging a bet preferable to crystal ball gazing.

Finally, I would draw to your attention the asset protection aspect of the programme. In the case of bona fide sale of market value, if the net sale proceeds less the acceptable sale costs are insufficient, after deduction of the borrower's original equity, to repay the interest reduction loan in full, then CMHC will normally waive payment of the unsatisfied balance.

The other aspect of the policy which seems to have been quite misunderstood is how our land holdings will be treated. I think that some of my friends may have read the pro-

gramme announcement with less than perfect care, so I would refer you again to my statement and to the press release, both of March 7. There is no suggestion that the Ministry of Housing is about to sell off all the land it holds, or that it will no longer develop land. If I may quote: "It has become clear that the Ministry of Housing should be developing land in a way that will create more balanced communities, providing housing for a wider range of incomes."

Certainly I said "Ottawa has agreed with us that the lands we and they have purchased should be sold, at the low end of the market, primarily but not exclusively to builders, who will make use of the AHOP/HOME Ownership Assistance Programme."

Some of the land we hold was bought under federal-provincial agreement. Naturally it requires federal agreement to sell it. And for what better purpose could we sell than to have a cost reduction effect on the price of housing? That's why the land was bought. And in what better way could we contribute to the development of more balanced communities than by facilitating physically intermingled, assisted and non-assisted housing?

Maximum house prices under the AHOP programme are quite widely and frequently published. I presume my colleagues are acquainted with these. They are package prices for land and dwelling units, and they apply whether the land was privately owned in the first place or whether it is now to be purchased from us. One of the major advantages of the new integrated programme is that it will be available everywhere housing under the AHOP limits is built. Under the former HOME programme, we could not provide this widespread availability because our land holdings are in approximately 30 of Ontario's municipalities. Surely no one is suggesting that public funds should continue to provide a price advantage on the basis of limited locations when we have an opportunity of improving on this. I assure you nothing is further from this government's intention.

To quote again from myself, which is a pretty good source, speaking at a recent Ministry of Housing workshop in Thunder Bay—

Mr. Martel: How reliable?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No interruptions. "Money accrued to the province by the changing of marketing strategy of the HOME programme will be reinvested in such vital services as water supply, extended sewers, or other housing programmes like the provincial grant plan." Have my critics suddenly decided that using provincial funds to assist municipalities with servicing costs, so that the production of housing under the AHOP limits becomes possible, is allowing and I quote "public funds to be exploited by private developers."

What my critics have failed to mention is that, in addition to extending the availability of home ownership assistance, the new integrated programme represents a major step in rationalizing housing assistance provided by two levels of government. On a provincial initiative an aspect of federal-provincial programme overlap has been eliminated. At one stroke, the effectiveness of federal money being spent in Ontario has been extended and provincial funds which were previously serving a similar purpose have been freed for other uses.

At the moment plentiful mortgage funds are available in the private sector and under the integrated programme builders will arrange their own financing through private lending institutions, with the Ontario Mortgage Corporation continuing to act as a lender of last resort.

If you look at the estimates, you will see that the single largest saving effected is in the Ontario Mortgage Corporation, where a reduction of $123.5 million over last year's outlay is shown—a major public sector restraint in an area where private sector funding is available.

Inaccurate response to this programme leads me to say a little more about my ministry's land policy in the hope that Ontario residents may now be clearly and accurately informed on the point. I was quoted in the Toronto Star a few weeks ago as saying: "Under Ontario's new policy . . . about 23,000 acres of publicly banked land—enough for more than 100,000 building lots—will be sold to builders at 'low' market values." As far as they go, those figures are correct; we do have about 23,000 acres, most of which had earlier been intended for HOME-type developments, and they will produce about 100,000 building lots.

What I want to clarify is that the land in question will be sold, as and when it is required to produce AHOP/HOME units, under the prescribed AHOP price limits; and, where it's useful and appropriate to do so, to permit the integration of this type of housing into mixed communities which also include unassisted, more expensive, market-priced housing. Quite obviously, any such decision will be taken in close co-operation with the municipality concerned.

If you have a copy now of the statement, I'm on page 28—just starting into the second paragraph. I know you want to follow along.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member for Sudbury East is interrupting me again.

Mr. Eaton: Going to have a campaign out of this?

Mr. Vice-Chairman: Order. We'll continue on uninterrupted; I think that was the agreement made by the committee. The minister will continue.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member for Middlesex and the member for Sudbury East are causing a problem here.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In this province, no AHOP/HOME development, no mixed community development partially assisted by the public sector, and no wholly private development, can be put on the ground without the approval of the municipality. And if conditions change, then so will the policy. I've told you at some length of the rather different population growth patterns which may now face us. Fortunately, at any time, there is little doubt about what is likely to happen in the ensuing five years—long enough in most cases to market land, plan for and build housing. Beyond that time, who would have the temerity to express certainty?

Perhaps we shall find that some of the land is not needed for urban development for the next 20 or 30 years. Perhaps after 10 years there will be a sudden spurt in housing demand, for which the land will then be available.

The point I wish to emphasize is that I and the government regard the land we hold as a major public trust. In the public interest we shall not hesitate to hold it as it is, to put it to use or to change its use, according to need at any given time.

Nor is AHOP/HOME integration the only rationalized initiative we are taking. I explained a few minutes ago why, for several reasons, we experienced insufficient rental apartment construction last year. The most severely affected area is Metropolitan Toronto, where costs tend to be high. I also explained why most of last year's apartment construction was public-sector initiated. You may recall that, during last year, the government introduced the private rental programme, under which builders arrange private mortgage financing and develop rental projects which they own and manage in return for government assistance. Its aim is to provide more units for the rent supplement programme, which is one of the ways in which we provide assisted rental housing.

The federal government also has an assisted rental housing programme, under which CMHC will provide an interest-free loan of up to $1,200 a unit annually to reduce economic rent levels to the market rate for comparatively new accommodation. This federal programme has been quite successful.

As I announced recently, to make it even more effective in areas where a further incentive is required, my ministry will now provide an additional Ontario rental construction grant of up to $600 a unit. We see the extra provincial grant being taken up mainly in the large urban areas, where costs are higher, and so providing additional starts where they are most needed.

I just want to add here that while I said most of the activity probably will be in Metropolitan Toronto—I think it will be; that's where the greatest demand is—the programme will also apply to a number of other municipalities where there are problems, for example, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Ottawa. It can apply in places like those and, I think, it can be effective there. CMHC expects the take-up of its assisted rental programme to be 5,000 plus units for 1977, and we anticipate that the integrated Ontario rental construction grant will provide more than 3,000 additional starts for this year. And I hope that is at the low end of the scale.

[9:45]

To make sure that the new programme is thoroughly understood and acted upon as soon as possible, we are planning a series of meetings with the builders and developers as well as local authorities, and they will all be invited. The purpose of these meetings is not only to clarify the details of the programme but to agree on suitable sites and ask for specific undertakings that builder or developer X will agree to construct rental apartment units on site Y, with, of course, agreement in principle from municipal representatives at the meeting that there are no apparent reasons to expect undue delay in the approval process. If this approach proves to be a successful role for the province, it might be used again in other cases where there is an urgent need for some particular type of housing.

Not only will the new programme ease the immediate problem, but the increase in supply will moderate the pressure on rents for the future and so assist in eliminating the need for rent review, which, as I said, is itself a contributing factor to the present relative shortage of rental accommodation.

The next policy development I wish to draw your attention to concerns the preservation of existing housing stock and related downtown core structures. Since the Ministry of Housing was formed, this has been of major concern. We have consistently displayed leadership in the area. Today I have given you my personal views on the importance of developing a conservation ethic in our society.

You will see from the estimates that even at a time of difficult economic restraint, when the total budget for my ministry is being reduced by almost $91 million over last year, the budget for community renewal has been increased by almost $11.5 million to approximately $36 million. Apart from administrative costs, $2 million represents continuing commitments under the former urban renewal programme, $9 million has been allocated to neighbourhood improvement, $4.4 million to the new downtown revitalization programme and $20 million to the highly successful Ontario Home Renewal Programme.

Over a three-year period, the province has provided a total of $47.7 million to 460 municipalities under this programme. So far, 9,240 units have been or are being rehabilitated, and funds committed are sufficient to rehabilitate a total of 12,165 units. Last year, on an experimental basis, we extended the programme to cover rental property. So far, the results have been most encouraging.

As a further contribution to conservation, we are presently reviewing all Acts and programmes controlled by this ministry in an effort to introduce energy conservation into all our programme functions. We are also contributing to five solar demonstration projects and OHC is presently monitoring energy usage in its projects with a view to establishing consumption guidelines. From one study made last year, for example, we learned that with bulk metering, where OHC pays the bill, electrical consumption increased by 23 per cent. But against this must be set the cost of conversion and the need to maintain the intent of the rent-geared-to-income scale.

Another of my major contributing themes, as Minister of Housing, has been on the need to rationalize both responsibility and accountability in the housing field. Today, I have told you of two initiatives recently taken to improve the effectiveness of federal spending in Ontario. Since the federal government consistently refuses the most rational and accountable approach—that of block funding—I believe I have followed the most rational course open to me.

Equally, I have been concerned to rationalize provincial-municipal responsibility and accountability. I believe the last time I spoke at some length on this was at last year's tri-level conference. Since then, my ministry has taken a series of actions on which I propose to bring you up to date.

You may recall that last year I advised you of the use being made of municipal housing policy statements, through which municipalities advise the ministry of expected total housing requirements and of their expected assisted housing requirements. This programme has been of interest to municipalities representing more than 70 per cent of the province's population and has resulted in the development of municipal housing policies.

A major review of the programme was undertaken towards the end of last year and municipalities were asked what changes or improvements they would like to see incorporated into it. The results of this review were taken into account when reorganization with a view to decentralization was being planned within the ministry. The objective was to provide those municipalities who wish to have it with additional initiative and responsibility for the provision of assisted housing, and to redeploy the ministry's resources, both to support these initiatives and to concentrate direct assistance towards other usually small municipalities who preferred to leave most of the responsibility for assisted housing with the ministry. Some of the results you have already seen. As I announced to the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee last February, municipalities can now select the assisted rental housing programmes which they feel best fit their individual community needs.

If a municipality chooses the construction of buildings designed for rent-geared-to-income tenants, either families or seniors, then it has the choice of either undertaking the development itself, in which case both financial assistance and the development resources of the ministry will be available, or it can request the ministry to undertake the development. In either case, the municipality will identify and purchase the site and rezone it if this is necessary.

A number of municipalities, through their housing policy statements and in other ways, have expressed growing interest in community sponsored housing, which generates rent supplement units, an alternative method of providing rental housing assistance. During last year's estimates debate, we discussed the technical difficulties which non-profit groups have had due to lack of development experience.

A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of announcing that under a new federal-provincial funding agreement, the federal Community Resource Organization Programme (CROP) and the new provincial sector support programme will provide funds to non-profit technical and professional service organizations to assist them in delivering this type of assistance to non-profit housing groups. This should go some way to resolve the problem and strengthen the growing interest in non-profit housing.

In additional support of the growing municipal interest in the provision of assisted housing, the ministry is arranging a series of housing workshops across the province. I have already had occasion to mention the second of these, which was held in Thunder Bay. The first was in Kitchener and forthcoming ones will be at North Bay, Kingston and Barrie. Municipalities of all sizes and representatives of the private sector are invited to attend these workshops, the purpose of which is to offer detailed information on the ministry's new policies and programmes to municipal officials, builders and others concerned with the building industry.

You may also know that in the last year, 11 new housing authorities were created. A further nine have been proposed and we are under negotiation. Thus, we are continuing to decentralize and put into local hands the management of rent-geared-to-income projects.

As you know, I personally favour the release of all possible information and this year we have done our best to assist you in following the reorganization changes necessary to support the policy initiatives I am discussing. I also instructed my staff to identify documentation pertaining to the operations of OHC and the ministry which could be made public. This has been done and a number of documents have already been distributed to you.

The last major development on which I wish to comment is that the philosophy and activities of OHAP have now been permanently integrated into the ministry. This, too, is an important contribution to the steady rationalization of roles in the housing process which we are achieving.

As you know, OHAP was established to accelerate the supply of serviced land, to encourage private industry to produce reasonable-priced housing, and to encourage municipalities to accept and plan for this type of housing. In the three years of its somewhat separate existence, OHAP provided more than $3 million in study grants to municipalities, $13.5 million in capital housing incentive grants, and $98.5 million in interest-free loans for servicing.

Perhaps even more important is the change in attitude which has occurred in that time. Builders are now willing to provide and municipalities to accept, higher-density, moderate-cost units which are required by substantial numbers of families.

A change of attitude has also been effected among other provincial ministries and agencies. OHAP acted as a co-ordinator between them and now such ministries as Environment, Natural Resources, Education and Transportation and Communications appreciate how important are their contributions and they co-operate with us fully in accelerating the provision of housing.

To round out this description of progress to date, I also advise you that the delegation of approvals authority to the regional municipalities is well under way.

In summation then, Mr. Chairman, improvements in rationalizing accountability and responsibility for the provision of housing are steadily being made, both between the provincial and federal governments and between the province and the municipalities.

Lower-cost housing is being made increasingly available and expectations are moderating, in line with our changing economic and conservation requirements, but there remains room for improvement both in this area and in the rationalization process.

Efforts in the several facets of both these major thrusts will continue and I have no doubt that, as further progress is made, we shall remain as we are—one of the best housed people in the world.

Mr. Chairman: We've heard from the hon. minister. Now we'll have the NDP critic.

Mr. Breaugh: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to start off by saying that we appreciate the problems and some of the efforts that this minister in particular has made in the field of housing. I think back to when I was on the local council in Oshawa and on the regional council in the region of

Durham. In the first term I spent on the regional council we went through something like four ministers. Every time you wanted to talk to the ministry and you called them down, you met with a new man and he had new ideas. Things changed a good deal and it was rather frustrating at that time even to get anybody to acknowledge difficulties that we were having—in the planning process, in the production of houses, in dealing with developers, in dealing with official plans and with zoning bylaws. It was tough going because personnel changed a good deal; plans came in and plans went out; The ministers themselves changed a great deal. We seem now to have entered into at least a brief period of some stability and some recognition of problems that a number of people in municipal governments and I suppose in the House as well identify as problems.

But there seems to be a continuing problem here and that is the ministry itself seems to be disappearing in a sense. It's a weird phenomenon because the minister himself seems to take a much higher profile than previous ministers. He speaks all over the province—rather well. I read most of his speeches and find them at least entertaining —not always informative, but always entertaining. Yet as the minister takes a higher profile, we see that the ministry itself seems to be slipping away gradually. Things are being moved about. Programmes are attached to federal programmes. It makes one think that Jack Horner was not the only Tory who wants to cross the bridge. I understand, though, that this minister has walked across that bridge once or twice and that's not a new phenomenon.

There's obviously a difficulty in trying to deal with a ministry that puts off to various levels its own programmes and its responsibilities. It's not that we're making the argument—at least I wouldn't make the argument—that we shouldn't put to the municipalities a good deal more responsibility. They've been asking for that and I think that that's the proper move. It becomes rather a matter of how you do that.

Are we charging municipalities with responsibilities that they (a) can't afford and (b) are not quite equipped at this time to perform? I suppose one could make the argument that they never will be able to afford them and they never will be staffed properly to handle those programmes unless we do it at first and see how much money they need and see how much direction they need; then we'll try it. That's an awkward procedure to take, though, because that provides for a good deal of trial and error in a field where we know a good deal.

In the field of housing, there are not many things that we don't know about. Sometimes the solutions are awkward to accept, very difficult, very complex and there are no easy answers. Most of us who've spent some time in the planning process accept that. But a basic premise that we're having great difficulty accepting—as a critic I have some problems with it and I know people still working in the municipal government field have difficulties with it—is where is the minister going? What is this ministry all about now? It certainly seems to have gone through that phase where the high profile was taken by very expensive giveaway programmes, very massive government programmes that seemed to always run into some kind of snafu along the way.

The HOME programme. What do you do with it? After you get all that land together, how do you get rid of it? What do you do with those problems? Do you let people who had some government assistance to get into their home in the first instance then turn around and sell it four or five years down the road and make a profit? There's nothing illegal, I suppose, about making a profit or even nothing morally wrong about it, except that it certainly defeats the purpose of the government intervention in the first instance.

So there's that continuing problem of the disappearing ministry and some uncertainty still remaining.

Another basic problem lies in the field of house purchasing. When someone buys a house, it seems to them to be their major investment and one would think offhand that the Minister of Housing would be responsible for those things related to the purchase of that house. Yet when you run through who's responsible for what in Queen's Park, you find that he's not. You find that TEIGA, for example, plays a rather odd role in the planning process. What are those people all about? I know that when I was in the municipal field, we always had great difficulty sorting this out—well, what's the Ministry of Housing doing in this field? How is TEIGA involved in all of this? It seems to be a rather disjointed effort.

[10:00]

On one occasion you'll talk with the Ministry of Housing staff and you'll get their assurances that you can proceed in a certain way; the next day, the Treasurer will announce something, and away it goes. We had this difficulty, particularly in the region of

Durham; we seemed to be a target area for a number of items. I think, at one point, we counted something like 128 federal and provincial projects at work through the region of Durham—all under different agencies. Even to find out who the hell was doing what was sometimes a difficult problem, let alone to go to work on it.

So there is this problem in planning. What's the role of TEIGA? What is it doing? What's the role of the Ministry of Housing? Are they obviously overlapped? Obviously, they should be a co-ordinated effort.

It's difficult, sometimes, to pin that down. The simple things like a building code, which one would think had something to do with housing, isn't covered by the Minister of Housing. Unfortunately, it's covered by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and the response to problems that people have with the building code is just not there. Although the building code sounds good and looks impressive, and although some moves have been made to standardize how it is enforced and who inspects the thing—when you get right down to it, most of the problems that people have aren't covered by the building code.

So you get the irony of the situation in which somebody is rolling an old piano across a brand new kitchen floor, and the piano falls through the floor. You find out, oddly enough, that everything in that particular unit meets the existing building code and the inspection was done; but the fact is that the building code doesn't cover for that circumstance.

You see all kinds of funny things in brand new houses, where people had great expectations, made a massive personal investment, and yet the thing is really a substandard unit. It's not substandard from a cosmetic point of view. It's not legally substandard in terms of the local building code, provincial code or federal code. Yet, things are still wrong; the response is not there. The building code needs to be updated substantially. I think it belongs in the Ministry of Housing because when people buy a house, they think that move is related to the field of housing—and that disjoints things.

The other obvious example, of course, is the rent review process. Part of the basic problem there is that when these things get shuffled off to other ministries, they become far less important to that person. For example, Consumer and Commercial Relations deals with almost everything. Everything you can name is, in some sense, the responsibility of that ministry. Nothing gets a high priority. Little attention is paid to very much, unless a major problem erupts.

So, I would be the one to make the case that those things related to the field of housing properly belong to the Ministry of Housing. If you want to get that co-ordinated effort, which is obviously lacking—and it needs to come about—some movement needs to be made in all of the reorganizing and reshuffling that you do in the ministry to get that stuff back under the control of the Minister of Housing, so that you can have that co-ordinated effort.

Let me move to this recent fascination with federal programmes. The minister made some mention of that in his opening remarks this morning on the AHOP HOME programme. Let me put to you a couple of obvious problems. I would appreciate your making a response to it later—maybe when the critics are finished this morning.

The basic problem with the federal programme, which everyone has known about for some time, is that it purports to do a couple of things with some benefit. It purports to get some housing units out with price limits on them; and it purports to provide some kind of a preferred interest rate and to subsidize. It purports to do all those things, and does; it addresses itself to that particular problem. But the problem is that it's an open thing. It doesn't necessarily mean that those who need that assistance get it; anybody can buy that tune. Even with the current AHOP home programme, anyone can buy one of those units. We can argue that if their income is too high, they don't get the subsidy involved. But the fact is that with the co-operation and financing of two levels of government to provide homes for lower and middle income people, the housing unit doesn't always get delivered to those people. That unit is very often bought by people who don't qualify for the subsidy. But they can buy the unit.

I took the time to reread both the federal announcement of the programme and the provincial one and, in both instances, anybody can buy the unit. You may not get the subsidy; but there's a self-defeating mechanism at work there. If you're going to spend time and money to get on the market these units supposedly designed for lower and middle income people, surely they ought to be delivered to them. There is this little quirk in the federal programme that's carried through into the one that you've joined into, which allows anybody to buy. So there is that great difficulty.

Let me move on to a couple of other areas that are related to this attachment to the federal programme. There is a new phenomenon arising out of it and I, frankly, find it quite fascinating. Builders are now complaining, as they have for some time, that these things are in competition with what they are putting up and that units are sometimes, in their words, substandard. I don't think that is necessarily true and I certainly think those guys are not in much of a position to talk about substandard anything, but there is this growing problem of what you do with these programmes when they are competing across the road with something that someone else has put up.

If we are trying to get the low and middle-income people into a housing unit of some kind, that's quite a sensible thing. But in my area, for example, there really is substantial backlog of housing units that were produced some time ago and they are not selling to anybody. Obviously not, why would they? If you were a buyer, no matter what your income level was, and you were out looking around my area, why would you buy something that was put out at conventional rates—and there are lots of them around—when you can drop around the corner and buy another one that has the new AHOP programme attached to it or the one, six or eight months from now, that will come under the AHOP/HOME programme? So it is not particularly our people who are buying those units.

For example, in my riding in Oshawa or in the region of Durham, people who work in General Motors would have an average wage of about $15,000 a year, which is rather high in the province of Ontario, but they still wouldn't qualify for most mortgages, most open mortgages, normal marketplace stuff in the area. So they have rather given up on the concept of buying any kind of a unit. So the market—and it is very clear from the advertising patterns in the industry—the market is Metro Toronto. Those people have slightly higher incomes. They commute back and forth from Toronto to Oshawa. They have the incomes to qualify. They are out buying.

Oddly enough, when they are out buying—that's the market right now—they are not buying the existing stock which was put up under old market conditions, they are out there buying the ones with the subsidies on them, the home buyer grants, and there are all kinds of cute little quirks going on with developers now to put their own little subsidies on. They are passing through some goodies they got from the federal government.

There is a rather interesting article in the Ottawa Citizen in the Saturday, April 3, edition. It deals with the problems of AHOP and says: "The subsidies and grants encourage low income purchasers to buy housing they can't afford. Families defer the impact of paying for that house for five years, living under the assumption that their incomes will rise substantially." That's a point that I would like you to address yourself to at a further time in more detail than you did this morning, because I think that is a substantive problem which you are going to have to deal with.

You did say that you kind of hedged your bet and that in five years time you can review that. I find no real grounds to suspect that with current wage and price controls on, with unemployment as it is now, people in the lower income group who may qualify to get into these units now under these programmes have any real justified expectation that their income is going to rise so dramatically in five years time they will be able to carry these things by themselves. I see innumerable young families in particular coming in with two incomes, qualifying just barely to get into these units and, in five years time, when a couple of kids arrive or only one kid arrives or one parent gets laid off, that there is going to be a rather bad financial problem involved in that.

The other small point that I wanted to mention—not in great detail now but I do want to get it in—is that I see some rather unusual, let me put it that way, unusual practices by real estate agents diddling numbers to come up with the magic number that qualifies people to get into these units.

In a sense you think that they are doing the buyer a favour, because they are just jacking it up slightly so that they do qualify for these units, but in a real sense they are not. A couple of years from now when one person gets laid off, when there is an interruption in the supply of both salaries into that mortgage, when in fact they are not really qualifying but there is some leeway involved, I think there are going to be some real financial problems for people who go in there.

There is a gap in this as well that is pointed out in this article, and that is that some families have incomes too high to qualify for significant AHOP subsidies and too low to buy on the open market. That is a problem for the consumer and for the in-

dustry itself. There is that small difficulty in there.

In order to participate in AHOP, this article goes on, "the Ontario government has dropped its Home Ownership Made Easy programme in what some observers see as an abdication of its responsibility to produce low-cost housing." That really is a programme I am very sad to see you dispense with because it's one I thought had great potential despite the snafus and the difficulties in getting the thing out and the problems that were in it. It had the potential there to do what I think the government should be doing in a large measure. You had the land. You were producing the units. People were getting into them.

The programme addressed itself very specifically to that income group that needed the help. In my view the HOME programme, for all its faults, at least looked at, and zeroed in on the income group that needed government assistance. It was on the verge of providing a substantive impact on the market. Perhaps that's why the programme was dropped. I don't know, but I do think the potential was there. The land was assembled. The programme was in place. It needed refinement; that's true. It had its faults but it had the potential to do what the government ought to do. I am really sad to see that programme go.

The other small point that I want to drag out of this article is one that I find a little ironic. I find now a number of developers praising the HOME programme and saying that it really helped the right people. The article goes on to list things like the high inventory of unsold housing units in Ottawa and other centres which it says can be partially blamed on government's growing involvement in the housing industry. That's a thorny problem. What do you do? I find it a little amusing that developers are now saying: "You had a good programme there. Why didn't you stick with that? Why are you sticking your nose into this one now? You are ruining the selling of my units which I put up on my own."

It is that relationship established where they were talking about a rental programme such as the one you have got going or AHOP/HOME programme. They are asking what's the relationship between the government and the industry. It seems that in some strange way even the industry is a little upset with the government these days. You are horning in on their market in a way they don't like. They are now having to compete with subsidized units across the way and they can't sell existing stock they have got because somebody else has whipped in with a government-assisted programme across the road.

In my area, in the region of Durham, I think the last number I saw was something like 25,000 units proposed under OHAP. They will be coming on stream and some are on stream now. That's a substantial impact. Some are in the wrong place without question. Some rather funny bargains were struck under the pressure of a gentleman you had working for you there under OHAP. Some municipalities got themselves caught in some squeezes. There are some corners being cut without question. Again it's that intervention of the ministry. How do you go about that thing? So there are problems in that field.

The last small thing I want to touch on in this area is this matter of what you do with all this land you have acquired over the years. The major one in my area and also I suppose in terms of the province of Ontario is the north Pickering thing. Having gone through that entire planning process, all the rigmarole about who got paid what for what piece of property, all the battles that we have got going on that and all the heartache in fact that the government has endured to try to get that project under way, what's finally going to happen with it? We had the little team out there planning away in north Pickering with their information office and meeting with the region and arguing with the citizens about it all. Now we are getting near the crunch. What do we do with that land?

That's a basic problem because I don't see this government, having abandoned the concept it had going for them in the HOME programme, now really doing very much of any note, and that's a crime. It's a crime, frankly, that you would take it on the nose for so long and in so many ways about that particular project and about the Townsend site and several other sites where the government has acquired a lot of property, and that you would suffer all that heartache, to have to ask what is happening at the end when you could finally do something good. I wouldn't be the first one to pat you on the back with this but you could do something that would make you look good in the public eye. You could actually put some housing units on the market at a price, if you want to talk about affordable housing, that people could afford. You could do that now. You own the land.

You are in the process of legal battles and that kind of stuff. But the development industry suffers those all the time and you

shouldn't have been surprised that you ran into them. You could now put something substantial on the market, a large piece of real estate next door to Metropolitan Toronto with the big blue pipe running through it so the servicing is available. What will happen to it now? Will that all get turned over to the hands of the developers? Probably not. As you said in your opening statement today, there will be some kind of a mix. There will be some go on the open market and some go into AHOP/HOME units. Perhaps that will happen but that's hardly much of an answer. It is hardly much of a response and it is hardly much of a reason to take all the abuse that this government has taken over the north Pickering project to bail out at the last moment.

[10:15]

At that moment, when you really could make a substantial impact on the housing market in the whole of Metropolitan Toronto, you are now going to dump it back into the private sector—with some agreements, that's true. But the guys who are going to make the bucks are those developers who move into that particular project and the others you have lined up when you start to put it out as private stock.

That is a crime, and the crime is, in my view anyway, that you really have done the things you should have done and you have suffered the heartbreak, and at that point where you could make a substantial difference in the housing market in Metro you are going to bail out. You won't be jumping out completely, that's true, and there will be some agreement struck, but I am saying it is not enough, and I am saying that it is a real crime. Previous ministers, and this minister in particular, have had some rather aggravating experiences over the north Pickering project, and it probably never will do what it was originally intended to do. But at that point in time when you could really make some impact you are gone. That is the tragedy.

Let me move to some other general areas, and I want to come back to most of them in specifics on later votes. A basic problem in the province of Ontario is that nobody knows what we are doing. There isn't a provincial plan. It is not that I am really all that hot on planning being the total answer to everything. I don't really believe that. I believe very strongly in the planning process and have spent a fair amount of my time working on planning boards and planning and development committees and things like that. It doesn't answer all your problems, but it really gets down to the meat of it when it occurs when you have no concept of what you are trying to do. This is so whether it is a local official plan or one for the province of Ontario in a case where everybody has agreed there is very little chance you are ever going to get anywhere and you will just muddle around. That is what is happening now in the province. It goes back to that original concept that I put forward about what is the role between the Ministry of Housing and TEIGA, and a number of other ministries that are involved in it.

The provincial plan isn't there. There is no agreed-upon concept, however generally you want to talk about what Ontario should look like five years from now or 10 years from now or whatever. We talk about a "go east" policy. But what is a go east policy? In my area we have probably spent—putting together what the province, the federal government and the local municipalities have had put out in dollars—$30 million or $40 million in planning studies, at a very conservative estimate, in that area. Yet there still is not an approved official plan for the region of Durham, though they spent their bucks on that and put their time in. It still hasn't got that one out. There isn't a concentrated policy for the area that is larger than the region of Durham, nor for that area that is called eastern Ontario or central Ontario or for the province of Ontario.

So we don't know where we are going. We haven't agreed upon that. And as someone who spent some time trying to get official plans together, I really appreciate all the heartaches and the jacking around that you have to go through to get any consensus on things. I know how tough it is. But I also know that it can be done. It is the responsibility of this minister in particular, along with several of his cabinet colleagues, to put that together. When it gets down to it, if you talk about affordable housing, at some point in time you have to ask where are they going to go? And how are we going to service them? And are we taking up the agricultural land to do that? And are we talking about satellite cities?

The irony of it all is that we went through this in our area, and it is exactly the same across the province of Ontario—this argument about satellite cities. We talked about two tiers in the region of Durham, and we talked about a Toronto-centred region plan which addressed itself to that idea, and we talked about a COLUC report

which addressed itself to that concept. How are we going to have that development? Where are we going to put the houses and the industry?

Nothing ever was really firmed up about that. In fact as late as last spring the Treasurer again tabled a massive bunch of documents in the House and it was impressive. I mean, if you are impressed by a pile of paper it was impressive. But if you took the time to read it it wasn't very impressive, because there was nothing new in there. It was a collation of old planning reports put together and bound up with a new cover and presented. Whatever happened to that? When did we ever discuss that? When did the province ever commit itself to anything arising from that, or portions thereof?

The next thing we see is a "go east" policy, whatever that is. I mean it is very catchy stuff; but it is not very definitive for sure. That is a basic problem, because we are now seeing developers walking back into the region, as an example—and this is happening throughout Ontario—and they are not talking about a subdivision with 100 units in it. They are talking about 1,700 acres, 2,400 acres; they are talking about 8,000 or 9,000 units at a whack; and the normal stalls that municipalities put at them about, "Gee, we can't service that site," are answered very quickly by their saying, "Well, we'll service it." The municipalities, as they did in the town of Newcastle, will say, "Listen, we can't hook you into Newcastle's sewage treatment system," and the developer says, "Don't worry, we'll build you a new one."

They do the other stall about, "Well, there aren't any arenas," and the guy says "We will build you an arena. And there aren't any libraries; we'll build you a library." He has such a massive investment in land there that he has turned the corner. Whatever the municipality might have previously used as a reasonable excuse not to allow his plan, he's saying, "Dollars don't count at this point, I've got so much sunk into this property," and because in that area there's been a lot of turnover and a lot of land speculation he probably bought it at the wrong time and is hung in there for a lot of mortgage money. If he's gone past the option stage he's got to bail himself out.

Oddly enough, one of the things that they are getting around to, what they are hanging their hat on, is that they have got an official plan. They are simply saying, "You've bought 2,000 wonderful acres I hope you have a great horse farm, but you can't build houses on it." The developer is extremely surprised, because he hasn't dealt with that before.

It would really help in that area if that regional official plan were approved, because I spent some time working on the initial concepts that were put forward there. I think that by and large as official plans go it is a good one. I think there are some land-use policies in there about agricultural land that are tough, that are reasonable, that I think represent a consensus of people in that area. I notice that the Minister of Agriculture and Food took the time on a couple of occasions to point out that they had addressed themselves to that problem in that region and they have come up with some—not classy solutions, but workable ideas.

We need that across the province of Ontario. I am sure that my friends from Sudbury and the north will want to talk to you, as you will probably want to say a good deal about what's going on in terms of northern Ontario. Where's the development up there? Where are the houses going? Are we using the same approach there as we are using in Metropolitan Toronto? Is that an appropriate thing in unorganized communities? How is the planning process used there?

We run into several rather severe hiccups, don't we, when we move away from urban planning areas, where they have planning staff, and we get out into smaller towns, villages, counties, unorganized communities. We see the kind of planning that goes on there. What generally happens, and I don't think it's news to anybody, is that they hire somebody from Toronto to come out and do their plan. The odd thing is the plan that is presented—I saw a couple from the former town of Uxbridge—looked amazingly like plans that I had seen for other small communities.

I frankly think what happens with a lot of planning consultants these days is that they hire a couple of young guys on staff who come down, they have this concept of what a community should look like, they slap a new cover on it and out they go. The senior planner goes to the council when they present that and makes the pitch. Of course, he looks very distinguished and urbane and obviously is a knowledgeable person. The fact is that he didn't do any of the work on that plan, and the plan is remarkably similar to what was put out before. That costs a lot of money. They spend a lot of money on those kinds of things.

Service money: You talked about that in your opening statement and it is something that I want to follow up on, in particular with the OHAP scheme, because for the first time in that one the government addressed itself to the problem of who pays for the pipes and it provided the interest-free loans, which sounds much better, quite frankly, than the municipality having to go out to borrow it on the open market. The fact is, municipalities under that OHAP scheme—and my region is certainly one of the prominent ones in that area—are piling up substantial debts and it is beginning to back up on them. The loans may well be interest free, and the loans may be forgivable for the first two or three years. I notice that in my area they slipped from three to five years and there's some small argument, as you know, about exactly what is going on in that area. I want to set that one aside because it is basically a local thing, and I want to address myself to this problem of servicing costs.

Are you lending money to municipalities that can afford to carry that kind of debt? In the studies that we did in Oshawa in the OHAP scheme, even with all the little goodies that were attached to the thing we were still losing money on it. The city came down and made a brief, as a number of other municipalities did, about whether you win or lose under the OHAP scheme. In my view it's questionable—at least initially—whether the municipalities lose very much. I think they do lose some—probably $600 or $700 a unit—but the thing that concerns me, municipal financing being what it is, is what are they going to do in five or 10 years when all these units are in place and in the ground, and those massive loans for servicing costs are due? Interest-free or not, the principal is due. That's a lot of money.

Should not the government of Ontario at some point in time decide that if it wants to put housing units into a particular area it is going to pick up the tab for the servicing costs? I have the very real problem, the obvious one of what role does the development industry play in all of this? I think a split can be worked out, an arrangement can be made, because they're quite prepared to pay for servicing. I remember when they used to always come in and cry that they could never afford it, but in the end when you struck the agreement they always could afford it. It struck me that they were simply negotiating the best they possibly could get from that particular municipality in terms of servicing costs, but always they could do it. So that servicing element is particularly important.

The other thing that seems to be an entrapment in all of this is the planning process itself and in particular the thing about the OMB, the Municipal Board hearing where, as an example, in my area again, if you've got a plan of subdivision or whatever you want to do, you do it locally, then you do it regionally, then you run it through the ministry, then you probably will have an OMB hearing, because anybody can object, and they do, and it only takes one person to file an objection, however frivolous it might be, to stop the project for seven, eight months, a year.

We have to address ourselves to that rather delicate point of, are we going to run roughshod over someone's rights, do we want to stop democracy and all of that? Or do we want to say that in the planning process there are some important things happening and if you file an objection it has to be a substantive one? Maybe we address ourselves to that by someone making that judgement, maybe we address ourselves to that by having the Municipal Board be far more active than it is now, with far more resources to deal with these problems so they are not held up for six months, eight months, 12 months.

I've been in that awkward position when the municipality, the region, all the planners involved, virtually everyone thought that the project was worthwhile, was conforming with official plans, was something that ought to go, and someone out there objected. I've even seen one, a shopping centre proposal, where the objection came from a property owner who was adjacent to the proposal and who very openly said, "I want a lot of money for this old house that I've got across the street."

What the developer did—and I very rarely feel sorry for developers, but I did in this case—was he made a business decision that buying that guy out was a hell of a lot cheaper than letting his project sit around for 12 or 14 months. He paid $138,000 for an old house that was probably worth, on its best day, $30,000. He paid, and that's a wrong thing to happen, but it does happen. It happens a lot. It adds to the cost of the unit in the end, because developers are not happy about socking that stuff in their own back pocket, they always like to pass those costs through, and we have to admit that generally the way things are going now, that happens. That's precisely what happens.

I want to mention very briefly a couple of items in talking about this planning thing. You quoted in previous speaches the Bureau of Municipal Research and I found a couple of their latest things rather interesting. The first one I want to put in, which addresses

itself to the point that I just raised, was the March 1977 issue from them, and it's called Design for Development, Where Are You? I don't think we need to say much more than to read the title because that's the problem. Where is that Design for Development? Whatever happened to it?

The other one from March 1977, these are both recent ones and they've done a lot of good work in this field, I think,is called Disappearing Farmlands, So What? I think again, without running into a long tirade about agricultural land, that's a very real problem. That is the problem in planning, frankly, in a number of areas, the disappearing farm land and that argument about agricultural land, and has this government been nearly definitive enough so that local municipalities have firm guidelines? Have they really done it?

I know what your problem is there, in terms of the argument about local autonomy, but frankly, in the Niagara situation, in the end what came out of it was not a satisfactory decision for most of the people involved. The compromise was struck but then you had a local municipality flying blindly, trying to arrive at its own things and in the unfortunate position that if it made the wrong decision it would get slapped by the provincial government. That's a very difficult thing.

All I'm saying is if that design for development for the province of Ontario was in place, if those firm policies that would come out of a provincial plan were in place, municipalities would know where they were going. They wouldn't be put in that awkward position of having to second-guess what the government is going to do. If we make the right move, they'll never praise us. There's no incentive to make the right move, in fact. If we make the wrong move, it'll become a great public issue, and at some point when it becomes politically hot enough, the provincial government will intervene.

[10:30]

It causes great problems all over the place, not the least of which is in the production of housing; almost all these planning difficulties centre around that. In the end you're reacting to someone who's trying to make some money to sell houses, and it's a very awkward situation for a local council to try to face. It's not a very healthy situation from anybody's point of view—even from a developer's point of view, I dare say.

Most of the developers I have talked to—and I happen to know a good number of them, because I spent time on the planning committees—don't object to an official plan that's in place, a plan which people are going to stick to. Their objection is that there are no rules; they play catch as catch can. There aren't any official plans for the province; there are a number of them for municipalities. But they don't know what the rules are.

I've never yet seen a developer who, when you said, "These are the rules; these are the guidelines; this is the policy of this particular area," wouldn't accept that. They have some objections, I suppose—that's quite normal—but they do accept it. They accept, in fact, the very basic premise that I'm trying to put out here, that the planning process is a valid one if it's carried through. It's not a valid one if all you're going to do is talk about it.

I think that if there is a major fault to be put to this ministry, it's that it really has not addressed itself to that provincial plan and the role that the Minister of Housing has to play in that. I know how tough it is to put all of those ministries together and come out with a consensus. I know how politically sensitive it is, in terms of coming to an issue, but I am making the case that it can be done; and nothing that you can do—no gimmicky programme, no giveaway, no assistance to the development industry—is ever going to go anywhere until that plan is there, until you make that commitment to do something about a provincial plan for the province of Ontario. Stop doing the documents and start making the decisions, because that's the problem.

We can tinker around with mortgage money and the financial problems of the development industry and all that, but developers are going to do whatever will make money for them and we should simply accept that. They'll do no more and no less. Frankly, it isn't their responsibility to plan the province of Ontario, it's this government's. It hasn't done that and if there is a keystone failure in whatever you're trying to do it's that. You'll never succeed until that's in place—until those commitments have been made.

Let me move to a couple of other general areas that I'd like to be a little more specific about later. There is this great difficulty about what is, I guess, commonly known as public housing. Who are those people? Do they have any rights? Where does the public housing go? Who builds and to what standards?

It seems to me, according to recent announcements in the ministry, that essentially all of this is being—and I use the word advisedly—shuffled off to the municipalities. That would be great if it was put to them in context, with some financial assistance, with a lot of good, substantive patterns having been set. But the patterns are really not there. Public housing, for the people who live in it, for the people who live around it and from the municipality's point of view, is a difficult thing. It is a very thorny question.

The problem really is, of course, that in some places there are, without question, some public housing projects that are certainly less than desirable, that have a lot of problems. I can think of a couple of projects I went through recently. Frankly, I'm not terribly sure what you could do, except tear down half of it, put in some park space and totally rearrange the project. They're there, they're in place and there's no place else for people to go. It's a sticky one.

I think it does no one any good to rant and rail at the municipalities, saying that the block to providing assistance to people in lower income levels who really need that kind of housing assistance is that the municipalities don't want it. That's an incredibly naive approach to it. The problems are there, and the buildings were put up by the province of Ontario, and, in many cases—either directly through OHC or indirectly through a local housing authority—are really still being run by the province of Ontario. You go to local housing authorities and the first thing they want to know is what is the OHC guideline on this; that's what they'll do—no more, no less. They're very reluctant to take on a lot of new programmes or make substantial changes in things.

Simple things like how the project was put up in the first instance—which in my experience with the ones I've seen is rather poorly—in terms of who inspected that site, who approved those standards in the first instance. They are just plain, lousy buildings. If it were the private sector, nobody would accept it. And if you were trying to rent those things on the open market, you wouldn't have anybody in there. But because you're dealing with a lower income group with no alternative, they live with the lousy windows.

You talked about conserving energy. I can take you to a lot of public housing projects where it would be a damned good idea for starters if you got the windows to fit and the doors to fit. It strikes me if you want a really brilliant move to complement our great movement to conserve energy, the first thing you'd do is go to those particular projects and start to put some insulation in them. You'd start to place a little caulking around the windows and start to get doors that would fit properly.

There are just a vast number of problems there and they are very difficult. I know they're going to be very expensive to fix. In some instances, I am not sure you can ever make those poorly designed initial projects that were put up desirable places for anybody to live.

I know of one classic place that I went through and I go through it quite often because I know a number of people there. It is an entire project and a big one and an ugly one. They have tried to do a number of things with it. A basic fault in the design of that project is that they forgot in designing it that people have garbage. There is no back door, there is only one front door and there is no place to put the garbage. You haven't got a choice. You can keep your garbage in your kitchen or in your living room or at your front door. Most people opt for at least getting it out of the living room and the kitchen and put it outside the front door. But let me tell you when you are canvassing or when those people are greeting visitors at the door, it is a little tough to walk over the garbage in the summer time. Yet there is no place else for them to put it.

There are basic design problems in a number of those buildings. Some newer projects I have been into lately are really quite pleasant. There have been a lot of improvements. We have got a senior citizens' project going up is Oshawa, which I notice you have listed, which I think is going to be rather a good one because there was a lot of consultation involved in that project.

I want to tell you there was a lot of heartache in getting that thing done. The Oshawa city council would not be one that would pat OHC on its back for the way it goes about its business and maybe the kindest thing to do is to put that entire operation out of its misery. Let the municipalities take it over. Certainly from my experience in working with them, it would not be a bad move. I know that that poses some difficulties and you will probably jump all over that.

There is that great difficulty of having any provincial agency move to a municipality and try to do something. They jockey back and forth. There has always been, in my experiences anyway, a lot of turnover in staff. You don't know who is going to be there next week. It is tough to do. Probably I am going back to that original premise I put,

that the local municipality with some help and with some financial support can handle that job well. But you will notice I did say with some help and some financial support. Don't ask the municipalities to do things that you could not afford to do because they are in a worse position than you are.

I want to run through a couple of other things you have found as problems and have set up a mechanism to deal with, I hope, in response to a number of things that have been put out before. I think you have got to get to some means of providing for local housing authorities that really means something.

I know it is great to make these very simple arguments that you want to have a lot of local housing authorities. That's nifty. But I think it is important that you address yourself to that question as to who sits on those housing authorities.

As they are dealing with a number of public housing tenants, that is a vested interest group for sure that ought to be represented on that housing authority. You can make the argument that they may not know anything about administering a project. I am simply making the case that they ought to be officially represented on that housing authority. They ought to play a role. If you are trying to get those people out of that economic condition, if you are trying to improve their lot in life, to make them aware of what is going on and to make them responsible for the actions of their kids and their wives and their families and everybody else, they have to play a role in that.

I am not saying that everybody on the housing authority should be a public housing tenant, but I am saying they should have a foot in the door. Put one of them on. That is surely not too much to ask. That surely won't break anybody's back. When you go to look at local housing authorities, part of the problem for sure is not that it is a local authority. That's probably part of the solution. Part of the problem is who sits on it. Quite frankly, there are a lot of appointments that come out of here to local housing authorities that are at least questionable. Where did those people come from? There is a magical process at work there. I am never quite clear as to how those people turn up on the housing authorities. I know who they are and I know which political party most of them belong to.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Careful, I could shoot you down for that.

Mr. Breaugh: That's right. You made the case. You said no interjections and now you are interjecting.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm sorry. My humble apologies but you're wrong.

An hon. member: Always.

Mr. Breaugh: Always? Well, we might dissent.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's the only time you have been wrong so far.

Mr. Breaugh: We might put a dissenting opinion in there. But I want to get back to that basic premise that those local housing authorities, I think, can be good things, but I do think they need to have the tenants on them. Not a lot, not the majority, but I think they need to be responsive to that group. The group needs to be represented even if it is only the one tenant whose sole qualification for being there initially is that he or she is a public housing tenant. I don't think that's an unwieldly notion. If you've got a housing authority of five people or whatever, the sole qualification of one of them might be that they're a tenant in one of those projects. As they spend some time on it I think they'll become as knowledgeable as anybody else.

I might even go so far as to make a case that if it is a local housing authority the appointments be made locally and that they be responsive locally. I'd be quite happy to make that case. I think there is a good case on that side. I recognize there are some problems as things now stand, but I think with the adjustments that you're making it's quite logical that the appointments be done locally.

Let me move to the alternative forms of housing. I notice you've again responded to this—that you are now providing some assistance to them. You can provide all the assistance you want to identifiable groups who spring up as co-ops or whatever form of alternative housing they might have, but there's got to be money in the budget to finance the project. And that has been the hiccup in the ones that I'm aware of.

They have the heartaches with the red tape. They've had the runaround from the bureaucrats and all that. But the basic bottom line problem is that when they get the act all together they've had some difficulty financing. The commitment that was made a couple of years ago to put a co-op together —and they spent all their time running around—and I had one in my riding fall through, because in the end, with all the planning approvals done and all the technical details worked out and the layout all drawn and development proposals put together, and so on—by the time all of that was done and

they went back to the federal government, in this case, for money, they said the money isn't there any more. It went somewhere else.

So what I'm saying essentially is that I believe that that's a very valid form of housing. That's not a solution to the housing problems in Ontario, but it's one alternative that's there, that can work extremely well with some technical assistance. That's necessary. But there also needs to be some money. At the bottom line the money's got to be there and I think substantially, because I think that that's a type of housing that can be put together.

I want to make the case for that form of housing that we've now got on the open market—all these condominiums, God bless them. They're going to keep me in office for years, just trying to work with those people and help them sort through their problems. They are particularly funny things. In many respects the condominium is a co-op. The only problem is the people buying into them don't understand that process very well and haven't spent any time in working through the design of the particular facility.

So I think that there is an area in the province, particularly since the government has stepped out of most of its effort to provide a government-built home that someone could buy, that this other alternative has to take a much higher profile and that means a lot of technical assistance from the government. It also means a big buck in the budget.

If you're taking your eggs out of one basket, then this is, I think, a very logical second basket to put them into. Because I know that those projects work, and they work in a wide variety of forms. I could show you great ones in the Durham region, ranging from rather classy single family homes that were put up 20 years ago as a co-op to a new condominium project that was put up as a co-op. And both kinds work well. They've got their problems like everything else, but they do work. They do provide low-cost affordable housing, if you want to use the little catchword. They work, that's the pertinent point, but they need some money and they need some assistance to clear out the red tape and the technicalities.

Let me deal with another problem, this matter of where the government is buying land. I noticed that you said it again today and I noticed that there's a question on the order paper, and there always is, about how much land does the province of Ontario actually own, where is it, why did you buy it, what are you going to do with it, what are your expectations, and will you do anything in the final stage of that development that's there.

I talked previously about a provincial plan for Ontario. I think what would be nifty, for starters, would be just an inventory of what we own and where and why we bought it in the first instance. I don't want to embarrass you by running through all those occasions of newspaper headlines that said that the government spent $30 million to buy land and they don't know why they bought it in the first instance and they're not terribly sure where it is in the second instance. No, no, I wouldn't want to do that. That would be unfair.

[10:45]

I think it's pertinent to recognize—frankly, I'm convinced—that we as a provincial government don't know what land we own, where it is and why we ever bought it in the first instance. So the argument about land banking in its simplistic form—that the government should acquire a lot of property—I'm rather convinced in the province of Ontario it happened a long time ago. The province owns a large chunk of the real estate in the province of Ontario for various reasons, that's for sure, and I'm not sure that anybody could give you a clear rationale as to why they bought the land or even where it is.

I know you bought 3,000 or 4,000 acres in Brooklin. Nobody's particularly sure why. The answer we got when I was on the regional council there was that you bought 4,000 acres to stabilize land prices in the area. You bought it at grossly inflated prices anyway, but why you bought that land and why you bought it there and even the admission that you actually own the land was a rather difficult one to get. It's not serviceable land. I don't know what you bought it for, frankly.

Maybe you were trying to stimulate the local economy or something, but I suspect that that's true in a number of instances across the province of Ontario. We can pick the big ones like Pickering and Townsend and we can pick the small ones. That 4,000 acres is a fair piece of development property, and I know several developers who would give their eye-teeth to have 4,000 acres in the region of Durham, never mind where it is, never mind whether it's serviceable. Frankly, it's not a bad idea to have it from their point of view. It may turn out to be a good investment at some point in time. It may turn out to be a real turkey. That's irrelevant from their point of view.

They like to get their hands on that kind of stuff.

Let me conclude what I have to say in these opening remarks with a rather snappy —I won't be snappy—summary of things that are going on.

I think one of your real problems is that you have never really sorted out your priorities, what you want to do, what's important. I don't mean the simplistic notions of getting a catch-phrase like "affordable housing" and trotting that around and making good speeches here and there and saying, "We're doing good things for people." I mean the real nuts and bolts that you would see in a provincial plan, in a clearly established policy by the Minister of Housing to really work for those very undramatic things of cleaning up the planning process, of providing money, of putting our priorities into—if we're talking about housing for low income people—seeing that that project gets delivered to that target group. That's your priority and you say it very clearly and your programme is designed to do that, and it doesn't go on the open market.

I think one of your real problems—and it deals very directly with this matter of establishing our priorities and getting a perspective on things—is that you've got this great inner conflict. Stephen sometimes says it's dogmatic Toryism. I think he's maybe right. I think that in many instances you do know what you ought to do. You do know what will make an impact on the housing market, as an example, but at that last moment when you could actually do the thing, someone in the cabinet reminds you: "My God, we can't do that. That's a socialist idea."

In every other area, the whole thing about the socialist horde routine—you know, who brought us Medicare in Ontario? We know that—all of those things are there, and I wish you'd just step aside from those items. If we want to have great philosophical political arguments, we should have them. We should have them in the House every day. It would be great fun. But in dealing with the problems of housing in Ontario it's irrelevant what the political philosophy is. What's relevant is, are you going to meet the needs of those people? They care not one hoot for political philosophy, most of them. They're interested in getting a house that they can buy, or that they can rent, or at least they can live in.

So all of those things seem to kind of cumulatively rise up to that point where it does become a matter, I guess, of political philosophy, where you figure that you won't look good, you won't appeal to the development industry because you're turning the corner. I think you lost that philosophical basis as a political party some time ago. I think you probably did recognize there were things that were appropriate to be done in this era, that might not have been appropriate 20 years ago or 30 years ago for you as a political party, but they had to be done, and in some measure you did them. I want to appeal to you not to let this dogmatic philosophy get in your way. You know what has to be done. You've recognized the problems in all of the literature that I've read, and it's a monumental pile of literature for one thing, but it's good stuff by and large. There's a little public relations around the edges, but it's not that bad. You do recognize what the problems are. The question is, are you going to deal with them? Are you going to deal with them from a very narrow perspective or from the broader perspective, the things that have to be done in providing good government? That's your problem, I think. The response is not gimmicks; it's not giveaway programmes or let's see if we can hand over $1,000 to this guy or $1,200 to somebody else. The pitfall in those is that though they are snappy for the time being, you really don't do much for anybody in the long run. You don't even address yourself to the problem in the short run; and politically they're always full of snafus that are embarrassing to government in the end. Wouldn't you be much better off to do what you know is right substantively? It might be less dramatic politically, but certainly it would be the answer to the question.

I want to put to you the case too that you very often respond to the development industry. That's quite natural. I've had some dealings with those ladies and gentlemen and I find them an impressive group of people. They've got the planners, the lawyers, the accountants and everybody else. They put their material forward to you in a very direct way and make a substantive case for whatever their point of view is. The problem is that in Ontario there is no consumer group doing the same thing from the point of view of the person who buys the housing unit. The consumers in Ontario do not have a great consumer group presenting you with glossy programmes, inviting you to La Scala for lunch to present their case and doing all their things. There is that problem. What you get are dribs and drabs from various councils, labour organizations, ratepayers' groups and things like that; but they really don't respond in the way that industry does. Maybe you're

simply responding to those people who make the case in front of you.

I know that on occasion the development industry in the province of Ontario has been most unhappy with you. We have little clippings here and there from all over the place where so and so from some consolidated building corporation, or somebody from Runnymede, or somebody else in Ottawa or in Sault Ste. Marie, or wherever, has said that the government's mucking around the free enterprise system again and screwing up the process immensely. That's true. You are probably doing that, and it's quite fair for them to say all of those things. I get concerned that you only respond to them and that you back off, which is exactly what they want to some degree, representing consumers in the province of Ontario, but not substantively.

In other words, I'm making the argument that you don't put a balance of judgement on that. Maybe some are political judgements that are done for the crazy political reasons that people do things around here. As an example in the field of condominiums, we are just now beginning to have an agency formed to represent people who bought into condominium projects. We are just beginning now. Up until this time we have been responding to a rather substantial lobby, if you like, or presentation of opinions if you want to use a nicer phrase, from the industry itself. We have not had that formal response from those people who bought into those things.

The other side of the coin, I think, often gets short shrift, because it's not there in some instances, or because it can't present its case, as the industry does, very forcefully, very professionally and very thoroughly. It's very pleasant, I suppose, to have dinner with the development industry, have them explain their point of view and give you a nice, well-put-together, substantive brief on whatever the problem of the day is. But the other side of the coin has got to be represented, and I'm not sure that the mechanism is even there yet. That's a concept and you might discuss or think about, to provide that.

Let me run through some considerations in my final remark. Do we really use the resources that are there? I don't think we do in the province of Ontario. I'm not sure we really put all of the people to work, that we use all that information. There are thousands of people sitting out there on planning committees. They know what the problems are. I'm not sure there's a very sensitive communication system that provides that information to the government. I certainly didn't find it when I was there. I don't think you really deal with problems in a substantive way.

There are a number of things you have suggested in your opening remarks and in various programmes that you've put before us today that have to be done, but there are problems that need substantive answers. Maybe what we're going to wind up with here is that I'm going to be arguing that you have not done enough or that you ought to respond with more money or more directly. That's fine and we should probably carry on with that. But I have that great concern that recognizing problems doesn't necessarily mean you have found solutions to any of it. I really get upset when people suggest there are simple, snappy answers to all of these problems. There aren't. In my view, the problem is probably very boring to deal with. It's politically not a good thing to do, but it has to be done. These problems fall in the area of the planning process itself, which is under review, and has been since God knows when but has never really happened:

In the area of land use, which is not news but which this government really does not have a substantive policy on; we'll probably argue over that but I think that is undeniable. In terms of support to the agencies that are there working in the whole concept of developing a sensible housing programme for the province of Ontario, the industry has its support system, it's in place; and the municipalities have their support system in place; but the consumer doesn't, it isn't there at all.

What is the final role of the province of Ontario in providing housing? I think we've gone through some agonizing determinations over that. Does the ministry build the house? Not very well, according to past experiences. Does it pay for the services? Does it do the planning process? In the provision of a housing unit as the end product, you have got so many people with their finger in the pie, all crossing over one another. At the provincial level there is a lot of that, and also at the municipal level. In the industry there is a lot of that. Everybody is doing a number of things and the roles are confused. They sometimes get so badly screwed up that in the end everybody walks away in disgust and nothing happens. Even when it does go through—I go back to the concept that I put to you in the House yesterday, I think it was a guy from CBC here in Toronto who showed it took 30 months to take a rental project from scratch to finish. That may be a little high and he is dealing with a specific case; but even in my area, with lots of planning being done and the rules being carefully established, most developers would say that it is tough to get a project under way—thought through, financed, designed, ap-

proved, all of that stuff and get the shovels in the ground—much short of 18 or 24 months, much short of that.

As for the statement you made that you are going to put out 3,000 new rental units this year, I would be prepared to put a little cash on the line about that. People in the development industry are probably just at the beginning of the building season with no ideas in mind now, and with no real financing lined up and no designs done. If you are saying that by the end of 1977 we will have an additional 3,000 units that we wouldn't have had anyway, I think there would be a lot of people around who would be prepared to put a dollar or two on that. I don't think that is going to happen.

Certainly if it does happen, it will be the first in the history of Ontario. What we may wind up with is people who had projects under way previous to this time taking advantage of the programme and kind of rolling in. They were going to do it anyway and there's some financial advantage now to continue with that programme, so they may take advantage of that. You will probably stand up in the House in November and announce, "Well, we didn't make 3,000. There's 2,999 that got under way."

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And you'll give me hell.

Mr. Breaugh: Whether those are units that would be built this year without this programme is a good question, and I frankly doubt that you are going to be able to get the 3,000 target or anything close to that. In fact, I'll be surprised if you get anything under way that wouldn't have been built anyway. It's possible, it's conceivable, but it's highly doubtful. That's why I think you get the development industry itself saying, "Well, that's a very nice idea, but no thank you"; or "We will think about it later."

I think that's your problem. You could obviously go to the development industry and buy your way into that. You could make it so financially attractive to them that they would abandon everything else and put everything in high gear and go with it—but, frankly, I don't think $600 a unit is going to do it. I wouldn't be in favour of upping the ante, because I am not terribly sure that there would be no rent controls on those units. There would be some subsidies involved. I'm not so sure that that is a desirable thing anyway. Again, I think that's a programme that is a little gimmicky and looks snappy. I don't really think it is going to do anything. The problem, of course, is that in November or December who is really going to make a great public issue about whether you missed the starts by 750, because you have the obvious answer, "Well, we certainly did do something." And who is going to get to the question of whether those are units that would have been built anyway? You'd have to get some developer to admit probably that he took money under false pretences, and they are always reluctant to do that. Once in a while they do that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Do they?

Mr. Breaugh: They rarely do that. I think you've got to re-emphasize and to bring into higher priority the whole matter of alternatives to the kinds of things we do, the co-op routine and all of that. That needs more money. That needs much more assistance. To say we are starting at square one with your announced programmes is probably to put it mildly. I think we are a little behind square one. I think that's a really viable thing and I think that can go and should go. It needs the support of this government, and never mind that it is a socialist idea, because a lot of people living in co-op housing are not socialists, so don't worry about that. They would be quite happy with you if you do the right thing.

[11:00]

Setting aside political concerns, I think you ought to do that and I think you know that that works and that has got to be put together. When you put it together let me assure you that we will tell them what kind of an idea it was in the first instance. Don't feel bad about that.

I think you have got to move in some measure and sort out what you mean by control of the development industry itself. I get terribly upset when I see that the housing warranty plan in Ontario is really the HUDAC plan. When I see the kind of little press release that HUDAC puts out about "this week we pushed this ministry into doing this; and next week we are going to push that ministry into doing that"; the thing that upsets me is that in the following weeks, usually within an appropriate time period and with some reservations, I see that minister doing that. That bothers me a lot. I think you have got the tail wagging the dog.

Recognizing that you believe very strongly in the free enterprise system and the private sector and all of that, that doesn't mean that you let those guys rule the roost. They are not nearly as certain of their positions as they might care to have you think they are. I think you have to learn to handle those

people somewhat more dramatically than you are doing now and deal with them.

I read all of the stuff some time ago and I have read the recent stuff on the lowering of standards, and I think you have to look very closely at that. In Oshawa when we looked at the HUDAC proposals to lower municipal standards, we thought it conceivable that the home buyer—if you did everything they wanted you to do, if you lowered all the standards—might save $700 initially, and the municipality would pick up that tab probably within the first year in terms of increased municipal spending.

I am simply saying that they have certainly got every right in the world to put their perspective before the government; and they do that. That doesn't necessarily mean that the government should totally jump in bed with those guys and accept their standards, their housing warranties, and let them run the programmes—all of that. Those guys have got a natural bias and they state it quite frankly. They don't hide it. They are in business to make money, and that's quite legitimate in the province of Ontario in 1977. But we should all recognize that that's their perspective, and they are not there to represent consumers.

They jump up and down when you say they don't represent consumers and they don't have the best interests of those people at heart, but the practical and rather sad fact of it is that they really don't. They are there to make a buck. Some are honest and trustworthy businessmen and they will be around afterwards. If you chase them a little bit, and yell and scream, you can get things fixed; you can have adjustments made to little deals that were struck; but if they are not, those things don't happen. They have that real bias.

I want to put a couple of final cases to you. There is a need to integrate the responsibility for a lot of programmes in the province of Ontario. We were talking about saving energy and we did dismiss the sales tax on insulation materials, but in new houses we haven't upped the insulation standards. It strikes me that if the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is going to announce sales tax exemptions, and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Taylor) is going to yell and scream that you should be insulating your houses; then the appropriate step past that point is to get the building standards up. Then new houses would have that, and you would provide incentives to people. When you put people in a public housing project you would recognize that the aim is not simply to put a roof over their head, although that's a basic need. You would recognize that you have got some responsibility, because you have got all of those people who need the same kind of assistance in one place at one time, to work with those people, to let them be on the housing authorities, to let them organize into associations. In fact you should help them much more at that local level—you know, set aside what you do for FOTA and other people at the provincial level, which is another matter entirely, help them locally in that project, you should be prepared to go to work down there. It might be your responsibility, as Minister of Housing, because the units went up under OHC initially, to bring in all of those other people.

It is tough to get those other government agencies—Community and Social Services agencies—to go in and work with those people. It can be done. It is being done in isolated instances across Ontario, but it is not done as a matter of policy across the province.

You talked very briefly about municipal housing policies. Again, this is an integrated field where I think it is past due. But I beg you to look very carefully at what municipalities are saying in terms of housing policies. Are they substantive and are they writing it into official plans? It is not just OHAP agreements where they should have a policy. They should understand what kind of housing should be provided for their community and they should get tough about that and stick to it. For far too long they have been reacting to developers, and they don't have an existing housing policy of their own.

They don't know what to do; and they still need to think about that. They should understand that there are some social consequences to the things that they do, and the kind of units they approve. And when the minister intervenes—should it be an intervention in connection with the private sector, where you are talking about the price of housing or the AHOP programme, or whatever—the intervention should be for a good and substantive reason: He knows what he is doing; it is consistent with the policy that was set down before; and he will carry through on that.

It will have nothing to do with who puts flowers in the front lawn or whether you pay the driver. It has to be of a substantive nature. The argument which I hear from the development industry is that the government at all levels is quite prepared to intervene with industry—and industry will yell and scream about red tape, bureaucrats and how

long it takes to get something planned, with some validity to their argument in that regard. But what should be said is that the intervention is there but it isn't a substantive intervention.

We talked to development industries about everything except how much is the unit going to cost in the end. And in the end we have very few programmes that deal with price ceilings; we have very few programmes that are targeted to a particular group. And when we do that we don't do it very well; we don't deliver what we purport to deliver. We don't always see that the income group which we are trying to look after actually gets the units. That is important when you get into that field and do that kind of intervention; and you are surely not afraid to intervene in the private sector, because I think you clearly recognize that you have to. But do it in a substantial way; be effective in that and follow through. Quite frankly—as I am seeing in a number of newspaper reports—the private sector is quite happy to have you intervene in that area, if you would stop messing around all over the place, if you were direct and concise and followed through. They would be happy to do it. That is their complaint now: that you drop one programme; you have other programmes going on; and you are interfering with their market. That is what they object to.

Let me say, too, that you talked at length this morning—and in other speeches—about decentralizing the operation. Let's be very specific, making sure that decentralizing doesn't really turn out to be dumping it on other people. Let's be very careful how that is done. When an entire programme like Ontario Housing is being decentralized, which appears to be the case just now, let us see that other things go along with that; it probably means money in the end, because a lot of what happens in that case does mean money.

We sometimes argue that 90 and 10 is not a bad split; but sometimes that 10 per cent locally is hard to come up with. We argue that maybe some municipalities can handle that, but you have to recognize that a number of other municipalities can't. They don't have the staff. They don't even have the inclination to do it now, and they are unlikely to pick it up. So, decentralizing may not mean very much unless the minister is prepared to follow through. Is he prepared to state very clearly what the municipal responsibility will be, and negotiate with them as to what the support system will be when they get that?

That is most of what I have to say in terms of generalities. There are lots of specifics which I am sure a number of members will want to deal with. I want to take a minute—because sometimes I don't agree with the way the minister responds to things in the House—to say that I do appreciate that he has identified—probably not he personally, but his staff and has had the good common sense to make it public knowledge—a number of the areas that are serious problems in the province of Ontario. What he hasn't done is go full measure toward not just identifying the problem but suggesting a programme, at being definitive, at carrying through with that. I really want to see you do that, because I think in the entire field of housing—in planning, in regional development, in getting a plan for the province of Ontario together, in getting a substantive land-use policy—it is not the problem that is news, and it is not the little pussyfoot solutions that are news, it is the substantive recognition of a problem and a gradual movement toward a solution of those things. That has never happened. And it is a tragedy that, as the minister, you can't get up and say "Well, this year I want to have 3,000 new rental units in the province of Ontario, and a little more specifically I want them in Metro Toronto. I know that my planning process will take it through, so those things can happen by October or November of this year."

It is a tragedy that you can't do that. I think, quite frankly, if the whole thing was in shape, if the priorities were sorted out, if your perspective was clear, there is no reason in the world why a Minister of Housing couldn't stand in the House in February and say: "We need 3,000 rental units in Metro Toronto this year. And it will happen." The tragedy is that you stood in the House and said that, and you will probaby say it for the rest of the year; but there is practically no chance, in my view and in the development industry's view, that it will really happen

There may be 3,000 units appear this year, but they will have very little to do with your programme. That's tough stuff because that speaks to the mess that the planning process and the housing industry are in in the province of Ontario. We are at least getting to that stage where we know what's wrong with it. I think we do anyway, but we are having some great difficulties sorting out for a number of reasons how to get out of this mess.

Mr. Martel: We need a benevolent despot.

Mr. Breaugh: He wouldn't have to be a benevolent despot at all if recognition was paid to all of those people who are working so hard to make this thing go. The development industry is part of that effort but it is there with a bias. I am going to conclude my remarks with that and pass on to the Liberal critic.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, just before we move to Mr. Hall, I wonder if I may make just one short comment. The hon. member for Oshawa, my distinguished critic in the New Democratic Party, has some sort of fixation about La Scala. I don't know whether it's because he really wants to go there some time or whether he has spent so much time there he likes to promote it. I would like at this time then perhaps to suggest to him that I would be pleased to arrange for him and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Hall) to meet with myself. We'll go dutch so that you may retain your political purity. I will also invite UDI and HUDAC so that you can sit down and have a chat with them.

Mr. Breaugh: I will accept that invitation if you will change the location to the McDonald's on Yonge Street.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, I want you to go where you obviously have a burning desire to be.

Mr. Breaugh: That's McDonald's on Yonge Street.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Frankly, I would love to get inside the place too. You keep telling me I've been there; I would like to go and see it. Is it Italian?

Mr. Breaugh: I don't know.

Mr. Martel: There is an Italian club.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's not the Union Hall in Sudbury anyway, I'll tell you that.

Mr. Chairman: I believe the Liberal critic is Mr. Hall.

Mr. Martel: Under the new rules, I understand we are supposed to have attendants here to send out for things. The minister has a staff of 18 here that he can send out for coffee. Those of us who don't have a staff here find it rather difficult.

Mr. Chairman: I understand the pages are in school today. That is the reason they are not here.

Mr. Hall: I am not disturbed at all by the slight interruption. I understand fully that the NDP philosophy is that the government shall provide.

My remarks are going to be short. A lot has been said in 2¼ hours already. This is my third set of estimates, plus a supplementary on the first-time home buyers grant. My philosophy on housing has been exposed to Hansard and probably not read by anyone in the past. I see the odd indication from the things that the minister has touched on and the government has acted on, which I would like to think I had a small part in encouraging. I won't dwell on them now. My main interest is to get into the estimates and talk about items in detail.

[11:15]

In the new directions that the ministry seems to be taking, I am interested and approve generally of the combination of federal and provincial programmes working together. That's not to say they're necessarily satisfactory, but I think that direction makes sense and eliminates a lot of redundancy in staff and the confusion that exists in people's minds everywhere with overlapping programmes coming from different directions.

One of the interesting directions you seem to be taking is putting more initiatives on a municipality, and I can't really gauge whether you're ducking your responsibilities as a ministry when you do that in a time of restraint, or doing it partly to defuse criticism of government. I wonder in some areas just how effective it's going to be. I don't view the government's role as that of a curator of housing unless it's a last resort. I view it in the role of an assister in the development of programmes.

One very important way, of course, is the dissemination of information, and I've talked about this before, where I said whether it be the urban development standards, or standardized zoning, or the merits of permitting mixed type housing in a community, whatever it is, I felt very strongly that there should be a team selling approach initiated by the ministry to relate to different municipalities, some of which are more sophisticated than others. You'll probably say the information is being provided and the steps are being taken. That may be, but whether you give it or not is a secondary question, it's a matter of fact as to whether it is in fact received and understood by communities; and if it under-

stood whether a good dialogue is entered into so the benefits of your expertise in many fields can be reliably passed on to the municipalities for them to use in their own judgement and guidance to actually work together as a team. Not in the fullest team sense, because they have other obligations, but to work with the ministry as opposed to working against it. So I want to find out more as the estimates proceed, to gauge just how effective your relationships with the municipalities are going to be. You're expecting them to have more initiative in Ontario Housing units in the future, but saying it just won't make it happen.

You've set up new housing authorities. I got a press release from you dated April 21. It sets up the North Niagara Housing Authority, inaugurated on April 14. I've checked and inquired and I know that in my own municipality there was no contact with municipal staff as to who might be put on such an authority. You've already cautioned the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) to not even dare suggest that the members relate to the same political party as you do. Some of the names that I see certainly relate to the same political party as you do, and some of the names that I see have never been particularly in any high profile in the community as regards their interest in housing, or as a matter of fact building management, so I want to find out more about that later on.

You have recently announced your piggyback grant on the federal programme with the $600 grant. I believe you've told me a low estimate would be some 3,000 units that would be assisted, which, say in metro areas, would not otherwise have been built. You haven't said that they'll be built this year; as a matter of fact, you've suggested that because of the time-frame they won't be built this year.

I know that hindsight is not much fun for a minister to take criticism about, but I'm not doing it in this sense. I do have to go back to the first-time home buyers grant, where $130 million of this province's money was put into that one-shot programme. I happen to think that consideration was given at the time as to whether that money was best spent in the type of programme that was used or whether it might have been used to encourage rental housing, the construction of apartment units.

With hindsight—and it's not hindsight on my part, because I said so at the time—I have to feel that had only a portion of that kind of money gone in to hit the problem of deficiency of vacancy rates for apartments in urban areas I don't think we'd be facing many of the problems that we are facing continuously under rent review.

Rent review is a problem for the tenants in a period of increased costs It's a problem for the landlords. I think I'm mature enough to see difficulties on both sides. What I also see, and I don't like, is a divisiveness that has developed in our urban society over this matter, where the gulf of understanding is not getting narrower; there's not the common ground. Under such circumstances, there is a widening of the gap of understanding.

I suggest that if the government is only spending the $1.8 million that is suggested in the $600 grant—by my arithmetic, that comes out to 3,000 units—it really can't be put forth as the major thrust in reduction of this problem. In comparison with the other earlier numbers, I just can't accept the comparison between the two.

I will be interested in discussing land-use planning. I come from an area that has had a high focus on problems of land-use planning and urban area boundaries in this past period of time. While decisions have been made—by cabinet, I assume—to save fruit land, the other problems have not been satisfactorily addressed; one is the question of the farmer who is on the land.

I quote from a letter of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) which appeared in this morning's Globe and Mail, where he states that the self-sufficiency ratio in Ontario for "canned peaches has dropped from 41 per cent to 19 per cent and canned pears from 79 per cent to 62 per cent" in the last 15 years. This was not because of any other factor except imports. The fruit could be grown in much larger quantities than it is. The competition from the United States and warmer climates presents real difficulty for our farmers. They've been willing, in a large measure, to make the sacrifices that have been put on them by society for the future public good; but I, for one, won't be satisfied until this aspect of land-use planning also takes into account the fallout responsibilities.

Land-use planning, for example, can include concern as to whether there is adequate transportation in a community. I suggest that land-use planning also has to concern itself with whether the person who has been restricted as to the use of his land can make a living on that land.

One thing that does disturb me in the relationship with local municipalities is that the regional municipality of Niagara's planning people, in my opinion, are first-class people, well motivated and intelligent. Yet through a lack of understanding outside the

Niagara area in many newspapers, television programmes and what have you, they have been cast as a bunch of people not really concerned about anybody else, interested only in a short-sighted view of the benefits for Niagara.

Part of this problem is that they have been trying to plan in a vacuum. I have seen an exchange of correspondence between Mr. Veale and ministry people as they tried to revise their plans from 1970 on, and particularly from 1974 on, until 1975 when it was turned down. I have seen an exchange of correspondence at an early point asking for what government accommodation could be made in this, that or the other area if they changed their plans.

For example, there were earlier questions on the matter of oversizing for sewers. Earlier replies from the government said that the government had no answer to the municipality in terms of cost sharing. Eventually, the government in its announcement on February 17 did come down and say that money would be provided for compensation for oversizing. The fact of the matter is that the public perception may be that the planners of Niagara were not doing their role. But I have felt all along they were doing the best they could with the plans that were provided to them and the support that was being offered to them. The support has in some measure come and in some measure it has been late, but in the meantime there have been some public misconception as to the quality of planning in Niagara.

The rules were changed a little bit. It is my understanding that development of an official plan for a community was essentially their goal. I am sure that at some time or other it was suggested by the municipality that it thought in terms of 20-year timeframes, looking ahead. The changes that have been made in the February 17 announcement said: "Here we'll cut it back and you'll have enough for the next 10 years." Even though the municipalities had planned for 20 years ahead, it was not the case that all that land that was included in their acreage would be used in five years or 10 years. It was an obligation on their part to look ahead as planners. Yet in the context of the last few months they have been heavily criticized for doing what earlier would have been required of them, that is look further down the road.

This brings up the basic problem of addressing ourselves as people interested in responsibilities of government to final guidelines as to the use of land for different purposes in Ontario. I share the confusion of the member for Oshawa, and I have certainly discussed this before, about the role of the Treasurer, TEIGA and the Ministry of Housing, and the split point where the overlap is. The cabinet committee on resources development is at an intermediate point on possibly some items, as it is say with the Niagara Escarpment Commission. I believe the minister when he is very much concerned about preserving as much measure of local autonomy as possible. The problem, as I see it, is to direct a programme of overall land use for the province which, within the framework of each municipality, will still offer a degree of local decision-making on land use.

[11:30]

It can't be abdicated by the province and given completely to the municipality, I'm afraid, in this period, because some municipalities would not necessarily take an overall view of the province's needs in total. There has to be a blend of views and it has to be a co-operative approach. It can't be a dictum. It's got to be something that's understood as to the need for and the benefits accruing from.

This dialogue with municipalities is going to be one of the more difficult and continuing problems that the Ministry of Housing has to work on. There are many items that we will touch on in the future as the estimates go forward. I'm finding and hearing about continuing problems with delays in the approval of some zoning bylaws, some as long as two and three years. I don't understand why they've been delayed. The municipality doesn't understand why they've been delayed, in some instances that I'll bring up.

What has happened is that there gets to be quite a bit of confusion because an old standard which obviously needed to be modified has been passed by the municipality but is not legal until it's passed after a hearing, by an Ontario Municipal Board decision. When there's a big time gap between the passage by the municipality and the final approval, the municipality tends, quite wisely, to want to proceed on the new standards and yet it's subject to legal challenge as to the status of it. Mandamus orders can be brought forth and elements of unfairness seem to enter in and there gets to be a divisiveness betwen neighbours and conflicting points of view. This is bad also, because there are certain areas where everyone will accept the independent and objective opinion of a court officer or a judge, but it's very difficult to resolve matters by arguing with your neighbour.

Those are the main areas of concern that I have. There are, naturally, many other parts that I think we could do better on. I have to be candid—I congratulate the Minister of Housing. I think he's done a good job in attempting to address himself to the problems. I don't think he gets the cabinet co-operation he might really need to make housing no longer a problem in this province. It's a competition of priorities, but I think the fact that we have had the same minister for a period of time has been conducive to a settling down and a better direction by the ministry.

I'll close at this point, Mr. Chairman, and I'm happy to get on with the estimates themselves.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Hall. Before the minister replies, I'd just like to thank him for the coffee, and Mr. Martel for suggesting it. I think if you want to add it in estimates we'd appreciate it for the rest of the period.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It'll be under "miscellaneous."

Mr. Chairman: Miscellaneous, yes.

Mr. Breaugh: Yes, put it in miscellaneous. It sounds good.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I wouldn't want it to be in the public accounts.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to comment—I'm going to comment very briefly so don't let all these notes scare you at all—on the remarks made by my two distinguished critics.

I want to say, these being my third official estimates, aside from the supplementary that we had, that I think the comments from the two critics have been positive sorts of comments, unlike what I have had in the past from previous sessions here, and I appreciate that.

So I want to touch just briefly on some of the points that were made by, first of all, Mr. Breaugh. The ministry is not disappearing. I've heard that comment made, both by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis), my critic, and others. It makes good copy—it's interesting reading. But the truth of the matter is that if it appears that the ministry is disappearing, then I'm quite happy that I am accomplishing a degree of success in what I'm trying to do.

The member for Oshawa indicated—and I thank him for the compliment—that I am some sort of a high-profile individual. If I can lose that profile, and at the same time the ministry can continue to operate without its high profile, and the unnecessary, I think, headline sort of thing that went on for some time, then I think that's an effective way for a ministry to run. In fact, I would take some of the comments you made as being quite proper, when you said that there are a lot of things that are everyday, workaday sort of things that can be done that don't necessarily make headlines. I am quite happy that that may be just the direction that we're going in, to take care of those things.

I have never been one who feels that all knowledge rests in one particular area. If I find—and I trust that you will as we go through the estimates, as Mr. Hall has referred to—an indication that some of us have been listening to what some of you have been saying, then I am quite happy. I think that there have been suggestions made that have been worthy of consideration and worthy of bringing into effect. I have no qualms whatsoever in saying that should there be a good idea brought forward by someone, that idea should be put into effect.

The question of who's responsible for what—I think we're trying to sort that out. I think that with the development of the Ministry of Housing since it first came into being, there were some obvious growing pains trying to establish the position of the ministry. As you well know, a great many of the functions of this ministry were scattered around in various other areas of jurisdiction. There were efforts to bring them into this ministry. It took some time to make these things work. You started off, essentially, with two functions in the ministry which were not necessarily compatible. You have to work out those sort of rough edges and blend them together. There are still some of the functions in other ministries—for example in TEIGA—that some of us feel perhaps should be in the Ministry of Housing.

I don't want to be a policing agency. I don't think that's a good function for the Ministry of Housing to have, and that's why I don't necessarily agree that the building code and rent review and what have you should be in the Ministry of Housing, because essentially that's sort of a policing activity. Rent review obviously is a consumer protection function, and I think that as we said at the time that it went to Consumer and Commercial Relations, there was a conflict in that the Ministry of Housing is one of the largest landlords in Ontario, albeit we are no longer under the rent review programme. But at that time, you will recall, we

were. There was, I think, a very strong area of conflict there.

In the area of federal programmes, we feel that by getting together with the federal programme such as AHOP and putting AHOP and HOME together, we are going to be able to serve a larger constituency out there and make available housing to people in a broader scale of income. Sure, I've said in my statement that there are going to be areas that are going to give us some concern, and we're aware of those. But one of the things we were trying to do, and I think we can do it successfully with this programme and it has been said in meetings such as this as well as in the Legislature—is that we should be integrating our housing, that we should have a better mix in the communities, and that one of the problems with assisted housing programmes has been that they were very identifiable, that they stood out like sore thumbs.

You mentioned the sort of projects, and I couldn't agree more with you. I think some of the original projects of Ontario Housing, which were very acceptable at that time —I read an article just recently in one of the Toronto papers in which Regent Park was being praised as a great project. I'm not too sure that it is that great. It's great in size, but I'm not too sure that it's a great place to live. It's got some problems. We've moved away from that.

I think we are now building better projects, providing better facilities for people to live in and, recognizing the social problems that have been created in those larger projects, that's obvious. We've moved away from those large projects but they're there and we have to try to administer them and keep them functioning to the best of our ability. I think that within Ontario Housing Corporation itself, the people there are more cognizant of their responsibility to those larger projects and they're doing a pretty fair job.

I would suggest to the hon. members that I met, not too long ago, with the commander of the Salvation Army who has a programme, two programmes I believe, going in Regent Park. We did not meet on that particular topic. We met on another one, but he was quick to comment about how effective his programmes had been in that project and the co-operation he had received from OHC in getting those programmes in and using up empty space in the basements of those projects that were not being used before.

So we recognize those problems but, at the same time, it is better to have home ownership. I think you will agree with that, and it's better to have a development that isn't all low-income people or isn't all moderate-income people, but that in that project we can have a mix, that there can be somebody living in an assisted house. The guy next door doesn't even have to know about it. What is wrong with having someone who is in the lower income bracket living next door to somebody who is in the higher income bracket? I think they both gain socially. There is no question about that.

I have projects in my area, as I know you do, where youngsters who come out of the OHC project to go to school are looked upon as something different from the kids who come from the other side of the street in a regular subdivision. That's unfortunate, but it happens. What we're proposing to do, and I'm a firm believer in this, is to integrate those communities to the best of our ability.

Under the AHOP/HOME programme, if someone in a higher income bracket is satisfied to buy and live in a home that is in the AHOP price range—in this area, $47,000, and in others down to as low as $34,000—and wants to move into that neighbourhood without any assistance, then by all means move in, understanding that next door there may well be someone who has been assisted to the maximum by the government, and that that person will be their neighbour and they will become good friends, I hope, in the course of the complete development of that project. We remove the stigma from what everyone has called "low-cost housing."

I don't like the term "public housing." I just don't like it. It's used continually to identify a certain group of people who are damn good citizens, who by some misfortune, not necessarily of their own making, require to be helped. I'm not going to have any part of sticking those people into a high-profile area so everybody can put a sign on their door and say: "This is an OHC tenant." It just isn't going to work as far as I'm concerned and it has proved to be inadequate.

What do we do about the competition that has occurred in some of the communities? We recognize that's true. There are some developers—and I was impressed, I suppose surprised is a better word, at your concern about those developers who built those higher-cost units and now find themselves in difficulty selling them. They must be constituents.

Mr. Breaugh: I just said we represent all the disadvantaged, rich or poor.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I will mention that to the executives of Cadillac-Fairview the next

time I'm talking to them, that you are concerned about their disadvantaged position.

Mr. Martel: At La Scala?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We recognize that's a problem, and in some cases it is not a fair situation we have created, but I think we can find some solution to that. When I do find that solution I do hope, though, it's a solution that will be to the advantage of the purchaser and not necessarily an advantage to the person who is actually doing the selling, or, if it's going to be an advantage to them, that it's a shared advantage and that both people will gain. By having these programmes developed in that area, we are creating competition, and it seems to me one of the best ways to moderate prices of housing is to have good competition.

Maybe some of those units that are now there at a higher price might well be sold at a lower price if we take in all of the factors, such as what was the original cost of the land and what is the marginal profit on that piece of land that those particular units are built on. Maybe we're going to be able to bring the prices down for all of the units. I think that is a very desirable goal, obviously to be applauded by my friends in the opposition as a very desirable goal.

Oshawa selling to the Metro market? Sure, we understand that. Again, that's understandable in that we're starting to get pretty well filled up in this fine Metropolitan Toronto area. There are people who are looking elsewhere to locate. My hope lies with the Go East policy, whether you like the term or not.

[11:45]

Mr. Martel: Why not Go North?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You fellows can argue that at lunch. I think it's a good policy in that we recognized one of the concerns of the people in Durham region, particularly the city of Oshawa, the city of Whitby and Ajax. They said to me quite clearly: "Mr. Minister, don't come in here and ask us to take the low- and moderate-income housing facilities. We don't have the jobs for them. You've got to create some jobs in these areas for these people before we can provide the housing for them." And they were right.

At least we have taken the first step in that direction, which I think you would agree is a reasonably good step, in locating the LCBO warehouse in that area and in moving one of the government ministries to that area. A number of people will be able to live and work in Oshawa and there will be people in the moderate income and some of the lower income brackets. We will be able to have that housing there and the people will not necessarily be commuting from Oshawa to Toronto. Some will, but many will stay there.

As for the problem of AHOP home buyers meeting the costs of the mortgages in five years time, that can happen. But, hell, that can happen if one is buying in any other programme too and somebody over-extends himself. We all have to look at our gross debt ratio before we go jumping into mortgages of any kind. Before you go out and buy a new colour television set or new automobile, you've got to look at whether you can afford to make the payments or not.

We are not trying to mislead anybody. We want everybody to know right up front that this is what is going to happen in five or really seven years down the line. There are a lot of people whose incomes will go up. There are a number whose won't. I am hoping those people are able to recognize what their difficulties may be. These are people who are going to have to look perhaps for some other way of getting their particular home. But at least that programme is available to them.

Two incomes are a problem; if you lose half of that income. That occurs in all aspects of the market. I think it is important to look at the other side of the coin. If their home is purchased on one income and then later there become two incomes—say, six years down the line, there are two incomes—then those people are in even a better financial position to afford that particular unit at the end of that seven years.

I am not unaware that there may be some problems but not, I think, on the whole for most people. I read an article on something about housing in a magazine that I saw over there. It was distributed to most of those of us who are living in apartments. There's an article in there about a family who did take a very long look before they purchased their home at what their costs would be because of their income. There has to be some responsibility on the purchaser. We just can't lead them by the hand down through every trail and direct them into a good, safe environment. I know some members of the Legislature who overbuilt their houses and are having mortgage difficulties, running raffles and all these sorts of things.

Mr. Martel: It's the landscaping for those acres that is not funny.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You say you regretted the discontinuance of the HOME programme. The HOME programme had some real problems. That lottery situation disturbed me. I never liked the lottery situation. People lined up like a bunch of sheep and waited to have their named pulled out of a hat. It was not a good environment. This programme is open to everybody all over the province, not necessarily in those areas where the HOME programme was in effect. We had a lot of criticism over who was getting these homes and how the lotteries were being run. At least under this programme each individual is judged on his own particular merits. If they can get the financing, they can get the home. They don't have to wait for their names to be pulled out of a hat.

We didn't have a balance of subsidy. Really there was a substantial subsidy in the HOME projects, albeit basically hidden because of the second mortgage sort of affair on the land. But that was only available again in certain areas. People living where there was no HOME project were just not eligible for that particular subsidy.

A provincial plan has been a dream that I have listened to for a long time. When are we going to have a complete provincial plan? I don't think you are ever going to have a complete provincial plan designed by the province. The reason I say that is that I think you can accomplish the same thing by having official plans on all of the municipalities, be they regional or local, that will blend together and fit together. As long as you have those plans being developed, and where there are bordering areas from one municipality to the next they are compatible and they have an agreement and understanding, your plan will develop as a total plan for the province.

For the province to just come in and lay down a hard plan, I don't think that is going to work, especially in the north where you mentioned. I don't have to tell the member for Sudbury East or the member for Cochrane South there are factors up in that unorganized territory which we have a great deal of difficulty in dealing with.

Number one, some of those small communities are resource-oriented and when people go in there, the life expectancy of that particular resource may be 20 to 25 years or it may be less. People in many of those communities don't even own their own homes; the company goes in and builds the houses on land that it owns. People go in and live there and do their jobs; so that when something does happen, at least they are mobile enough to pick up and move out without having a big investment.

But we do have areas where people do own the homes when, suddenly, the resource runs out—I am speaking of small communities like Madsen and Armstrong—and they are left sitting up there with an investment in their homes. What are they going to do with it? How can you plan in that area?

I have got an experiment going on now in the area north of Sault Ste. Marie, where there was a real problem. I hope this works out well. They are developing an official plan in unorganized territory; they are working with this ministry and with private consultants in developing an official plan for a very large tract of land. I hope that it will work. I hope, when we complete that sort of thing, that the same approach may be able to be used in other parts of Ontario.

If we get that official plan in place, we may have to make some legislative changes so that there can be a sort of bylaw application of the terms of the official plan. It may be that once we get it done, we can establish a municipal structure in those areas where there is sufficient population; and we should go ahead and do that. But to try to apply a whole plan on that tremendous piece of real estate, with the sort of insecurities that pop up around the small resource communities is a very difficult problem. I think most of the members from northern Ontario recognize that those are difficult problems and we are going to have to work toward finding some solution.

Regarding the OMB and the planning process, we have reviewed The Planning Act. That report will be out reasonably soon, I think. It is completed and it is probably in the printing process.

Mr. Hall: You said that last year, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I know, but I can explain that. It has reached the point where it is being printed. Am I right, Mr. Wronski? Yes, Mr. Comay's report on the review of The Planning Act is being printed now. There will be some interesting suggestions in that as it relates to the OMB, to planning in Ontario and what have you. I hope we can get it out.

I have touched on the public housing. Alternative forms of housing? Yes, we have been doing as much as we think we can do at this stage in community-integrated projects, co-op housing and non-profit housing. There is nothing wrong with that. That,

to me, is part of the private sector. These are people who privately get together and form their own corporation and go ahead and develop their project. Yes, the funding has to be there. Sure, it is like anything else: eventually you are going to run out of money somehow. You get so much allocated for it; maybe there has to be more allocated. But there are problems there.

One of the reasons we put in this assistance for technical advice is that we know from experience that on some of those projects well-meaning people go ahead and start to develop their project and then run into real problems because they really don't have the experience. Now we want to fund that sort of experience for them. As an example, I will use one right here in Toronto, called DACHI, which started off full of great and wonderful ideas. It was going along great, but they got led down the garden path. I won't say by whom, but it was the federal government.

Mr. Breaugh: You did that nicely, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I will give you just a quick example of what happened. There was a large number of houses, all about 60 years old. Somebody came in and gave them an estimate of what it would cost to renovate these homes, fix them up and make them available as apartments and conversions for low- and-moderate-income people. There was only one thing that was missed: Nobody told them that these 60-year-old houses had to have all new wiring and all new plumbing; all of a sudden they get into real big financial problems and they had to get bailed out. That's what causes the problems. The cost of that thing went right up the pipe because they were naive and they really didn't get 100 per cent good information. Okay, that project is an example of why you need good, expert help. We recognize that. We are making the funding available and we will continue to do that.

You mention about not asking the municipalities to do what the province can't afford to do. We are really not doing that. We are asking the municipalities to become part of the total process. I have found in my brief tenure in this ministry, and in my experience as a municipal councillor before that, and I am sure you did too, Mike, that municipalities had a great habit of making all sorts of grandiose statements about "we want family housing, we want senior citizen housing, we are going to ask the government to do this." We do the survey. We go in and we acquire the site. Then the very people who ask us to go in and do it say: "No, you can't build it here." We go to get the property rezoned and the people opposing us before the planning board are the municipality.

All I am saying to them now is: Don't come and ask me to build your housing unless you really want it. Go and get the damn land rezoned. That shows your commitment to the project. Then we will come in and do the job. And we offer you some alternatives; if you would like to build it yourself, fine, go ahead. If you want to build it under the present circumstances, providing you will rezone that property and have the site selected properly, then we will be there.

So we are not asking them to do something we can't afford to do. We are simply asking them to be a part of it because too many municipal councillors around this province have publicly stated housing is not their responsibility. It is the responsibility of the federal and provincial government. I accept my share of it. I think the feds have accepted their share of it. Now the municipalities can come in and play with us too. We will all have a nice game and we can have all the parties in place. That is all I am really interested in.

You say that tenants should be represented on the housing authorities. Okay, I see nothing wrong with that. We have said that, and we have appointed some tenants. We haven't made it a rule that there must be a tenant on every housing authority in Ontario. I am not going to do that. But I think there are areas where we can, and we have appointed tenants to the housing authorities. We want to assist them to get out of their economic situation. The best way to do that, I think though, is to develop a better atmosphere and environment in which to live. The integrated sort of community will help them a lot better. Because living in those projects, if the guy beside you, above you and below you is in the same box you are in, life looks awful dull. I think that is a better way to assist them to get out of their economic situation, and give them a chance.

Mr. Martel: Give them some jobs.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, that might be an idea. But there are some of you who would like to close down some jobs I understand.

Mr. Martel: You want the office to go to Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I know we didn't go to "Hogtown northern Ontario"; but you have to spread it around a little bit.

Mr. Martel: No, Kenora.

Mr. Ferrier: You guys just live on the fringes of the north in Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Or Hogtown number two. That should be discussed in the Northern Affairs estimates. I had nothing to do with that announcement of the appointment.

Mr. Martel: Oh I read your statement last weekend, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On housing authority appointments made locally let me point this out. I know you know the process. The provincial, federal and municipal appointments are made. I think there are some people I know on housing authorities who would really be upset if you suggested they were Tories; or they would be really upset if you suggested they were Liberals. As an example, the chairman of my housing authority is one of the most staunch New Democrats; he makes you guys look like right-wingers. He is probably one of the best chairmen in Ontario. He has been a supporter of the New Democrats for so long he actually believes he is right. And he is a great guy.

Mr. Martel: A real New Democrat doesn't believe, he knows.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And when I go back and tell him you said he was a Tory, you are in trouble.

Mr. Riddell: There is a federal Liberal candidate on my housing authority.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There you are. Isn't that nice?

Mr. Ferrier: The Liberal party appointed him.

Mr. Martel: That's federal.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I can tell you right now that the people who are appointed to those authorities may not have high profile. They may not be real high profile in the community. Hopefully they are people who are prepared to dedicate their time and talents for nothing to operating and managing. It seems to me you don't have to be a high profile person to have some administrative and management capability.

Mr. Hall: If you are thinking of high profile from my point of view, John, I meant high profile with regard to knowledge of housing and rental needs and what have you, not high profile like being a radio announcer or president of a service club or something like that. That is not my interest.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think everybody should have a chance to learn. I've seen people come into this Legislature who weren't really that good, but certainly developed quickly.

[12:00]

Mr. Hall: That's right. I'm interested in the people you have put in place who have an affinity for the work you've asked them to do.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think most people who offer themselves to serve on that must have an affinity with the work or have a desire to do something well, because there are not very many people who do anything for nothing, but they do it.

Mr. Hall: It might have been good if you had asked the municipalities, though.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Municipalities are involved with the appointments as well.

Mr. Hall: Well, not mine.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I agree that we may miss one or two small ones, that's true.

Mr. Hall: I'll tell them what you think of Grimsby.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I didn't say that. We have an inventory of land; we can tell you what land we own. In fact I tabled it so many times in the House myself I don't know what you guys are doing with the copies of the inventory. We can tell you, really. I think you have thrown it away. Twice I've tabled the inventory of the land that OHC owns; and my predecessor tabled it at least once. It might be that Cassidy's eating the damn things. But they're there; we know what land we've got.

Mr. Hall: We want an update, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We'll give you an update. We haven't bought any land, we'll give you a repeat of last year's. The inventory is there; we can tell you where it is, what it was bought for and what it was intended for. The land in Brooklin has certainly been tabled as OHC land; nobody's trying to hide that OHC owns it. It's not serviceable at this time, you well know that.

Sorting out priorities; sure, we're continually trying to sort out priorities. I take exception, as you expected me to, when you suggest that HUDAC or anybody else is

setting the policies. I said to you before, and I say again, that I don't think all the brains sit in the Ministry of Housing. If HUDAC has a good idea, we are going to listen; if you've got a good idea, we are going to listen; and if the consumers of the province have a good idea, we'll listen too. We'll take some of those good ideas; and I'll take full credit for them, even if they are yours.

You say the consumers don't have a lobby. The consumers in the housing area have the biggest lobby and the best lobby of all: If they don't buy, the dang producers don't sell. And for many years one of the problems in the housing market in Ontario—if not all of Canada—was that people just wouldn't buy the type of housing that is now being marketed. After all, as a developer or a builder you sure as hell aren't going to build something that nobody is going to buy. Everybody wanted that larger house—that big, palatial house with the double doors, they wanted that house; and they bought it. They bought such houses in Sudbury East, they bought them in Durham; that was the whole idea, to get those larger homes.

Mr. Martel: A quarter of a million.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Is it up to a quarter of a million?

Mr. Martel: Up to a quarter of a million.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Geez, that inflation! And done by scab bricklayers too, I might add.

People wanted these houses and that's what builders built for them; it was the market. Now you get people who are prepared to buy townhouses, smaller homes; and that's what builders are prepared to build. They build them like mad now. So I think the consumers' best lobby is their resistance to buying what the builder is trying to push on them. If the builder won't build what you want, you don't buy it. I think they're doing that now, and there's a better mix of housing coming on the market. It's going to be interesting to see if Barnard's report is accurate, that we will have a great run on single-family homes later on and just exactly what happens to them.

Well, Mr. Hall, we think the integration of our federal and provincial programmes is worthwhile. I said, when I was first appointed to this ministry, that I was sick and tired of listening to who was blaming who for what; I don't want any part of that. I would rather work in co-operation with agencies at any level who are trying to work toward the same goal that we are. I don't see the need for duplication of administration. If there's an administrative function in place now at the federal level, and they are willing to have us come along with them and take advantage of that saving, then I think we should do that. And I'll continue to do that wherever it is practicable and do away with the overlap.

I'm not trying to place responsibility with the municipalities totally, but I do want them to share in the responsibility, because I do believe that all three levels of government have a responsibility in the provision of housing.

I say to municipalities very plainly, "You don't want a responsibility for housing but you want total responsibility for land-use planning. You can't build houses without land." Unless they are prepared to take their responsibility for housing and plan accordingly, then the only alternative I have, if it's my housing responsibility, is to take the land-use planning away from them. I don't want to do that, so I'd rather co-operate with them and let them accept some of their responsibility.

As to the first-time home buyer grant, there are a couple of red headlines from the Toronto Star that give you my opinion of the first-time home buyer grant, so I won't dwell on that one.

On official plans I think we're making some good progress in this area. We have a better working arrangement now with the other ministries and other agencies of government. You mention the NEC, the Niagara Escarpment Commission. Later on in these estimates we will be discussing that in some detail. I have some rather interesting figures to show you, and I must confess they surprised me a little when I started putting them together and seeing what they all added up to, as to just what has been happening out there.

I'm going to continue to respect local autonomy, because I think the real grass roots as far as government is concerned is at the municipal level. They recognize and know their problems. We have to work with them, to co-operate with them and maybe provide more money. I don't disagree with Mr. Breaugh's comment that there has to be money put into servicing. I have said before and I say again, perhaps this is an area where we should be offering the same type of subsidy that we offer for streets and roads. We need that servicing and I think that's an area we have to move into.

I'm not enthused about many municipal councils which say, "We are going to sock it to the developer. He's going to pay for the sewer mains, he's going to pay for the roadways, he's going to pay for the rinks and he's going to pay for the sewage treat-

ment plants"; and all that thing. You and I both know the person who will pay for that will be the person who buys the lot in the subdivision and builds the house. It's passed along. For some reason there are some municipal councils who really think they just socked it to the developer. What they did was they socked it to the guy who is going to buy the house in that subdivision later on. That's what happens with imposts and that's what happens with all those things. When I hear of $4,000 and $5,000 imposts on a lot, that's $4,000 or $5,000 going on top of the mortgage and going down the pipe at 10 to 12 per cent interest for 35 years; that's exactly what it is. That's the last of my comments.

Mr. Chairman: That's the story?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, in your books today you will find a colour-coded gizmo which at first sight looks like a snakes and ladders game, and if you don't know what it means that's exactly what it might just as well be.

The other thing is the way the books are set up. I wonder, because we're not going to have much time to deal with specifics today, if I could ask the committee's agreement that Mr. Crosbie give you an explanation of how your books work, how this can facilitate you and I as we go through the estimates vote by vote.

I think we should just distribute these. I've got some material which explains our organizational changes. Rather than reading I think I'll just have it distributed. We have copies for everyone. We'll distribute the copies to the members and they can read it at their leisure.

Mr. Hall: Is there not a paper shortage in your ministry?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We are trying to help the pulp and paper industry, Mr. Hall, and at the request of members of this committee over a number of years I'm going to drop paper on you like there's no getting out it. I'll give you information that you never knew existed. It's openness in government.

Mr. Breaugh: Didn't I see you stand up against Lawlor's bill?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Against openness in government?

Mr. Breaugh: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Never. I was the guy who got up and agreed to the inventories.

Mr. Breaugh: I thought you were over at La Scala?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No. If I was, I was looking for you.

Mr. Hall: I really enjoy the minister's constant interruptions in the House, yet when we get into committee here he says: "Now Mr. Chairman, I don't want any interruptions while I'm making my discourse." I got a kick out of that but now you're reverting to your old self.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Hall, wait a minute now. The reason I said that was I was given to understand there had been an agreement by the House leaders that there would be no interruption of any of the opening statements, but we're all fair game from now on.

Mr. Crosbie: In last year's estimates there was a concern expressed about trying to relate the estimates before the committee to what had gone on in the previous year. Because of certain changes in the organization of the ministry and certain directives from the central agencies on how public accounts are to be kept, I think we are faced with a similar problem this year. We have tried to assist the members by outlining, in the material in the first part of the books, the reconciliation of accounts. I've just had distributed a copy of the summary sheet of last year's estimates. Perhaps you could just look at that briefly and compare it with page 1 in the opening material of your book, which is the summary sheet for this year's estimates.

You'll notice, going down the list of programmes, that ministry administration is common in both years and community planning is common. Last year we spoke of housing action, and it does not appear in this year's estimates. Housing development does not appear in this year's estimates. The home buyers grant is common to both years. Looking at the present summary in this current year, you'll notice that community development, Ontario Housing Corporation, Ontario Mortgage Corporation and North Pickering Development Corporation are new programmes listed in the estimates.

What has happened here is that various parts of programmes have been split out into new votes so they can be more specifically dealt with and identified. In the material—and I apologize for the length of it—we have tried to be as explicit as we could. We have attempted to show for each of the current programmes just where the funds would

have been located in previous years. For the individual programmes as well we have set out in the introductory pages just where the particular items within that vote were located in previous years.

For example, starting with the first reconciliation statement, which is found on the bottom of the summary page of this year's estimates, there are four items listed. One is the previously published data for last year's estimates and the previous year's estimates. It shows the supplementary estimates that have been added to that, it shows the impact of government reorganization; and then gives a new total for the ministry, which makes the estimates for the two years comparable.

On page nine of the introductory material in your notes we have a further explanation, for example, of item 3, government reorganization. Where it identifies a sum in the 1975-76 column of actual expenditures, of $47,773, that represents a function, a land acquisition that was transferred out of the ministry to the Ministry of Government Services. So we no longer have a comparable item in our vote this year.

In the following line it shows a figure of $328,000 plus, covering functions that were transferred to the Ministry of Housing from other ministries. On page nine we show what those items were. It was local planning policy, Planning Act review, the Sault North planning study, the Community Planning Association of Canada, the Stratford seminar on civic design; all of which in previous years were in TEIGA. This year, as well, we have picked up the Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research for the first time.

We have projected backward the sums of money that had previously been allocated to those services and they are shown as added in on that $328,000 figure.

[12:15]

Mr. Hall: Mr. Crosbie, you refer to page nine.

Mr. Crosbie: Yes, at the start, prior to the red tab.

Mr. Breaugh: The pages are not numbered.

Mr. Hall: I think the problem is that they are in a loose-leaf package.

Mr. Breaugh: They're not in here.

Mr. Crosbie: It was set in loosely in the front of the book. It's about a 45-page summary.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's it there, isn't it?

Mr. Crosbie: It's called financial analysis summary.

Mr. Breaugh: If you shuffle pages long enough and hard enough you'll forget what it's all about in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Last year that's what happened. That's why we wanted to see if we could straighten it out.

Mr. Breaugh: I'm beginning to understand why the planning process is so screwed up. You can't put a book together.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's terrible the way this is. Last year it was just atrocious. This year we've cleaned it all up.

Mr. Crosbie: Proceeding through the book from page 10 on, we have each of the current programmes, ministry administration, community planning, Ontario Housing Corporation, community development and so on. For each one of those, on a separate page, we have set out what functions are included in that vote this year and we indicate where they were last year or in previous years. In some cases, items have been transferred into the vote and in other cases they have been transferred out of the vote. This relates to a large extent to the reorganization of the ministry.

The colour-coded chart the minister referred to earlier is a further attempt to identify for you the various operations within the ministry that are included in the separate votes. On the colour-coded chart, you will note that the colour coding corresponds to the colour coding on your tabs. When you are in vote 2101 this year, it is shown in red on this chart, with all the functions that are listed there; such as administration, policy co-ordinator, communications, legal services, audit branch and so on. These are the items which will be discussed under that vote. We have also indicated, in round brackets, what the comparable vote was last year. If at some later date, you are trying to correlate this year's estimates with last year's, these two documents, the detailed explanation and the colour-coded chart, will show you what the comparable item was last year.

Mr. Riddell: How many man-hours' work did it take to thoroughly complete this?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think we could have done it in about a day and a half. We knew it wouldn't be difficult.

Mr. Breaugh: It's clear the Auditor will have to look at our three-piece Mao suits.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Are you going to come in with your vest? You'll notice that in order to co-operate even further what we've done is that in the books we've put little coloured tabs that fit in with the colour chart, that fit in entirely with the material we've given you.

Mr. Breaugh: The only thing that's lacking is a little blue wheelbarrow to carry all this stuff around in, with a trillium on the side.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There's one complaint and criticism that I just will not accept, that is if you're going to start complaining about the amount of material they're getting.

Mr. Breaugh: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Over the past number of years it has just been the opposite. I could very well have not given you anything. It would have been safer.

Mr. Martel: The select committee recommended that we get some of this material.

Mr. Hall: You could get a hernia carrying it downstairs.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: For Hansard's benefit, that was "hernia." We only adopted the policies and practices that had been followed by the select committee. In fact, I understand the select committee used our method as a model.

Mr. Breaugh: Everything is according to Hoyle, but a wheelbarrow is going to be necessary.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That completes the explanation. I would like to suggest to the committee that with 10 minutes left we adjourn until tomorrow morning and we start fresh at 9 o'clock with sharpened eyes and great frivolity.

Mr. Riddell: Is the deputy minister finished with his explanation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Did you get it all? Those of you who would like to have extra help can stay after class.

The committee adjourned at 12:21 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 27, 1977

Ministry administration programme R-3

Opening statements: Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Hall R-3

Adjournment R-40

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Johnson, J.; Chairman (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J.; Vice-Chairman (Huron-Middlesex L)

Ministry of Housing official taking part:
Crosbie, D. A., Deputy Minister



No. R-2

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard) Daily Edition

Resources Development Committee

Estimates, Ministry of Housing

Fourth Session, 30th Parliament

Thursday, April 28, 1977

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

STANDING RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Chairman: Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel, PC)
Vice-Chairman: Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex, L)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming, NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton, L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex, PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South, NDP)
Hodgson, W. (York North, PC)
Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin, PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt, NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East, NDP)
McNeil, R. K. (Elgin, PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington, L)
Rollins, C. T. (Hastings-Peterborough, PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing, L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South, PC)

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1977

The committee met at 9:10 a.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HOUSING
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: We have a quorum so we might as well start. Who would like to start off?

On vote 2101:

Mr. Breaugh: I would like to get in a question which may require some preparation for an answer. Maybe if I could just read this now, the staff could have a couple of days to sort it out and get back to me. It would probably come under this vote at any rate. It really is an administrative matter.

Could we get the following details? Most of this we have in a slightly different form, or the numbers come out the wrong way. We would like to get broken down the public housing programmes, separating programmes for senior citizens and programmes for families, the rent supplemented buildings owned by private developers, and again separations for senior citizens and families.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Excuse me, you mean the number of supplement units in a building?

Mr. Breaugh: Yes. The supplement in non-profit buildings, again separated for seniors and families; the HOME units—not the lots but the units; and an indication as to whether they are included under OHAP or preferred lending or OHC, or how that's broken down; how many units—and again, not lots but units—were produced under the Ontario Housing Action Programme, if possible—I am not sure you can do this—broken down by income group; and how many of these were, in fact, produced under other programmes such as HOME and AHOP. We are having some difficulty sorting out what was produced under what particular programme, particularly the units that were produced for people on low or moderate incomes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Can you use a time frame? Are you referring to last year, or the last two years, or the last three years, for example?

Mr. Breaugh: It depends, I guess, on how complicated this is going to be to sort out. I would guess that all these numbers are there and available; it's a matter of presenting them in a slightly different way.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But how far back would you like us to go?

Mr. Breaugh: Oh, the last two years I think would do it. If it's not that difficult, it would be nice to be a little more comprehensive, but I would just like to see a breakdown on that.

[9:15]

We are just having some difficulty transposing different reports of different sets of numbers, so it would be of some assistance if we could do that.

Ross, if you had some specific items that you would like to get started on in this vote, I would be very happy to let you go ahead.

Mr. Hall: Are we referring to vote 2101 at this point, items 1 through 8?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Right.

Mr. Hall: In item 6, dealing with analysis, research and planning, I see that increased, 1975 to 1976, from $2.1 million actual up to $4 million, and now you've cut it back to $3 million.

I don't know whether this is the specific area, but I think you talked before about housing-needs forecasts and is this where Barnard's work would be costed, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Mr. Hall: Do you consider this work, by the nature of the way it was done, definitive for some period of time ahead, in terms of years?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Are you referring to the Barnard report?

Mr. Hall: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Considering the inaccuracy of the science of trying to predict population and what is going to happen, we'd like to think it has some validity. Certainly it's a guideline and it gives some indication of what the trends are, but as I think I have said before, it's not a perfect science and I am sure you know that from your own experience.

Yes, we would like to think the type of work that was done, the analysis that was done, and the projections that have been made are worthy of acceptance and should be considered as we make our plans ahead for the next, say, five-year bloc or 10-year bloc.

Mr. Hall: A lot of demographic work was done there which would be applicable to ministries other than Housing. Is this information now being considered a tool of government in economic planning, land-use planning and so on? It cost this government a good deal of money, and I suggest that if it is valid, if it is applicable, it should be shared with others so that it can be properly used. I don't like to see individual studies by individual ministries, each working in a vacuum. I'm not saying this is the case here, but I do think that if it is a good report it may have other uses and if you have not already shared it with other ministries, you should do so.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Certainly the report is in the hands of all other ministries, and in fact, the population figures that were used in the Barnard report were figures that were taken originally from TEIGA's figures, as to what their projections were, and then Barnard's report modifies those figures, if you will, as to what they see is going to happen over the next 25 years.

Mr. Hall: What is the comparison between Barnard's and the Ontario Economic Council's demographic projections? Have you taken a look at those to see whether, in combination with trends and options, Barnard and the Ontario Economic Council, and possibly a federal report, you finally do have a pretty valid document to look at in the future?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'll let Mr. Burkus respond to that.

Mr. Burkus: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Ontario Economic Council last week published a series of reports on Ontario's economic trends for the next 10-year period. I noticed in the report that they did have some population projections for a 10-year period. We haven't had the opportunity to analyse those projections in relation to the assumption that are in the Barnard report, but over a 10-year period they are not substantively different.

Hon Mr. Rhodes: Could I just add to that? I think you'll see in the Economic Council report that, without even looking at the numbers, they still are accepting the premise from their work that there will be a substantial decline in the birth rate and an accompanying decline in the population growth.

Perhaps the biggest problem we would have with numbers as far as population goes is the effect that the immigration policy of the federal government will have. If that immigration policy becomes more stringent, of course, that is going to reduce the number of people coming in, especially considering the percentage of immigrants who find their way to Ontario. The trends have been a reduction of that, plus the migration within Canada, as you know, is changing. Alberta, because of its economic situation, is finding a lot of people moving there who perhaps might have been coming to Ontario.

Mr. Hall: I appreciate that there are those factors that will enter into it, but I do just want to make the point that valid and expensive work for one ministry should be utilized in the whole programme as much as possible. At the same time, it disturbs me that—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Hall, could I just interrupt for a moment?

Mr. Hall: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You understand that the price of that particular study you're referring to was $26,500, not the $306,000 that's there?

Mr. Hall: No, I'm not worried about that. You're satisfied that, for whatever money you paid, it was the best available study that could be done, and it was properly done and thoroughly done?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think we're satisfied that it's a worthwhile report.

Mr. Hall: I think it's a little much, however, even with any study like that, to place the people in different parts of the province. Would you agree that this is not a very definitive type of statement in that regard? Do you think it's really possible to take a report which takes into account birth rates

and net migration and immigration and so on and so forth, and then go on beyond and say so many are going to be here and so many are going to be there?

What I'm getting at is, a member of one of the other parties has used some of these figures to say, "Ah ha, there's only going to be so many people in Niagara." I think that is going beyond the final ability to plan that precisely. Tell me if I'm wrong.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't think the report attempts to say that there will be X number of people in any particular area. There are, as you go through the report, a number of variations from various parts of the province and there isn't just a set figure that you can say applies as a blanket across this whole province. So I don't think anyone can, with any degree of accuracy, pick any particular part of this province and say this is exactly what is going to happen here over the next 25 years. There are so many variables that can come into the equation that throw it all into a cocked hat. Aside from the Niagara region, let's take the northern region, where they indicate in the report that the growth will not be very extensive, and yet you know and I know that should there be a mineral find in part of northern Ontario those population figures are all thrown into a cocked hat. The place will grow.

Elliot Lake is a good example. I don't think there are too many people who thought a few years ago that Elliot Lake would be the size it is today, but it is.

Mr. Hall: Similarly, your go-east policy, if it had a massive set of circumstances created that would make it attractive to go east, you could shift away from another area. Over a period of time, by government intervention, you could cause people to be attracted to different areas.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Oh, surely. I think the announcement of the location of two of the office facilities to the eastern part of Ontario, Oshawa and Kingston, obviously is going to have an effect to move some people there. There will be some spinoff as a result of that which will see some population growth there. That is desirable from our point of view.

But more important than the numbers in that report, I think, are the trends it indicates; and we recognize there are a number of variables that can change some of those directions.

Mr. Hall: That's fine. These things will be coming along from time to time, and I think it is nice to have these guides as communities and regions do their planning. I don't like to see them put in the light of saying, "Your thinking was all wrong, because this is now happening." Any planning committee can only live within the information that it has provided to it at any one time.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't think any regional council or municipal council, or for that matter the province, can say without any qualification that this is exactly what is going to happen. At the best of times, and with respect to the profession, planning is an inexact science.

Mr. Hall: In this area of analysis, research and planning—I am sure it is the thing you start every day—did you figure out what dwelling unit starts are going to be happening in the province annually? What is your projection for this year?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On the number of starts?

Mr. Hall: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't think I'll change my approach in any way to that particular matter. I don't think I am going to give you a number as to what starts will be. Again, I am faced with the same sort of variables. I only say to you that we will build as many as the market will allow us to build. I am a little concerned about overbuilding in the single-family residential because of what has been happening.

I am afraid of numbers. Yesterday was a good example. My friend from Oshawa latched on to that 3,000 figure and had them starting, like, yesterday. He said very accurately that if I only make 2,999, somebody is going to beat me over the head with it. So I appreciate his warning.

Mr. Hall: Nevertheless, somebody somewhere in preparing the budget worked it out to 80,000 starts this year. I am just wondering whether that work comes from this section of vote 2101?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We would think somewhere between 75,000 and 80,000 units. The Ontario Economic Council says 73,000, but we still think 75,000 to 80,000 units would be about what we will have this year.

Mr. Hall: That being the case, I understand 84,000 was predicted last year and 80,000 is predicted this year, but I think there was somewhere around 80,000 in actuals last year. Right?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Mr. Hall: I gather from CMHC's statistics that in urban Ontario between 1976 and 1977, up to the end of March, we are down 32 per cent. What is going to happen to jack this up quickly, do you think?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In our starts?

Mr. Hall: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think again you can only put on the market what the market is going to absorb. I still maintain that there is no housing shortage in this province. There are pockets of shortages; there is no question about that.

Mr. Hall: And there are categories of housing shortages at certain price levels.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Again, though, it is a question of trying to get that sort of housing on the market. I'll go back again to yesterday's comments, where Mr. Breaugh was indicating his concern for the fact that some of the programmes we were bringing in were offering too much competition for those that were already there and unsold. I don't know whether that should be a concern of mine or not.

In the category of housing you have to put on the market that which the market will absorb. We see a change in attitude where people are prepared to live in higher-density accommodation, such as town housing and apartments of the condominium style, and on smaller lots and in smaller homes.

[9:30]

Mr. Hall: I understand that it's not up to you to build the houses, and I don't want it ever to be that way. I also realize, when I ask you these questions, that you're trying to gauge what will happen as best you can. But as far as the Ministry of Housing is concerned, and as far as I myself am concerned, the best way to lower costs, candidly, is to have an oversupply within reason, because prices will tend to decline.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It gets a little confusing for me, though, because I read in the papers about the excessive number of units in the Metro area, say, where they were using a number of about 20,000 unsold units of various types.

Mr. Hall: Including condominiums?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I think that included condominiums.

Mr. Hall: Of course, there's a lot there alone, eh?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, but there were about 20,000 unsold units; and, of course, everyone thought that's great, because that's going to have the effect of pulling the market down. I think it pulled it down a bit, but I picked up the paper the other day and I saw a real estate spokesman saying that things are on the upswing again and sales are increasing; and if that starts, of course prices will start to follow the sales trend a bit.

Mr. Hall: Possibly part of the reason for the slower starts, in minor effect, is the fact that a lot of builders didn't get registered under the home warranty plan and they're slow in getting off the blocks on this.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That gave me some concern but I understand, from having checked with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, that the home warranty registration had run into some difficulty in keeping up with the work. This is a time when HUDAC found out that it's easy to sit on the sidelines and criticize administrative practices until you have to do it yourself, and you find out it isn't as easy. Although they ran into some difficulties administratively, they have not prevented people who have indicated their desire to be registered from going ahead and building.

Mr. Hall: Except that oftentimes local building inspectors won't let them start unless they can flash a registration.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That may be. I can't comment on that. I don't know.

Mr. Hall: In this area of research and planning, Central Mortgage and Housing, as a federal body, for many years—going back into the 1950s, I guess—put out books of house plans. They may still do so; I don't know. But considering the cost of housing and the need for encouraging density, if we're to contract and save as much agricultural land as possible, as well as considering future energy costs in what is essentially a cold climate on this earth as compared to most countries, I have to feel that there might be room for research and planning of homes, whether it is inaugurated by government-sponsored architectural competitions and things of this nature. Have you any thoughts on that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Very frankly, I don't know whether we've ever done that in the

government in Ontario; I don't know whether OHC has done that in the past or has actually done design work. I see some heads nodding up and down. Mr. Crosbie?

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Beesley could.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Beesley, can you tell us what OHC has done or is doing in that area? Can you come to one of the microphones? You can sit beside Mr. Martel, but don't pay much attention to anything he whispers to you.

Mr. Martel: It might do him good.

Mr. Beesley: Mr. Chairman, they had a number of competitions—one, I guess, of note—about three or four years ago, where they advertised it widely and got quite a number of responses. These were in the cluster housing, stacked town housing and row housing forms, and not in the single-detached type, which I think Mr. Hall is referring to. This was to solicit submissions from builders' architects who would offer the proposal, OHC would endeavour to find a site, and then the successful proponent would proceed to build on that particular property, arranging his own financing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But what we would be designing though, in this case, would be units that would be Ontario Housing Corporation units. Not necessarily for sale on the open market, as you're suggesting.

Mr. Hall: I was actually thinking beyond that. I think that there's a lot of focus on many other concerns these days and I'm not so sure that there's the unified focus in research and planning on the question of shelter. The type of programme that's just been mentioned—I gather it was three or four years ago—is not necessarily a continuing thing; I gather that it would tend to offer something to those interested in a particular segment of the market, as opposed to the whole broad market.

It's great to say that we may have to build our houses differently because of energy needs. I saw a clip on television a night or so ago in which the federal government was actually wondering about the same problem on new homes as well as retrofitting. It's trying to decide whether to spend a billion dollars on saving energy lost in homes or to spend a billion dollars to open up new tar sands to provide more petroleum products. And they can't do both; they've got to go one way or the other. This is something that Mr. Gillespie is, apparently, wrestling with right now.

I suggest to you that possibly there's time for housing to become more sophisticated. You've sent out urban development standards; you've discussed—you and I have discussed it here in past estimates—the possible benefits of uniformity of zoning categories, even though they may be broad in numbers, to offer selectivity to a municipality without it having to engage a planning consultant and, in each instance, design its own.

I'm just wondering if we're not ready to put together courses offered at university on housing or, at least, a housing institute where different professional, practical and financial people could finally put housing into one sophisticated and all-encompassing area of study. Of course, it has to be the government that leads on such a matter. I think you would agree with me, from all the conversations we've had with tenants and landlord groups on the rent review, that there is a lack of a common voice; there are different factions, each with its own view. But there's not much of a common voice as a result of an institute gathering or something at which all have studied together and all come out seeing the other guy's problems.

I'm tired of going to housing seminars where the developer blames the municipality, and the municipality blames the ministry, or something like that. We all know that there are problems, but it seems to me we've got to go beyond those problems and say, okay, we recognize that you have to live with this, but you have to recognize that we have this aspect to consider, and finally we put it together. I think the government is the one to lead on it.

I touched on design. I touched on recognition that it is a problem which has many facets which must be put together if housing is to mature. You get the general thrust of what I'm talking about, I'm sure. I haven't buttoned it all down but—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The thing that I have to be concerned about is—and we have a tendency to do it—that we don't over-react. Not too many years ago housing really wasn't that great a problem. You don't have to go back that many years to a time when there was all kinds of housing around; and all the various factors were different. Interest rates were much lower. There weren't the concerns that are now being expressed as to the environment and the preservation of agricultural land. No one had those great concerns. These have all come on the scene within a relatively short period of time.

Again, if you look at the Barnard report and other numbers that are being tossed around from various sources, they indicate that we may well be over that hump; the big boom to provide housing for people who are coming into the housing market may very well be starting on the downward turn.

Surely we don't want to get to the point where we are going to develop some sort of an institute or system, call it what you will, that in a period of time will be totally redundant. You know, we have done that so many times. I don't want to criticize any other area of responsibility, but we are facing a very serious situation over the next number of years as it relates to schools. We built schools like they were going out of style because we needed them—the youngsters were there—but now we have got a real problem. I venture to say in every community in this province right now there are school boards scratching their heads and wondering what in the world they are going to do with all the school rooms they have. So I hope we don't over-react, because all it does is cost us an awful lot of money and we look like damned fools for not having the ability to look beyond our noses at what was going to happen 10 and 15 years down the line.

Mr. Hall: I don't suggest any over-reaction. I suggest that we are in an era where we are having seminars on this subect. The Canadian Council on Social Development had one in Montreal last fall, I believe. The Bureau of Municipal Research periodically delves into this. Habitat last year looked at it—on a somewhat more global scale, of course. I am not suggesting that these things cost money but, in a clear-cut practical area, I don't see too much of it in our educational system. If community colleges can offer the variety of courses that they do, I am simply wondering whether a person, as well as the whole industry and government, couldn't benefit if there was some area of mutual instruction which therefore would disseminate some mutual understanding, as to exactly what the problems are in housing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I will let Mr. Crosbie give you some of his thoughts and views. He may be around longer than me.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Chairman, this is not directly to Mr. Hall's point about having a specific institute or courses going on at the colleges or the universities, but in a number of areas we have approached the energy problem you mentioned, for instance, in connection with our OHRP programme. We are, in conjunction with the Ministry of Energy, setting up training courses for the local municipal administrators who are involved with the programme and trying to raise their appreciation of the energy conservation measures that can be taken in reinsulating or simply a lot of the very common practices that could be applied under the OHRP programme.

While we run a course of that type for the municipalities, it is quite true that we have not involved ourselves in a course of study or encouraging a course of study at any of the universities or colleges. We have been associated in housing management, for example; we have supported the institute that was formed in that area. We have been instrumental in having courses established on housing management, but not in the construction area.

Mr. Hall: I just leave that thought with you as something for the future, because I suggest that there are far more varying thoughts floating around all the time that haven't been finally weighed and resolved in the minds of the different people who are involved in housing and servicing. There is disagreement as to whether industrial assessment is really better than residential assessment nowadays. There are also some figures being brought up by people like Mr. Archer, who is reporting on his review of Niagara regional government tonight; and from what he has said, I think his investigation is going to put the lie to some previously held beliefs even on a matter like that.

[9:45]

On the matter of the handling of storm water drainage, Paul Thiel has certainly got views that are not necessarily held by consulting engineers doing work for municipalities right now, and so on down the line.

So long as each just speaks from his corner and there is no resolution of the factors of it we're not progressing as much as I would like to think we could, and this is why I'm suggesting some government-led industry-supported organization of a high enough quality that it could make legitimate comments. We could certainly have a dialogue with people like the Urban Development Institute and the Committee of Concern for Rental Housing in Ontario, which I understand represents small landlords. We haven't got a good handle on vacancy rates yet. There is no central registry of vacancies. We depend on something that's old by the time we get it from Central Mortgage and Housing. It's a little old and it only takes into account certain types of units.

Maybe I'm being too pragmatic here. I would just like to get some of the bogies out of the way in this field. I don't say we have to dwell on it. I think maybe it has been overstated and I'd like to simplify it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If there is some way of getting all of the various factions together and coming to a common conclusion, I would like even to just be in the room when that happens. I think it would be a very historical moment, not unlike what has been happening in a number of areas where you've got a real difference of opinion.

You mentioned storm water drainage. We get caught in some rather strange situations. It isn't too long ago, again in my own experience, where hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent by municipalities to separate storm and sanitary sewers within their municipalities in order to get maximum capacity out of their sewage treatment plants for that which, in fact, should be going through the plants to reduce the gallonage. A great many dollars were spent to do that separation. Some of them hadn't even had the opportunity to go back and put on the second coat of asphalt in the streets to take the hump out of it when somebody came out and said: "Oh, my God, you've got to treat all the storm water." Someone says there's a tremendous amount of pollution being pumped into the watercourses as a result of storm runoff, and immediately the reaction is, "You'd better build another plant," or "You have to treat that storm water." You're getting into ponding situations and zero runoff situations, and I don't have to tell you, you know that conflicts are going on in the whole area.

On the question of getting a handle on vacancy rates, you're right. We depend on the Central Mortgage and Housing statistics. They're perhaps not as complete as they would like them, nor certainly as we would like them. In some areas in this province we have a great deal of difficulty. We can't get a handle on vacancy rates, for example, in the Ottawa area because CMHC does Ottawa-Hull together.

There's another problem, and that is, if I am a developer and I want to build an apartment building and I'm looking to Central Housing and Mortgage for financing, I'm sure not going to tell the guy who calls me that I've got a whole bunch of vacancies. When he calls, I'm full. That's how they do it, by telephone. They call up the guy who owns the building and ask: "What's your vacancy rate?" He says: "That's my friend from CMHC and I'm looking for a loan to build another building. I'm full right to the brim. I've got people lined up outside the door," because he wants that loan. If he says he's 50 per cent empty, good luck. So it's a very inaccurate situation and I don't know how you put a better handle on that unless you can get enough people to go out and do a thorough survey with some degree of regularity to determine exactly what the vacancy rates are in the province.

If you go into the city of Sudbury right now you're going to find an extremely low vacancy rate, practically one of the lowest in Ontario today, but it isn't too long ago, as Mr. Martel will tell you, that the landlords in that particular area were charging around tearing their hair because they couldn't find any tenants at all. It's that boom-and-bust situation that is experienced in cities like that. How are you going to get a handle on a vacancy rate there? You walk in one month and take a survey and they're full. You go back three months later and you conceivably could have a very substantial vacancy rate. I don't know how you would ever get a handle on that one.

Mr. Hall: We're not going to resolve it all this morning. But this seemed to touch on the area of analysis, research and planning; and I want to raise them as items that your people will possibly consider in the meantime.

One more point and then I'll pass on this section for now. This is through you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like a confirmation from the member for Sudbury East—Elie, didn't we have it understood yesterday that the minister would be buying the coffee? I don't see any coffee here today.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I had understood in order to retain a balance of purity here that we would alternate. I bought it yesterday and—

Mr. Hall: It will be my pleasure, if we could set it up.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think we should do this in the proper order. It seems to me that the official opposition should be in position now; it strikes me that it should fall upon the critic, aided and abetted by his very affluent colleague from Sudbury.

Speaking of designs of houses, you know we could do well on this. We could go from one end of the housing market to the other. For example, I could supply the design for my modest little home for the lower income people and we could get one from Mr. Martel for the upper end.

Mr. Martel: I designed mine myself.

Mr. Breaugh: I want to point out that I did buy coffee this morning but no one wanted to share. Talk about fiscal restraint.

Mr. Chairman: Are you through with your comments?

Mr. Hall: For the present, yes, until—

Mr. Chairman: We're dealing with vote 2101, items 1 to 8. Since we're dealing with all the items, I think it only fair that if anyone would like to come back to an item at a later point that we do so.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The representatives of the New Democratic Party are having a caucus on the purchase of the coffee. It appears to me it will be a co-operative effort by them.

Mr. Breaugh: Everything we do is co-operative.

Mr. Martel: It's the socialist method of doing things.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Excuse me, but if it's the socialist method of doing things, I'm going to end up paying for it.

Mr. Breaugh: I hope so.

Interjections.

Mr. Breaugh: While we count the coppers, I would like to raise a number of specific points in line with our discussion earlier this morning on how to proceed with this.

Mr. Martel: What if you haven't got enough?

Mr. Breaugh: We may have to float a debenture to get the coffee paid, but it'll eventually happen.

I want to deal with this matter, because it comes under this administration concept of how you do things. I notice in this vote that you have things like the Niagara Escarpment Commission and how it functions. I want to deal with that as one example; and with the Ontario Housing Action Programme as a second example, in administrative terms, on how the thing is set up.

We have experienced a number of great difficulties with things like Housing Action when the government decides to intervene in a way that's abnormal—other than through the normal planning process, as you would with the Niagara Escarpment Commission where an agency is set up, or as you did with a programme like Housing Action—the Housing Action one in particular. We wound up with a representative of the government attempting to facilitate the Housing Action Programme. Setting aside the merits or demerits of the programme, that is probably an acceptable thing to do.

The difficulty was, though, that the local governments were faced with a representative of the provincial government—well, there isn't a polite way to say this—making a deal which side-stepped, in some respect, the planning process; which put municipalities in awkward positions; which forced them to make judgements on planning matters which essentially were not planning judgements. They were, by and large, financial concerns and it escalated to a problem point near the end of the programme when you were faced with final termination date.

The municipalities were approving subdivisions under conditions which they normally wouldn't do, in order to take advantage of what was essentially servicing money. A representative of the government—a nice way to put it, I guess—co-ordinated proposals from developers with concepts that would normally be discussed by a municipality's planning committee with other concepts that would have probably been discussed by the city's public works committee or servicing committee with the council in general.

So some rather strange arrangements were struck whereby a particular development, or a group of them usually, would be brought in as a package to one municipality or to more than one municipality. The package was put together by an official of this government designating a number of projects that were to be OHAP projects, and a number of units that were to be OHAP units, and there was a good deal of wheeling and dealing done, to put it politely, between developers and municipalities. The bottom line was on a take it or leave it basis. If you wanted some assistance in servicing a particular area of your municipality you had to extend that to an area that you weren't prepared to consider before and had to do that in conjunction with an area in a second municipality that really was none of your business at all.

To be a little more specific about it, in the Oshawa area there was a place called the northeast section of the city undergoing some planning studies. Adjacent to that were some proposals in the town of Newcastle. It isn't presently serviced. There is now an OHAP agreement tying in the northeast area of Oshawa, the Courtice area, just north of Courtice in the town of Newcastle, some studies and some environmental problems for

development within the city—all of these were put together in a package, really co-ordinated by the gentleman representing the Ontario Housing Action Programme. It was a matter of some discussion for a lengthy period of time. There were some obvious compromises made. Clearly the process used deviated from the normal planning process considerably.

I have some difficulties, mostly because a lot of what was done was done with individual members of the council in terms of lobbying, with the individual developers in terms of striking a fair deal with them. There are two ways to look at this. Maybe the planning process was being expedited. I don't know. It certainly happened faster than it normally would, that's true. But there is that element of another agency operating contrary to what you would expect in the normal planning process. Deals were struck; arrangements were made; developments were put there. It put the municipality in some awkward positions. In order to get servicing money—which they did need without question—they had to allow some development they normally would not have allowed.

Would you care to comment on how you set up that programme and whether you think that that is a desirable approach, whether that's through an officer of the government representing a particular programme that you have in effect at a given time, or whether it's the other route as when you had an agency like the Niagara Escarpment Commission or, as we anticipate in the near future in our area, the north Pickering development agency?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: First of all, I am not going to go into the details of the OHAP concept. I will leave that to Mr. Farrow. But I do want to comment on the fact that one of the great criticisms of this ministry has been—and this came from municipalities and it came from developers and it came from members of the Legislature, from all parties I might add—that we were responsible for the major delays in getting on with the development of subdivisions and the development of housing.

OHAP people went into these various areas where it appeared that development could be accelerated and their main job was not to wheel and deal but their main job was to expedite the process, to cut through the red tape that was there and that we were accused of being a very large part of, to attempt to get subdivisions approved, to get municipalities to accept development in their areas. It was not intended to totally abandon the planning process but to overcome what was one of the major criticisms: that rather than expediting and helping to get things done, we were a great party to the long delays that were costing everybody money and at that same time preventing the development of needed housing.

That's what the OHAP idea was about. It was to go in and accelerate. No question. To bring on ahead of normal timing development in certain of these communities.

[10:00]

Now, you mentioned the Oshawa-Newcastle area. That was one of the areas where we did go in and attempt to expedite—accelerate is probably the better word—accelerate the development. The OHAP vehicle was used and our people, as I understand it—I'll let Mr. Farrow go into more detail—attempted to bring together the two parties that were most intimately involved, namely the developer and the municipality.

To bring them together we used, I suppose you could call it, the carrot at the end of the stick, saying "Here, if you can do that, this is what we've got for you." It was all done for the sole purpose of attempting to get housing started at a time when we certainly needed housing and at a time when we appeared to be part of the delay. Mr. Farrow.

Mr. Farrow: Thank you, sir. Taking that specific area, the Oshawa area and the Courtice area, those subdivisions which were expedited in this last few months before the time ran out, as you mentioned, Mr. Breaugh, were really started several years ago. There were studies prepared, financing put into the municipality by OHAP to help them pick areas that they wanted.

I think, by and large, if not in all cases, in the areas in which we got involved with the municipalities, they weren't told, "If you don't take it here, you won't get money." We said, "Here's the money to do studies." In Newcastle there were a lot of dollars put into doing studies. The municipality hired various consultants and they came up with areas they thought could be developed, including engineering studies of what could be hooked into various sewerage schemes and servicing schemes.

We agreed we would help finance these if they did certain things, but they picked the areas. We didn't go in and say, "If you don't do it here, you don't get the money." On that basis it was, as the minister said, working with the municipalities and the

developer and putting in the extra dollars that were needed to get something moving quicker rather than later, and this is generally the OHAP outlook.

The concept was to find those areas where development was likely going to occur anyway sometime, to go in and help co-ordinate the work of various local agencies, provincial agencies, and to bring these three parties together—and sometimes four where you had a region, a municipality, the province and the developer—and say, "Okay, why is this not going to happen soon?" "We need a secondary plan? All right, we'll help you prepare a secondary plan." "We need some services? They'll come, but it's a long way down the pipe." "Okay, we'll give you some interest-free loans to put in these sewers."

The OHAP concept was to find out those areas where development was likely going to take place anyway. As you know, in northeast Oshawa, Oshawa wanted that to go. Some time it would have gone. There were some concerns of whether it would fit in with the parkway belt, because of the boundaries. Some of it might have been cut off. This was where the OHAP people got involved with the various ministries.

Your suggestion was that it overran the planning system, the whole planning programme; there were many cases where OHAP people were suggesting specific sites, because developers would come to them and say, "What about this location?" These proposals would be put through the provincial planning system and sometimes they can't be supported because it does seem to run counter to either provincial goals or some municipal long-range goals.

The ones that got on-stream, by and large, were run through all of the provincial policies and they were definitely those areas where the municipalities wanted development. There was no doubt at the last on the CHIGs—not so much the servicing loans but on the capital home improvement grants. The municipalities gave some approvals. The Newcastle area is an example where they, in fact, gave some approvals to some plans in that area as quick as they could to get the grants. It was something that they had been working for for some time and they had been into us asking us to speed up and do whatever we could.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Can I just make one other comment? In the three years that OHAP basically operated on its own, as I mentioned in my opening statement, we gave $3 million in study grants to the municipalities that were involved. They were selected areas, as you know, but certainly that was a part of the planning process, to give them the money to carry out their particular planning studies ,and in some areas the reports came back and the studies showed no way.

Mr. Breaugh: It is a matter of perspective, I suppose. It sounds quite legitimate the way it was put. But I really have to put this to you. I sat in my office one morning when I was on the Oshawa council, and a fellow from OHAP showed up and put the deal to me in these terms: "I have to get rid of this money. This is where it can be spent. These are the projects, these are the developments where I have OHAP agreements with the developers." He named them; then he proceeded to tie in the Newcastle proposition and some other things. It was put in those rather blunt terms, and I know that was done with other councils.

It strikes me—from a very biased perspective, I suppose—that they then proceeded to fund all the things you probably should have done in the first place. In fact, a number of the planning studies were studies that were almost done, and on which money had been spent, in order to prove that the original idea was the right idea in the first instance.

Complications arose when other ministries, like the Ministry of the Environment or the Ministry of Natural Resources, got involved. In this case, the local conservation authority got into a battle and said, "No, you can't develop that land there." The Ministry of Natural Resources first supported the conservation authority, then relented; and it went on.

It is a matter of perspective, and perhaps it is that fine point on how you carry out a particular programme, but there were some great difficulties with that. I want to say that when you went to the city with propositions such as funds being available for servicing and asked the city to identify areas in that municipality—and, I suspect, in every municipality—there aren't many areas, in terms of extending services, where that could be done in short order. In Oshawa there was really only one, the northeast area, that had servicing potential somewhere down the line.

I don't think the financial rewards under OHAP in the long term are going to turn out to be that good for very many people. But in the short term it did expedite the process and get some things done. What I am objecting to is someone from the province operating in that manner. When the proposal

is made, he comes to you and says, "I have got these developers lined up. I have agreements with them to produce homes within a certain time period." Since it can only go in one particular place, the question about where you want the housing to go is rather an irrelevant one. There is really only one potential area in that area; it was identified by the city and the planning studies were done.

There were a number of developers who benefited substantially by the Housing Action Programme there, because the cost of studies that should have been done some time ago—technical ways of servicing particular properties without causing other difficulties downstream, which was a major concern in that particular project—which probably should have rightly been paid for by the developer as a business cost, were absorbed by the people of the province of Ontario under a Housing Action grant. There are great difficulties with that.

Maybe I am arguing about perspective on this matter or the way that one particular representative of the government operated. But it really struck me rather forcefully that here was a great government programme announced, with obvious funding available, and the purpose of the exercise was to spend a lot of money as quickly as possible. It seemed rather irrelevant, through most of that process, whether the money was well spent or the housing would go in an appropriate area. In fact, the houses aren't up yet and probably won't be up for another couple of years.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I would agree with you that I don't believe we should be using that sort of approach you have just described. I would hope that was an individual and not necessarily the norm as it related to the application of the programme. However, what I am finding some difficulty with—in fact, I am finding it rather interesting—is that you are saying to me that here was the province of Ontario, through one of its particular people, going into a community and attempting to impose upon that community the will of the province; that we were, in fact, circumventing the municipal planning process.

I appreciate that, because I don't like that sort of approach. But, with respect, it is not in line with what has been said in this committee before by your predecessor, that we should be going into these municipalities and imposing our will upon them; that we should be circumventing their planning process and telling them how and what they should have within their municipality.

I would be quite happy to go along with your direction, because I am a very great believer in local autonomy. I think that you are, too, and that is as a result of the time that you spent on that council.

Mr. Breaugh: Yes, I would be a little more specific about it. I wouldn't really have a complaint if the process that I experienced was the same as the process that you described—where you went to a municipality first and said, "Where can you put these things? Where is your potential?" Let them name it. But the process that I experienced was the other way around. I really objected to that.

In the middle of all this, the region was trying to put together an official plan and was hamstrung, in large measure, because of the kind of deals that were there. The economic stick of providing servicing grants is a forceful one. When you are talking to those people who are getting the razzberries daily about their local tax rate and the argument about lot levies is there and the ministry is against lot levies, and everybody wants to build houses but nobody wants to pay for the services, you stick it on a lot levy.

It is a very difficult thing, and it messed up rather badly, or certainly complicated what was going on. And I am not terribly sure that the end result is all that positive a thing. There will be lots of units up there. We also know what kind of units they will be now and they're not going to meet the needs of the local citizenry that well. They are not addressed to that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes. Can I ask what you mean by the kind of units? You've lost me a bit there. Your concern is about—

Mr. Breaugh: Okay. To put it very bluntly, under the OHAP agreements where there was a price restriction on percentages of the units, in order to hit those densities and to keep within those price restrictions, the developers are really pleading for a higher density unit. They're going into townhouses and condominiums, specifically, and the market is already flooded with those in that area. So it is one of the problems of going into an area where there has been a lot of land speculation. The last guy in, of course, paid the largest dollar and, of course, in order to get some profit out of it at the end, he really wants to go to the highest density.

You are caught in that mechanism, when the programme is tied so nicely into servicing grants and affordable housing and all that

routine which is a desirable thing from the municipality's point of view. You're caught in that small web.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I must say that I sincerely wish, and I say this most sincerely, that you had been here over the last two sets of estimates I have sat through. Because you and I are not too far off apparently on what the thinking and the attitude is. I was beaten very severely here, in this room—

Mr. Breaugh: I doubt that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Well, attempted, attempted.

Mr. Martel: You seem to have survived.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Oh, very well. Very well.

Mr. Ferrier: You have lots of scars on you though.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, I don't scar easy. I don't get mad. I get even.

Mr. Breaugh: I'd better get this quarter in my pocket. I am dealing with a crook.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But one of the things we were told about our OHAP programme and many of our other housing programmes, was you cannot permit the developers to go into these areas and build only houses for the upper middle class and the upper incomes and the high income people. You have to have a large percentage of those houses available to people in the lower income brackets.

We accepted that as being a reasonable goal—that we should have that sort of mix. The OHAP programme was to provide for a percentage of houses in those certain levels.

I can read back to you out of Hansard the criticism I got from my critic of the day about how that percentage was not near high enough; that I shouldn't have only that number of units going into that percentage of units; that there should be a much greater volume. I was told that I should go down into the Ottawa area—which might not be such a bad idea—and take a large area of land and develop that whole thing strictly for the lower income people. Nobody else. All of them. I have letters from the local ratepayers' associations saying the same thing—from your colleague from Ottawa Centre saying the same thing.

I don't know which way to go. You fellows have really got me mixed up now.

Mr. Breaugh: We're giving you reasonable alternatives.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm sticking with you because you seem to be—have you decided? Are you going to come over? Because I think you are with us on this one.

Mr. Breaugh: Want to make the offer in writing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If I give you a Horner offer, will you come?

An hon. member: Is it a cabinet post?

Mr. Breaugh: I've got enough aggravation now.

[10:15]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Nobody knows it but that was actually a trade that was worked out a long time ago between Horner and me.

Mr. Martel: Both lost.

Mr. Breaugh: I think that I would agree if you had accomplished something with that.

Mr. Ferrier: J. W. Spooner set the precedent years ago.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That was before my time.

Mr. Ferrier: He was a Liberal before he went to be a Conservative.

Mr. Chairman: Let's return to the estimates.

Mr. Martel: What did you think Horner's lost?

Mr. Breaugh: There is no concrete offer forthcoming for me to reject.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: One of the points you made to us yesterday in your remarks was that we were not targeting our housing to income groups.

Mr. Breaugh: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We thought maybe we were trying to do that, but not as well perhaps as you thought we should.

Mr. Breaugh: Yes. Specifically the problem with this is the point about how the programme worked, not in theory, not in brochures but how it actually worked in the field. I object to the particular way it was handled in that area. Secondly, the end result didn't accomplish what it set out to do. The target was that 30 per cent of those units were for the $15,000 to $20,000 bracket. That's above the average wage in that area. You've missed out people. You've got 10 per cent in there.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Excuse me, "our people." Who are they?

Mr. Breaugh: My constituents, who are our people.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yours and mine.

Mr. Breaugh: There is that problem of missing what you set out to do. The end result is going to be a massive influx of people and we are going to experience some rather serious difficulties by allowing that growth. I give the Oshawa council and the councils in that whole region a lot of credit for not sitting on development. They have had their problems, but there really has been a boom in that area and they have let it go, they have attempted to co-operate and to see that housing is available.

The price is going to come in shortly—is in now already—in terms of jobs in the area. There are a lot of serious problems in terms of losing an identity of a community in that area. There are just vast tracts of land with housing units on them that are vacant all day long. You've got to go back there after 7:30 at night if you want to find any people. There is that very real problem and there is also difficulty with transportation.

All of those things are at least thought about and discussed rather thoroughly in the region's official plan. There are some very necessary items in terms of good planning that aren't in place yet. I am anticipating, and most people who are working in the municipality there are anticipating, some rather serious difficulties in the next few years. This government is aware of the problem. A liquor warehouse and transferring the Ministry of Revenue are not going to solve the problem. They are first steps maybe and perhaps the first desirable steps we've seen. But there are some difficulties and I wanted to raise that one.

I wanted to raise a number of other specific things, and maybe Mr. Hall would want to jump in on some of these, about this affirmative action programme. I'd like to get your view on whether that's actually accomplishing very much or is it doing anything for anybody anywhere?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We think from our ministry's point of view, yes. We think it is working very well. I am going to let Mr. Crosbie comment more on that than I will. We think that the affirmative action programme is working very effectively in our ministry and we are going to continue to see that it does work effectively.

Mr. Breaugh: Could I clarify this, because I've seen this discussed in other ministries? Everybody says we spend the bulk of our budget on information programmes or public relations and we submit a lot of reports. But there still doesn't seem to be a lot of qualified people of one particular sex getting to important job positions. Everybody has one or two or three that has moved to some important position but it is not a substantial move. When you say that it is working effectively, do you really mean that a lot of people are talking about it or it's under active consideration or do you really mean that there has been a substantive change in who holds what job?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think there has been a substantial change and I regret that the material you have and the material I have is not quite as up to date as it should be. The number of positions that have been filled by women in the upper areas of responsibility, the more senior positions, has increased substantially and their salaries accordingly. I'll let Mr. Crosbie, who is as interested in this as anyone is in seeing that it works properly, comment on that and perhaps we may even bring in our women's co-ordinator to give her views.

Mr. Breaugh: One token woman.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We have more than one token woman.

Mr. Breaugh: How many are there?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I sometimes wonder whether there are any men in my ministry.

Mr. Breaugh: Is anyone named "Ray" on your staff?

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the ministry, I think in some respects we are in a bit of a preferred position. Right now, we do have three women directors in the ministry, and the programme in the ministry has directed itself toward the very problem you have talked about—getting some substantive change in results. Of course, one of the very real problems with that is that it's not possible to make a lot of these changes overnight. We are directing a lot of effort to identifying, in the ministry, the positions which historically have been associated with men and which should equally be held by women. We are creating what are called "bridging positions" so that women, who do not immediately have the skills, can go to this bridging position and in a period of time qualify for the other, higher and more-preferred position.

A lot of the work, too, is in the area of employees who have not, right now, got skills and in the matter of job enrichment. As you are aware, in almost every ministry there are large pools of secretarial and clerical staff, who are largely women. Without considerable work in upgrading their skills, it is difficult to hold out a great deal of hope. Obviously, you cannot approach this programme with the thought that everybody is going to become a director. So a lot of the work we are doing is in trying to enrich jobs in situ, if you will, by allowing more components—different jobs—to be open to the same group, to make their work more interesting in place.

In terms of statistics, you don't see any great strides forward here; you are talking in one or two percentage points, two or three percentage point changes in the number of women who have moved into senior positions. But one of the problems that has, I think, influenced the statistics in the affirmative action programme, particularly in the last year, is that, by and large, government ministries have been reducing. For example, in the last year, we removed five senior-programme executive positions from the ministry; they were eliminated. And when you are embarked on a programme where you are eliminating senior positions, the opportunity for moving people up into them is reduced. You wind up, in many cases, with a surplus of people who are already fully trained and qualified with no place to go in some cases. And in those circumstances, it is a little difficult to bring a person ahead and put them into a position or create a new position for them.

So the constraint programme has affected, I think, the results we would like to see. But as the minister suggested, we would be very pleased for you to hear from our women's co-ordinator. She could give you her views; we have asked her to come over and she will be here in about five minutes. If you would like to take it up with her when she comes in—

Mr. Breaugh: I really don't want to go into the routine about all the good information that was put out, great discussions that were held and all that stuff. We've all listened to that, and there's no argument about it. When will we actually see some redress in the imablance that's there; when will we really see the numbers? The minister indicated that they are better than they appear on the information we have now. How long is it going to take you before some very concrete results are shown?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think that the approach being taken by the ministry right now has been to assign people to various positions and to promote people to various positions, not based on whether they are male, female, black, white, brown, but on their ability. You used the term "token woman"—

Mr. Breaugh: No, you used it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, you brought it up first.

Mr. Breaugh: But then you liked it so well you used it several times just after.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I just followed along. I told you, you and I are getting along so well.

Mr. Breaugh: You're so easily led.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The number of women who are moving into these more senior positions is definitely on the upswing in our ministry. You can see that from the number of people who are holding positions of responsibility, who are heading up branches of the ministry and who are doing a good job. The planners, for example, that I deal with on a day-to-day basis, many of these positions are held by women and they're doing an excellent job, there's no question about it. Many of them are very young, many of them have not been in the ministry a great length of time, but their potential is there, there is no question about it.

Again, it depends upon their own particular desires. I've talked to some who are very content and happy with what they are doing. This is what they want to do. They're not really that keen on moving into other areas. Those who have shown an interest and have shown the ability are never denied the opportunity to move up.

I know in my own office, for example, two of the more important positions in the minister's office are filled by women. In fact, the latest change was a woman who replaced a man in that particular position.

Mr. Breaugh: Do you kind of think you're at that level now where it's become a matter of individuals gaining sufficient experience to hold positions and that any other obstacles have been eliminated; as soon as they gain sufficient experience or expertise in a particular field, they'll be there, that's probably the difficulty you're going to run into from now on?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think it's a matter now of the women who are in the ministry and

who have been there for short periods of time, who will gather the experience and the knowledge that they will need to move these other positions, which they are doing, they are gaining that experience and they are demonstrating that they have the ability to handle these positions, to fill these positions as good as anyone has, and that when they become vacant they certainly are not being denied those positions by virtue of the fact that they are women. In fact, I sometimes think in my ministry that the women are beginning to wonder if they are not almost being relegated out of being women. Some of them are never referred to by other than their last names, similar to the men, and abused the same way, dressed down.

Mr. Breaugh: Equal rights.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They're going to be equal all the way. No, I think we've got an excellent situation right now in the ministry.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Minister, on a different subject, I've just looked through this, the problem of the unorganized townships in northern Ontario and what your ministry intends to do with respect to them. I see community planning and the whole business, but I don't see anything there with respect to unorganized townships. I don't know where you want to discuss it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes. We'll talk about it here if you won't talk about it later.

Mr. Martel. That's fine.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As far as unorganized townships are concerned and unorganized areas, I mentioned yesterday I've got that one experiment going on the development of an official plan for a large area of unorganized townships, if you will. The community planning branch has been working with these various communities to try to assist them as much as we can.

Mr. Martel: But the minister knows one of the fundamental problems, and the minister is well aware of it, because he and I, when he first came in here, visited with the then-Treasurer to try to get something done in terms of some type of planning as to what we're going to do with people who own land around his own city, around the city which I represent, some of the unorganized townships where there are great tracts of land being held, where people want to give some of it off to their children, which, in fact, then creates a whole series of other problems.

I just don't see much change in what's going on. I'm constantly in touch with Milt Farrow about Joe Blow's severance, what's going to happen. One of the main problems is consistency of application of what's going one, and it's a hell of a mess. It seems to me that you can introduce a freeze, which takes some pressure off for a while, but then even that reaches a point where you're just forcing people to move a little farther from where the freeze is. Once again, the whole pattern starts all over again of a house here and then down another concession road another house, and then the first thing you know you're sending in a school bus and you're sending in police protection, and you're trying to collect garbage, and it's so damned costly that we can't afford it. Yet people say, "Look, I own the land. What am I going to do with it?"

[10:30]

If we don't bring land into production in terms of proper planning in the organized communities, people are going to move out. Land is selling at $26,000 a building lot in a part of the city of Sudbury. The only thing people do then is they say, "Look, I can't even afford it. If I'm going to pay $26,000 for a building lot in the city of Sudbury, I might as well go down to Dill township or around Estaire or Alban"—places the minister is well aware of, where they have a relative who has a chunk of land they can buy.

We've met in Sudbury—some of your staff; Mr. Sowa and so on—with the legal profession and with the real estate people to see if they would stop leading people into traps. The real estate firms are selling land to people. The lawyers aren't bothering to check to find out whether or not the individuals are going to be allowed to build. When an individual buys a whole farm and comes to apply for his building permit, he finds we're saying no to him.

Mr. Sowa and I have met with the president of the real estate board and the president of the law society to see if we could get them to encourage their own membership to stop this. It's just creating such massive pressures and raising the cost of land. The only place that sells land at a decent rate is the town of Capreol, where all the land is owned by the town. They develop one subdivision at a time and they're getting fully serviced land—with underground cable and the whole business—on the market for about $10,500 a building lot. If you go to Valley East—and the minister is well aware of what I'm talking about—it's $12,000 or $14,000 without services; and if you go to the city of Sudbury, which is on a pile of rock, you pay $26,000 in Moonglow subdivision or $20,000 in a subdivision that

your people are partly involved in out in New Sudbury.

Working people can't afford $20,000. The thing that amazes them is there is so much land around that they start to move either to the unorganized portions just beyond the boundaries of regional government. This is creating a very serious problem, because the problems we've had in bringing services into Dill, which is just starting to come in, or into Valley East, eventually are going to catch up to us there when they have enough people. They go to those communities and say, "We don't want services," but they're not there very long before they are starting to scream for services.

I've got a petition on my desk now from 100 young people in an unorganized township, wanting some form of recreation for them for this summer. We can't get a cent of money into them. There's no way the government can get money into an unorganized community except if the school board wants to do some of it. The local roads board is the only type of organization there. I can recall meeting with the present minister when he was vitally worried about it, and he wasn't in his capacity as minister then.

I would hope that the minister, recognizing those problems, would perhaps institute a study of sorts; we've been dabbling with Bill 102 for two or three years and it hasn't gone anywhere. Surely we've got to do something to get a handle on the unorganized townships and the people who continually move just beyond whatever the boundaries are. Unless we do something, there's no end to the problem and no end to my telling people, "Look, I don't think you can get a building permit, but I'll check with Housing." The reason I have to play what is a political game is that you don't know if somebody's getting approval. I would take a firm line and say that when you've got a guy like Chris Sowa, you're in pretty good shape, because Chris will not allow any games to be played. But for a period there were people with whom it was much easier. For example, they were allowing you to move into an old house that the health department said you might be able to live in if you repaired it; or you could move down to an old farm that hadn't been utilized for 40 years if you added on to it. You added on to the old house and tore the old section down and you're left with the new house. Sowa doesn't play that kind of game so you're in good shape, but you're always wondering.

When you say to someone: "No, I don't think it's right because we're going to have to send a school bus down 12 miles"—I'm sure the minister is aware that in the first snowfall in the fall you've got some fellow who is 12 miles away down a local road and he pays $12 local roads board tax, who wants the equipment there to plough out his road the first morning. The local roads board can't afford it because the cost of the equipment is higher than what he pays in tax for the whole year. We've just got to get a handle on this.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, no one can deny that that problem is there. Strangely enough, though, the same problem exists within organized territories, even within organized municipalities. If you take the Sudbury region—Timmins is another one where the boundaries have been extended out and it makes it a municipality—then the municipality immediately puts in an urban service line and says: "Everything beyond this line won't be serviced for 20 years." Then the planners in the area immediately say: "You can't build on this unless you've got 500 feet frontage and five acres of land."

That's what happens out there. People are trying to move into these areas and there's no water, there's no sewer, there's no servicing of any kind. They're attempting to find wells and they're attempting to put in septic tanks.

So what's the answer? You get out around areas that you're talking about in the Sudbury area where you are having a large demand to go out into those areas and in some of those unorganized areas there are substantial populations growing.

I wonder if we might just say, "Take Bill 102 and forget about it," because I think it's trying to put a Band-Aid over a pretty large wound, and take a look at the possibility of forming some sort of municipal structure in those areas.

Mr. Hall mentioned an interesting point when he said that there is a report coming from Mr. Archer which is being tabled tonight down in the Niagara region. I'm going to find that most interesting, from what he said.

Mr. Hall: Are you coming down, John?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'd like to but I won't be able to get down. I understand that if I did I would have to go to your place.

Mr. Hall: No, some other time. In daylight we'll show you the great fruit lands down there.

Mr. Ferrier: There might be a vote tonight, eh?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I would think there might be. He mentioned that there's some feeling that perhaps we may not have had total information as to whether or not residential developments might not be as costly to a municipality as many people would have us believe over the last number of years. That being the case, maybe we can organize these particular areas that are relatively close to the Sudburys of this world, the Timminses and the Sault Ste. Maries, rather than just extending those boundaries out—because you're right on.

I had a proposal made to me by a gentleman who still is, I think, in TEIGA—back when it was the Department of Municipal Affairs, or he was with that department—suggesting that the boundaries of the city of Sault Ste. Marie be extended 90 miles north. That was going to solve the problems.

Mr. Hall: Don't let Mel Swart hear about that one.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mel didn't hear about that but I'll drop it in his lap and it will keep him busy. That's some size of a municipality, that's some sized town. I'd like to see some of these areas organized into municipalities.

The planners would go right up the wall. They'd think you're right out of your mind. But they've had their way long enough.

Mr. Martel: I think, with Mr. Farrow, we've managed in one unorganized township —but what I'm trying to do is get the ministry to move in these unorganized townships— I don't care who gets the subdivision—to prevent that unorganized municipality from spreading out down every concession road. If you've got an Alban, which is an unorganized township, get a subdivision approved in the heart of whatever that little community might be rather than having them even there go down the concession roads.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But we've still got the servicing problems.

Mr. Martel: Yes, you've got the servicing problems, but if you can make your lots big enough that they can utilize septic systems you're better off having them at least stay within the boundaries—not the natural boundaries, but the boundaries that exist. If you can get a subdivision in there, you are better off. You are not creating a situation in which you need more school buses and garbage collection down every concession road in that township. At least if you have 20 lots available in an unorganized township where there is a cluster of houses, then we are not going to let you build on concession 2, lot 4, six miles down the way. There are 20 lots available right in the heart of that unorganized township which we, as a ministry, have approved. If you want to live there, those are the 20 lots or the 25 lots, from which you will build.

At least that way you are keeping it confined to a restricted area which will, in fact, eliminate in the long run the costly features such as sewer and water works when they do come. I see this in Valley East where there is 11 miles of development, one row of housing on each side of the highway; and it is $50 million for sewers and water. If you look ahead that far, they are going to build around there anyway. They will build illegally and all the Act says is that they will be fined $50 or $500, you don't tear the house down. They build anyway, so in those townships where you have the cluster of houses, you are better off improving some of the 25 lots for development. At least it's organized in the sense that it will meet the standards for a proper septic disposal; and hopefully, it will prevent the Joe Blows from moving on down into every nook and cranny of the township.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't find any fault with that. But what do we do if you allow these subdivisions to develop, let's say 10 to 12 miles outside the boundaries of the existing municipality? You know and I know that once that subdivision is developed there will then be a demand for the services, the various services. Somehow you have got to get the services out there.

The approach which has been taken by the ministry for some time has been not to allow a subdivision to develop out there. Aside from the minister—forget whoever he may be—the people in the ministry itself have never advocated strip development, they have never advocated that. In fact they have been very vehemently opposed to strip development. But once you develop that subdivision out there, you have isolated a group of people who really are entitled, if you will, to a degree of services.

Now the ministry has said that it is better to build these subdivisions or permit these subdivisions to develop adjacent to the existing municipality; in that way if you are going to extend services it is going to cost a heck of a lot less to bring them out from an existing municipality and to hook onto that subdivision.

Mr. Martel: If it's close enough, John.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If it's close enough. But if you are going to go 10 or 12 miles, you are going to end up with pockets of subdivisions scattered all over the place, which is maybe almost as bad as strip development.

Mr. Martel: What concerns me is that it is just happening in reverse. If you go to Estaire—and the minister has driven through it frequently on his way down—they are now moving up the road that joins Highway 17 and Highway 69 south.

All along there it's strip development; by a whole variety of means they are getting improvements.. They buy a whole farm, because that used to be a Finnish community and many of the farmers moved out. There might be an old house on it. They move in. You can't stop them. Are you not better off to put one subdivision in Estaire, to keep them all there rather than allow them to drift off somewhere else? Or if you move a little further into the French River country, in a place like Alban where they are going to go; there all kinds of roads, because it's tourist country, leading into all the lakes and to the various tourist camps. If we don't keep them in the confines of Alban, if there are no lots available, then they are going to drift off and buy land on any one of those roads leading into the various tourist camps. That's what they are doing, and I am trying to say are we not better off trying to keep them together.

[10:45]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: All right. I'm not going to fault that and I'd like to see subdivision development take place in those communities as well. I'm pleased there are those who are hearing what you're saying. I would like to see those subdivisions develop. The only way I can go about it, of course, is I'm going to have to slap a minister's order on the whole area, freeze it harder than blazes, and only allow the development to take place in that subdivision.

Now what will I have done? Whoever owns that land in that particular area has now basically got a monopoly on the available developable land. Is that desirable? Are we not going to run the price of those lots up the pipe? If I want to live in Estaire or Alban, and there's only the one subdivision there with X number of lots, there's only one guy I can buy from, and whoever has got that land has got a pretty good grip on the market there.

We're now back to the old competitive sort of thing. Maybe what I should do is be approving about three or four subdivisions and making these guys compete with each other. I've got a problem—I'm going to have Alban and Estaire and other similar type communities starting to grow like Topsy, because what will happen is they'll all fill up, and then what have we got?

Mr. Martel: But they're moving out there anyway.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They're all going to be transients. They're all going to be commuters. They're all going to be driving up and down the highway, back and forth to Sudbury to work. These communities then become the bedroom communities of Sudbury. One of the big complaints I've got out of Mike's area, from such large municipalities as Oshawa and Whitby and Ajax and others, they're saying to me, "Don't you try and make us into a bedroom community for Metropolitan Toronto." You can't fault that. They don't want the people sleeping there and working in Toronto.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They don't want to have to supply the schools and the libraries and the rinks and the parks and everything for those people while they're all working here in Toronto. They want job opportunities there too. What do I put in as the job opportunity in Alban?

Mr. Martel: The only thing that's gone in is Rogerson Lumber. I'm saying they're growing at any rate, John. The trouble is, through a variety of loopholes they're going in, and what concerns me is rather than at least keeping them in a confined area, they're moving off onto all the side roads. They can't get into Alban proper, so they move down a side road.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Would you be happy—

Mr. Martel: You've got a freeze, by the way—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Would you be happy if I went in there and said, "After discussions with Mr. Martel we have come to a mutual agreement that this whole area should be frozen. There will be no development allowed except in approved subdivisions in these communities"? Frankly, I think you're right.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Minister, I went along with the freeze in Cleland township. In fact, I worked very closely with the ministry,

when it was with TEIGA, that brought about the freeze in Cleland and Dryden townships. They were escaping from the city of Sudbury—if I can use that term—they were going down into Cleland and—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You were losing your constituents?

Mr. Martel: No, no. That is all part of my riding anyway.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Is it?

Mr. Martel: Yes.

Mr. Eaton: No wonder they want to move.

Mr. Martel: They were moving down into the Wanapitei area, but all along the two roads that join Highway 17 east to Highway 69 south; they were moving in there to trailer parks, without services; it was just a lousy mess and creating more and more problems for everyone.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How about extending the planning area? Would you go along with that?

Mr. Martel: Yes, I would suggest the planning area should be extended to the French River. I recommended that during the bill bringing in regional government, because the boundaries that are used up there for school board purposes run right to the French River and for the health unit run right to the French River, but for regional government purposes or planning purposes they only go to Estaire and Wanapitei. You've got that great gap of 20 or 30 miles that people are trying to move into just beyond the boundary. Then you go beyond that 30 miles and you run into that whole strip of communities in the French River which are part of Sudbury for tax purposes, for education and for health services. We're creating that zone there.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The way to do it then would be to place the land control, which I think is probably right anyway, in the hands of the ministry and take it away from what is now being used, section 17 of The Public Lands Act; get it out of Natural Resources and get the total land control of that area into the hands of the Ministry of Housing. Then slap a freeze on it—

Mr. Martel: Cleland still has a freeze on it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Freeze the whole area properly. Put out minister's orders in the whole area.

Mr. Martel: As long as you are going to plan it. For the other five years nothing happened. They put on the freeze there was no planning.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And then allow subdivisions to be established in these communities you are talking about?

Mr. Martel: That is the only solution I can see.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are still going to be faced with the very major costs that will come along that will be required for the servicing. I don't know the ground area down there. Is a 15,000 square foot lot down there going to be able to handle a septic tank?

Mr. Martel: Two of the small communities that are organized, which we hoped would expand, are getting sewers this year. Alban isn't and Estair isn't. Attlee township and Marshay aren't. Three of those are unorganized townships. I think 15,000 or even 20,000 square feet, if need be, might do. Mr. Farrow is certainly aware of the soil tests that were done in the Alban area. I am not sure if 15,000 square feet would do it or even if it was 20,000 square feet. It just seems to me it would be better to do that than simply say no to everyone and not providing anything. My concern is you can freeze as we did, about 1970, and then do nothing for five years. We did no planning or anything on what we are going to allow to develop there during the intervening five years. You just can't freeze it and do nothing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Maybe it is because of my past bitter experience with what happens when you allow these bedroom communities to develop. They go broke; they go flat, outright broke. I have seen amalgamations and annexations take place because the bedroom community couldn't get any money, couldn't debenture for services and couldn't provide the services for the people. They couldn't get enough return out of the taxes on the residents who were living there. There was no industrial assessment and no commercial assessment of any kind. It was strictly on the backs of the homeowners.

They just couldn't hack it. The services that were required didn't come. You end up with an amalgamation and then the total community ends up jamming these services into that place. It costs a lot of money.

Mr. Martel: I am not sure what the answer is, then, because people are still going into those townships. It would be different if people weren't getting in and if they weren't

building. I am sure my friend from Algoma-Manitoulin has the same problem. They get in anyway somehow. The population keeps escalating. The thing is they are so spread out they will never have services. But they are there. You are putting school buses in. You have problems with servicing for roads. It gets very costly.

I don't know what the answer is then. It just seems to me maybe what we need is someone who is going to do nothing but take a look at what we do in those areas. It is right across northern Ontario. It just isn't unique to my area, it is just right across northern Ontario. I don't think we can go on any further and I am sure the minister is convinced of that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No; it is a mess, no question.

Mr. Martel: That's right. I just think either we establish somebody who is going to look into trying to find solutions to the problems or it is just going to continue to escalate.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Agreed.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Chairman, I thought this maybe was coming under vote 2102, but seeing that Mr. Martel has brought this problem up I would like to follow along on that line of thought if I could at this time.

The minister has pointed out that maybe there is some way we can organize some of these municipalities in some manner. That really isn't the answer. About four or five years ago we did that with four and a half townships on the north shore improvement district.

There has been the reverse side of the problem that Mr. Martel talks about. We have little pockets of housing in Spanish, Serpent River, Algoma Mills and Spragge, and they are going to have to be bedroom communities of Elliot Lake or Blind River or whatever industrial development comes along there.

In Elliot Lake we are now getting along famously with planning in the town itself and development is progressing; but as Mr. Riddell has pointed out, even in Elliot Lake now a serviced lot is around $14,000 and people do not want to live in Elliot Lake. It is only 22 miles or so to one of these little villages on the north shore in the improvement district. We are having difficulties getting subdivisions approved down there. We are having a terrible housing problem right in Elliot Lake, and yet we can't seem to get going in this area.

We already have the pockets there, so we already have to supply the school buses and keep the roads up and so forth; so it is just really filling in that I'm talking about. So being organized isn't really the answer, either.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think you recognize, though, that in the north shore area, one of the major problems is inadequate water supply; one of the real major problems.

Mr. Lane: But we are going to have to solve it with the people who are there, so adding to the development isn't really going to make it any greater. If we didn't have any development there, I would certainly agree maybe we should hesitate to put anything there. But we already have the pockets of development that are requiring the services—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You've got only two answers, at this stage anyway; one is to completely deny any development there at all, none. For anyone who does go in and develop there illegally, there would be some teeth put in the legislation so that you could walk in and tear down what they've built and charge the guy a horrendous fine. That's the one solution you've got.

The other is to attempt to have orderly development within the area. Pick an area where you're going to allow, as Elie has suggested, a subdivision to develop. They are the only alternatives you've got.

But when you do that, are you then going to leave those people sitting in that subdivision out there with no organization of any kind, trying to exist on their own financial capabilities—whatever they generate through whatever you call it—a local roads board? It just won't work, I don't think.

Mr. Lane: These people are already organized. The people I am talking about, there is already a north shore improvement district there. They have the local government body.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But you are saying to me, though, that it isn't working.

Mr. Lane: It isn't working, no.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Well, then, if organization isn't the answer—

Mr. Lane: It isn't working because they can't afford to supply the services for the pockets they've got. Either they've got to get bigger or they're always in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But if organization isn't the answer, then the only other answer is what we were talking about.

Mr. Martel: I'm just trying to prevent it from becoming more scattered. I'm not unhappy with the development. I would prefer that we could keep them in a confined area. What I fear is that if they can't build in a small community like that, they're going to go down another road.

I'm not sure how one does it. What's that new department? Northern Affairs. I intend to give Northern Affairs some teeth, Mr. Minister—I announce it now—if we ever get to it. Contrary to what your colleague has said I am going to support the bill, you see. But I am going to give it some teeth. We are going to move an amendment, which is exactly similar to the type of community arrangements that appear in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I'm sure the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) won't be able to accept them.

There will be community councils—that's what we intend to move—community councils which will work directly with the Minister of Northern Affairs in running those small communities. They won't be incorporated the way a town is, but they will be local people who can get some funding in. I am sure Bernier won't be able to accept it. We're going to give him the opportunity, because he's been spouting off in the north rather viciously, and we're going to give him a chance to have a good bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You think he's vicious.

Mr. Martel: Oh, I've heard you too.

But maybe that's the answer. If you have a community council, not an incorporated town, who could work with a minister who would be responsible for helping to get the funding into these communities through the community councils, we might be able to get some funding in there and bring about some orderly development.

But what is going on? In my 10 years here we haven't moved one jot on it. I am saying that it can't continue along the lines that it's been allowed to go. If we get to the bill and providing the Premier doesn't call for an election, we will be moving an amendment calling for community councils in which we will explain that the money will be put into them through the Ministry of Northern Affairs to provide certain community amenities which are unavailable. Hopefully, the type of development that I am talking about will have someone who is going to be responsible for ensuring they are developed along proper lines.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But don't we have to make one major decision in our own minds? That is, do we really want these small communities that are popping up on us? Do you suggest—

Mr. Martel: We don't want them to develop any more, no.

[11:00]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The only alternative, as I see it, is for the government to impose a very severe restriction on that development, not allow it to happen, and have teeth in the legislation that would provide for substantial penalties and inconvenience if you do try to develop illegally. That means then that you are going to be allowing people to develop only at the major growth centres on the first two or three levels of growth centres. I am not saying that it has to be the city of Sudbury or North Bay or Timmins or Sault Ste. Marie or Thunder Bay. It can be the Blind Rivers and the Elliot Lakes of this world.

Mr. Martel: But it's one of the things you have to do in respect though, Mr. Minister, of the economic planning of the north. If an industry goes to Ear Falls and starts up a mill we simply can't allow a bedroom community to develop. It has got to develop in Ear Falls.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Agreed.

Mr. Martel: That's where most of these little communities start to develop. They go in there originally because they can't get near the site of a temporary economic boom in an area and they start to develop these little communities. Long after the industry has extracted all of the natural resources and has gone, the pocket remains.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And you've got a problem.

Mr. Martel: We've got to stop that—but it's gone on for 50 years, and what bothers me, John, is that we are still not doing a thing to cope with it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Of course, there is a degree of cruelty needed here, and I use that word advisedly. One of the things that we have done is that in the past I think we recognize now that you can't allow these small communities to develop all over the place because a resource industry develops. You've got to find some community where the

people live, take advantage of that particular centre and have transportation to and from.

In many communities that is happening now. You've got the portal to portal, say, of pay arrangements where the man is picked up and he is driven 35 miles—I think, up in your area, Bill, something like 45 miles that's considered to be a reasonable commuting distance for a man to go back and forth to work. That was the smelter in Timmins with the road going to Smooth Rock and the road going to Cochrane.

Okay, that's fine, you can do that. We recognize that and that is what is starting to happen, but we do have existing in northern Ontario, you well know, the communities that are there. Let me just mention two, Armstrong—right? Why is Armstrong there?

Mr. Ferrier: The railroad, wasn't it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Right, but is there anybody who is willing to say to all of the people in Armstrong, "You've had it, this town is gone. You are going to move. If you want to stay here, good luck, but you are not getting any sort of support from us"? Can you do that?

Mr. Martel: You can't do it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, they are there, so you've got to try to take care of them. Madsen: the gold mine closes down, these people are all sitting there, some of them own their own homes, some of them don't, but it is their home. What am I going to do with them? Am I going to say to them, "That's too bad. If you want to live in this area you move in to Red Lake"? Do I do that?

Mr. Martel: I think there are some of those communities where—you know, you've got some where there are only 20 or 30 homes—it might be advisable, although it is probably heresy to say it, to move the houses, lock, stock and barrel, eight or 10 miles down the road. Move the whole home. That's heresy, I realize that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Can I just tell you that in Armstrong, for example, we went in and looked at that situation. We were prepared to move the people from Armstrong to Thunder Bay. There were job opportunities, because up there the people were looking for employees in the mills and in other areas. There were job opportunities for them. We would assist them to get accommodation. They wouldn't move. No, sir. Armstrong is their home.

Mr. Martel: Sure.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You can't just turn off the world for them.

Mr. Ferrier: You can't even move them. Did the whole community have to move?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Some people wanted to stay there and operate tourist facilities, and that's fine, but there were a lot of people there who were working on the radar base, which was shut down flat; they wouldn't move.

Mr. Martel: All I'm saying then, John, is we've played around with it for years and I am not sure we've ever put into place the bodies necessary to do the major work on how we overcome it, and at the same time the problem continues to escalate. That's what worries me, it continues to get worse because of pressures.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think you are right.

Mr. Martel: I'm just saying that I don't think it can go on. I think it's time that perhaps we put up the money to do a study which shows we mean business in terms of how to resolve it. The nonsense around Bill 102—and you might disagree with me—is that it was so quickly thrown together that it didn't have a chance of succeeding. The meetings which were to occur across the north didn't occur, because I was over with TEIGA when we discussed the meetings across northern Ontario with the unorganized communities. It wasn't really serious; it was window-dressing for an election. You won't agree with me, I'm sure; but it was, in my opinion.

We just haven't moved in resolving the problem, and I think it's time. You might want to let it go for two more years, but in the interim there should be something being done in order to bring it all to a head. If we ever get to the Ministry of Northern Affairs bill tonight or Tuesday, if we're around that long, one of the proposals I will make—it's an amendment I have already drafted—will be to establish community councils, which will deal directly with the Minister of Northern Affairs, in order to get some money into those unorganized communities which exist already and, I hope, do some of the work that's necessary to prevent any more proliferation of that sort of development.

I'm sure the government will turn it down, but we want to give you that opportunity to make Northern Affairs work. You people have been going around the north saying the New Democrats are opposed to Northern Affairs. Personally, I am, because I don't think the bill addresses itself to the problems of northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You were opposed before you saw the bill.

Mr. Martel: Yes; even more so after I saw the bill, because there's nothing in it. It's so bare-boned that there's nothing in it. But we'll give it some teeth, providing you Tories are willing to accept the teeth.

Mr. Lane: I was very rudely interrupted a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to carry on with my discussion.

Mr. Martel: Oh, pardon me. I apologize.

Mr. Chairman: I think I should clarify one point. It was agreed before we started that when we raised an issue or an item, we would discuss it in detail, and any committee member who wanted to speak on it could do so rather than keep referring back to it, to avoid repetition. If anyone would like to continue on this point until we resolve it, then we'll get back to vote 2101 and carry on with it.

Mr. Lane: As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted – thank you for your apology.

Mr. Ferrier: He is getting thin-skinned in his old age.

Mr. Lane: The communities I'm referring to are really there. These were established back in the days of the sawmills in Spragge, Cutler and so forth. We're not bringing in new communities in the North Shore improvement district; we're trying to make it possible for those people to have a standard of life that's acceptable to people in this day and age.

My friend from Sudbury East and I aren't so far apart in what we think about the new ministry. My projections about this ministry from day one was that it would co-ordinate the efforts of a lot of ministries to do a job and get it done. What seems to be happening here is that when a guy makes an application for a subdivision in Spanish or some place, the whole thing seems to be written in stone; we have to wait for this person and that person to reply to a certain inquiry and so forth. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) seems to be the one who always doesn't get around to replying, and he's looked after through the Sudbury and district health unit. If the application is made in August, say, by February nothing has happened; then I find out they can't do it because there's six feet of snow up there; then next June they're too busy. The thing goes on and on.

As Elie says, we're going to have to get together and have some kind of a working relationship between ministries. How it's co-ordinated, I don't know; but perhaps three or four guys should go into this area to look at the subdivision all afternoon and agree that "our ministry can or cannot live with the situation that exists in this particular application that is being applied for." Rather that than repeatedly putting the fellow off until the boom in Elliot Lake is no longer there, the housing has been supplied someplace else and these people are left out in the cold again. They are already supplying the school bus services, they have to keep the roads up and so forth, and they have to have more tax dollars. We can't say to them, "We can't have a Spanish any more, or a Serpent River or a Spragge; you must move someplace else," because they've been there for 100 years.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But will those tax dollars that you're talking about come from the people who live there?

Mr. Lane: They are going to have to live there and work someplace else because there is nothing there to work at. I agree we can't build these places but we already have them.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: To my own way of thinking, if the person is going to work in Elliot Lake he should be living in Elliot Lake.

Mr. Lane: Yes, but they can't afford it. There's $15,000 between the price of the same house in Spanish and the same house in Elliot Lake because of the cost of the lot, the cost of the rental of the equipment to do the various work that has to be done to the house, the labour itself and so forth. We can probably build the same house in Spanish for $15,000 less than we can in Elliot Lake at this point in time.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But you create a fantastic problem for me that's not just confined to the north. It's right across the whole province. One of my pet peeves is Cavan township. I thought that might get a rise out of somebody. I'm sure you can go and build a house and live in Cavan township a heck of a lot cheaper than you can if you try to build one in Peterborough. But is that the criterion I am going to use? Am I going to say, because it's cheaper to build a house in Cavan township, away you go? Go and build it. I've got a checkerboard situation up there that would drive you crazy because of unvalidated lots. All kind of baloney is going on up there that can cause nothing but heart-

ache. If I only use the criterion that because you can build a house cheaper here and travel someplace to work, whether there is a community there or not or whether the community is viable or not, I've got a problem.

Cavan township is an organized township with an elected council of sorts that would allow this development to take place on every given side road around there on lots that nobody knows for sure whom they belong to.

Mr. Martel: Or if you can get to them.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Or if you can get to them. A lot of them have roadways. I don't know if I can use that as a criterion. I could go to Oshawa, even closer, and say we are going to allow any kind of development that wants to take place out in Newcastle or over at Brooklin or up in Pickering in the area outside the municipal boundary because it's cheaper to build a house out there than it is to build one in Oshawa or Ajax or Whitby. It is obviously cheaper because there would be no servicing, and there would be septic tanks. They'll drill wells. I don't know whether I can do that.

Mr. Lane: I am not creating the problem for you. It was there before you and I were around. What are we going to do about it? This is my question.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't want to compound it. Am I not compounding the problem if I allow a whole lot of development to take place 30 or 40 miles away from the centre, the community that is going to be the work place? Again I go back to the question of the smelter at Timmins. The city of Timmins said: "We don't want to absorb all these people who are going to come in here for this smelter operation. We think you should put a roadway through and hook up to the highway and the people can commute from Smooth Rock Falls and Cochrane."

Mr. Ferrier: I think they said it themselves. Cochrane and Smooth Rock said it rather than Timmins.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: A representative of the Timmins council and the Timmins Chamber of Commerce met with me and with representatives from Cochrane and Smooth Rock Falls and from the company in my office when I was in Transportation and Communications and they unanimously said to me: "We don't want all those people to end up living in Timmins. We want them to live in Smooth Rock Falls and Cochrane."

If you have any question about that, you can go and talk to the guys who came to see me. One of them is now the mayor of Timmins, by the way.

Mr. Lane: The other side of the coin is that we are trying to encourage home ownership rather than public housing. The mines have the obligation to provide some units for their people but there is an awful lot of service people involved in the development at the mine at Elliot Lake who just cannot afford to have a $14,000 lot to start with and then put another $35,000 in a house. If they are going to have homes, they are going to have to go someplace else to have them.

It is a case of whether we are going to have more public housing in places like Elliot Lake, which I don't subscribe to, or whether we are going to allow them to build someplace in one of the suburbs, I suppose we'd call it, and drive to work. This is what some of them want to do.

We've got the improvement district officials there. They are trying their damnedest to do a good job for us but they are faced with an impossible task of keeping up all these roads and supplying improved water services and so forth and not being able to enlarge their tax structure so that they can collect more dollars.

[11:15]

I'd be against starting something like this, but as I say, it was there long before any of us were around here; this goes back to the logging days when that area was thriving. Of course, there wasn't much problem with pollution in those days; we didn't have any uranium mines. But we're faced with the situation and, personally, I'm much more in favour of allowing home ownership in a place where a guy wants to live, even if he is going to drive 20 miles to work, rather than trying to put him in public housing just because the development is there.

I know it isn't an easy thing to solve. Mr. Martel brought the question up and we talked about the possible chance of organization being the answer. Well, it's not the answer because we had the organization here for five years and these people are struggling to keep their heads up; attempts have been made to improve the quality of life for the people who are there, but there just isn't enough revenue to do it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: To develop a subdivision in those areas, regardless of whether it's organized or not, you still have to meet the basic needs of the people, such as proper

sewage treatment facilities, whether it's septic tanks or whatever it is, that there be an adequate pure water supply, that there be an adequate transportation facility, whether it's a road to drive on or a bus service. I know that area fairly well; there are some real problems in trying to get septic tanks in, because of the difficulties with water which they're now experiencing. We were up in the area not too long ago.

Mr. Lane: You and I were there last winter and we—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The water supply, you know.

Mr. Lane: Right. But we're going to have to purify, anyway, so we might as well have another 100 users. This is my argument.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't know where they're going to get the money to pay for it, unless it's expected that the taxpayers of the total province pay for it; then I really have to wonder. Do I say to the person who lives in Elliot Lake or Blind River or Sudbury or wherever they be, you live in that community? But the guy who says I don't want to live in that community because I can't afford to live there, it's too expensive for me, the taxes are too high—he moves out into the unorganized territory and then turns with his hand out to the provincial government and says, now I want you to pay me to be out here. And the guy living inside that organized community is paying the full blast.

Mr. Martel: Yes, but my concern is that he's going there anyway. How do you stop it? He's going out there through a variety of means. He's buying old tracts of land which have been let go for years; people haven't lived on them. They're getting out there. All I'm trying to do is prevent that.

I don't know what the answer is. I'm not sure if it creates more problems than it resolves, but the other problem continues to escalate and that's what bothers me. I don't know how to put a stop to it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't think we've got an answer to it. I know I haven't. I'm assuming that none of us really has an answer but we are in that brilliant position of recognizing the problem. I guess, maybe what we have to do is apply ourselves to it and attempt to find a solution.

Mr. Martel: That's really what I'm looking for. You'll recall that that's why you and I met with the Treasurer five years ago. You're somewhat in a position to order that type of work to go on, and that's what I'm asking you as minister to do. I just don't think we can go on the way we're going.

Mr. Lane: Just to wind up, Mr. Chairman. I'm certainly not trying to discourage people from living in Elliot Lake. It's a good place to live and I think they should be encouraged to live where the work is and where they earn their money; and they should spend it there. But I just point out that there are a fair amount of people who can never afford to build a home in Elliot Lake, because of the cost of serviced lots and the cost of construction. So, if they want to go to a community which is already established, we shouldn't make them wait two, three or four years and have no housing while it's being decided. I think we should decide within six months after an application comes in whether or not they can have a subdivision. And if it means getting officials from three or four ministries together, or if it means that the Ministry of Northern Affairs has the responsibility of putting in some kind of a co-ordinating organization which is going to tell you people what the situation is—I don't know. But we have to come to grips with this situation somehow or another. Because we're always going to have those people who can't afford to have that home or don't want to live in that particular community, as much as I'd like to see it encouraged. And we have these communities that I mentioned here—you're very well aware of them, I'm sure, because you travel through them all the time—they're already there. They've been there for 100 years and we just can't say to them, "Okay, there's no more Spanish, it's going to disappear."

We have to provide the benefits of improved water systems and so forth, as you and I know. We were up there last winter. So is it cheaper to do it for the 150 people who live in the village now, or is it cheaper to do it for 300 who want to live there? That's the question I'm asking. I know you can't supply the answer today, but it's something that we have to come to grips with.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Just as my final comment in this situation, as an example of the kind of problem that we run into, John, and you and I are both familiar with this one, where the ministry has just recently approved lots for development within the town of Espanola. There's an approved development for a number of lots in McKerrow and, by the same token, the one that you and I were talking about not too long ago, where some guy comes walking in from right outside be-

yond the municipality and he wants to put in a subdivision. We agreed that this was probably not the right thing to do because there are all kinds of lots around. I know what's going to happen to me. Somebody is going to come along and say: "There's a good place to put a subdivision in" because he can sell the lots cheaper than the other guy can sell them. I can buy one for $1,000 or $2,000 cheaper down the road than I can in Espanola. So what do I do?

Mr. Lane: In that case you and I agreed that we should delay any approval there until such time as there was a need shown for it. I agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: With the cheaper lot sort of thing you can move out.

Mr. Lane: That can go on forever.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's cheaper to buy one in Moosonee than it is in Toronto.

Mr. Riddell: It seems to me the onus is being placed on this ministry. I'm not familiar with northern affairs but do they not have, up in the north, official plans and secondary plans, zoning bylaws and things like that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Not in the unorganized areas. A lot of the organized areas haven't got them either, but in the unorganized areas you really don't have them.

Mr. Martel: They have no form of government at all.

Mr. Breaugh: You spoke about this problem being a northern one, and it isn't, because in the region of Durham, as an example, the very same problem is there and the pressure is much greater. The partial solution, I think, is you need an agency in place to deal with the matter. The fact is that right now there's nothing there to deal with it, so it kind of goes as it feels like going or as it happens. It's tough stuff to do but I think that it is conceivable to develop in a planning context, over a large area of turf, and that some of the things that everybody has discussed here can be done.

You can talk about a small hamlet that has 14 or 20 houses. In the OP for Durham, they more than doubled the size of Seagrave from eight houses to 16 houses or something like that. That's conceivable. You can talk about estate properties. That's conceivable, but there are some real problems. The idea that you would allow subdivisions in small places sounds good, but you better be sure about the servicing area and whether it is a viable, economic thing to provide; what kind of service for that kind of area, because you can't put in a water and sewage treatment plant for 20 houses.

We inherited a number of small places where, for some reason or other, the local council had allowed subdivisions to go in, and it's rather disconcerting to drive out to a rural hamlet and what you see is a subdivision on septic tanks and everybody complaining that in a 40- or 50-house subdivision there's no garbage collection, there's no bus service; "We came in here on septic tanks and there was lots of water for the first two years but now we have to truck it in, and the septic tanks are backing up and the lots are too small."

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And, "the ditches are smelly."

Mr. Breaugh: That's right: "You're not paving my street and you don't plough it in the winter time." There are some judgements to be made and I think Durham is an example; at least they investigated that and I think came up with some reasonably sensible approaches to it all.

You have to start thinking about things. You want to have enough people around so that the guy running the general store can stay in business. It seems rather picayune but to the guy running the general store it's pretty important; and to the people who live in that little hamlet, it's rather important to them as well. If you look at it in context over a large piece of property it probably can be done. Whether their solutions will be ultimate solutions I don't know, but I do know that it did substantially stop the strip development idea; and boy, there were a lot of squawks about that. It can be done, in context with an official plan in place and with some serious thought as to how you service an area, and how big it can be, and some tough restrictions.

I do know that in a place like Blackstock, which had a couple of little hamlets, with one subdivision, I think, you'd really have to come up with the answer that you'd have to provide some services there, and the services that we contemplate as being sensible to put into that area will handle another 40 units but it won't handle another 80 units. So those people who are in the serviced area are fine, okay, you get to put the other 40 units in; but the guy in the next field has to be told: "No, we can't do it." He doesn't like that answer too often but it has to be done.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I know.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, let's get back to vote 2101.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Earlier, Mr. Breaugh was talking about the affirmative action programme, Mr. Chairman. We said we would bring our co-ordinator here, Judith Davidson-Palmer, to answer some questions you may have, Mr. Breaugh.

Mr. Breaugh: Ross, did you want to get in on that last one or can we proceed with this?

Mr. Hall: On what you were talking about? Yes, I've been listening to the discussions dealing with prior to the affirmative action programme. You are delineating on warning people more and more by the passage of urban service area bylaws. I'm not talking about urban area boundaries; I'm talking about urban area service bylaws, which make it quite clear that within a certain part of a municipality services will be provided and taxes will be assessable for a certain level of services.

Like Mike, I've faced for a long time the situation and the concern about people moving into areas that have a low standard of service and then gradually demanding more and more of the municipality, or of anybody else. I just can't quite get the handle on it, but it seems to me there is some opportunity in that you're specifying a particular type of service in an urban area service boundary, such as full sewers, full water, storm sewers and what have you; can't that principle be further extended to the other areas so there's no question what it is they are going to expect to get, and their demands will have to be understood to be beyond the requirements and obligations of the municipality, except under some local improvement system or something like that? Can't this be extended further than the full set of services to some delineation of services by bylaw?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm sure the municipality can pass the bylaws it wishes to pass as they relate to what they are going to service and over what period of time. That's being done now.

Mr. Hall: I don't mean that. This urban area servicing standards bylaw was primarily to establish a fairness of taxation and fairness of expectation of taxation in an area. I'm saying it seems to me that guidelines could be developed that would take it further so that it's a matter of record to purchasers what it is that they are going to get and what they are not going to get; it would be fair, at least in terms of pressures on a municipality later on to be providing things which they really have no right to ask for, if they have been forewarned that they are trading off those benefits for lower costs.

Mr. Breaugh: Although there was some squawking about one of the things we did in this area, by and large people seemed to accept it. I am talking about development in a hamlet, say, as opposed to a subdivision, where people had a lot of expectations because there were no rules. People in a little subdivision in Blackstock, say, thought they were really living in a subdivision in Oshawa, and wanted city standards, because it looked like a subdivision. But if you established what you would do in a given area, then people who wanted to live in a hamlet would know they were not going to get city services. They knew the rules of the game beforehand and accepted that, "If I'm going to live there, I'll get my house and property cheaper. But the reason I'm getting it cheaper is that I don't have any right to turn around and expect city services." That seemed to be okay. If the rules were clear and people had thought that out, that was acceptable. What wasn't acceptable was moving to a little subdivision in a hamlet that didn't have city services but, in fact, was marketed like a city subdivision.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You can do that; it takes some fortitude. It takes fortitude on the part of the politicians. I've seen a number of areas in this province where that sort of regulation came into being; they've been forewarned and what have you. That's all well and good until the area starts to develop and gets bigger and bigger and more people; suddenly they become a political bloc and they start to bring their political pressure to bear on their elected representatives. The next thing you know you've got the elected representative looking at the number of Xs that are sitting out in that particular area and he is much more understanding of their problem.

[11:30]

That's happened all over the place. I'll give you an excellent example of that right up in the northern part of my own area; and I wish the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) was here, because I'm sure he's experiencing it now. I refer to people who have moved out into a trailer park area and developed the trailer park—it was not a good trailer park, I'm the first to admit, but they moved out there. The sort of services they are demanding at that trailer park now are just not available to them and are not going to be available

to them, but they are demanding these services. They want municipal services, basically, in an area that is outside of any urban area, that is away beyond the boundaries of the municipality, in unorganized territory. They have started to make a lot of noise.

Mr. Hall: I have to get back to you on this subject because I very rarely hear you express a defeatist attitude, and to a certain extent that's what you are doing when you view it this way. We are here to recognize what goes on, and I agree with that; but beyond that, we're here to try to suggest new things that could happen. In the broad, people do accept a different standard of service wherever they live in Ontario. Certainly in northern Ontario, they know they are going to get a different shake in climate and so on. In Grimsby, I know damn well we are not going to have rapid transit, and the show might close and so on and so forth. You do accept these things to a certain extent.

I appreciate your point that it's tough for the municipality to take that position; but if you could assist the municipality, you might save a lot of bickering. If we thought about it more, even though the problem does exist, we might try to set up criteria that seemed to be fair, and fair for all municipalities not just the municipality that's got the weakest council or the strongest pressure group; that's the interest I have.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There isn't a Metro member here, so I bet that every one of you at one time or another in your political career, perhaps with the exception of Ms. Gigantes who comes from a larger community, has had somebody at one time or another in your area, say to you: "By God, if you can build a subway in Toronto, you can put a bus on my street." I have heard that time and time again. The municipality puts the bus on the street and it runs up and down that street every day, four or five times a day. There is nobody on it, but gee it is nice to look out and see that bus go by. That makes up for no subway. You know that happens.

Ms. Gigantes: That definitely hasn't been our experience.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, it isn't in Ottawa. I agree.

Mr. Martel: Surely you have to do that, as I said earlier, in your capacity as the minister responsible for the planning. We have simply got to put in place somebody who is going to consider this problem seriously for the first time; and I mean seriously. People who know the north, who know the problems of the north and who are going to have to grapple with them. If we don't, 10 years from now we could both still be sitting here—in reverse roles of course.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Do you think it will take you that long?

Mr. Martel: Oh, no; I will have had 10 years' experience by then.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am sure it will take you that long.

Mr. Martel: If we ever get the power, you will never get back.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't want power, I want responsibility.

Mr. Martel: Is that right? One doesn't come without the other.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's the difference between us. You are always looking for power.

Mr. Martel: Surely we just can't sit on it, because 10 years from now we could be here discussing the same issue.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Perhaps we will be, in the same roles. I would hope I am not still the Minister of Housing, really.

Mr. Martel: We might give you the job of co-ordinating the development of housing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: All right. I am probably going to say something that will warm the cockles of the hearts of some of my staff. If you want to apply this sort of thing you are talking about in northern Ontario, particularly in the unorganized areas where the most concern is, if we want to do that, then it is going to have to be done, I suggest, with some very firm planning commitment. We are going to have to allow municipalities that are existing of various sizes to expand and grow to make it easier for people to live in those municipalities; people who do not necessarily want to go and start developing down the road a piece, but to live in those municipalities. In order to encourage that, we are going to have to severely restrict the haphazard development that has been taking place throughout those areas and which we are all experiencing.

If you have any area in the north at all that's the only way you are going to do it. It isn't going to be done by persuasion, it isn't going to be done by pleading; it's going

to have to be done by firm, hard policies, backed up by strong legislation and enforcement.

Mr. Martel: And strong planning.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Oh yes. That's what I said at the very beginning. You have to have your basic planning in place first; and once you've done that, you must then live by those rules.

Mr. Martel: We've done it in reverse, though. We brought in freezes and we didn't have the planning.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: All right, that's a fair criticism.

Mr. Martel: We could do it in reverse; and I think people in the north will appreciate it once it starts to take shape.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What you really are saying to me is you want to see some affirmative action. On that note, I would like to turn back to the affirmative action.

Mr. Martel: You mean, let Mrs. Davidson-Palmer head it up?

Mr. Breaugh: I want to know what you do when you identify a promotable female employee? I would also ask the other question: do you also identify non-promotable female employees?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: Basically, what we did was request our management to interview all female employees. They assessed their current level of performance and the kind of career pathing they saw them undertaking, and so on. They identified women who were under-utilized, they identified women with supervisory potential, they identified women with senior management potential; and then they outlined various steps that could be taken—whether it was job-enrichment, whether it was trying to identify a bridging job, and so on.

Basically, if you are looking in terms of priorities from my point of view in handling this inventory, I am interested in women who are promotable at the present time. It's the manager's responsibility to develop those other employees as well though. So, we have identified promotable women, and we have moved quite a few of these promotable women.

Mr. Breaugh: May I ask how you identified these women?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: The same way a manager would identify, I guess, the career development of any employee. That's basically through a form of performance evaluation. It's done in consultation with the employee; it's not done in a void or a vacuum, the employee discusses this.

Mr. Breaugh: Testing, interviews; what?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: No, it's basically just an interview.

Mr. Breaugh: Gee I'd hate to be one of the losers on that. Would you tell me what career path assessment is?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: Career path? Basically, this is a problem for women in the office services categories in particular, as to where they go from here. What are the career options they have, given their background and the position that they're in right now; where could they conceivably go, either within the branch or within the ministry as a whole, or within the government. So the manager, to the extent that he or she is able, tries to identify what's available within a branch. If they require counselling beyond that then I may be involved, or else the people at the Civil Service Commission would be involved.

Mr. Breaugh: What do you think is the most serious problem you still face in terms of job promotion? Obviously, if you have identified a group of female employees who are promotable and you have career-pathed their assessment, or whatever it is you do. What's the problem now, because they don't seem to be getting the jobs?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: I don't know that they are not getting the jobs. In the recent interviews we did for management trainee positions, for example, the overwhelming majority of successful candidates in the Metro area were, in fact, women, We've moved women—actually we have the first arboriculturist in government, the first female arboriculturist.

Mr. Breaugh: Oh, my God, what is that?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: She takes care of landscaping and so on.

Mr. Breaugh: Oh; I feel much better about it now.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: We also have senior financial officers, economists and so on; women have moved into these positions. So in fact they are moving; it's a slow process, but they are moving. I think the biggest problem, getting back to your original question,

is that perhaps constraints are a fairly major problem in this area as far as senior positions are concerned; because there simply aren't that many and they are highly contested the ones that are available.

Mr. Breaugh: What specific things are you doing in terms of—you use the term here training and development initiatives; what does that mean? What do you do?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: This is done in consultation and through our personnel branch, through the staff training and development section of that branch. The manager would identify a training need for a particular employee. They would look into what's available in terms of courses or seminars or whatever, or whether it may be job enrichment, or it may be some kind of apprenticeship thing within the branch or within a comparable type of branch where the employee can pick up that type of experience.

In addition to that, we've run quite a number of career development workshops which were general workshops for women in the office services area. We also evaluated those workshops; and in point of fact a fairly sizable proportion of those women actually made career moves after the workshop, they were motivated to do so and got their managers to help them do so.

Mr. Breaugh: Could you be a little more specific on what you mean by initiatives? Do you provide funds?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: The ministry provides funds for staff training, yes.

Mr. Breaugh: Is that all in-house staff training, like the kind of workshops and seminars that you run? Or would that include things like university upgrading?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: It does.

Mr. Breaugh: And they are compensated for that?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: They are.

Mr. Breaugh: Do you deal with simple little things like who looks after the kids while she does this?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: We don't deal with simple little things like that, in the sense that if you're asking whether or not there is remuneration there is not. However, if an employee was encountering problems in this area, I also do counselling and would be available to try to assist them, but we haven't had any requests of this nature.

Mr. Breaugh: You haven't had any?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: No.

Mr. Breaugh: Okay. The final point is, you've got a little thing in here that you do salary reviews. Are you satisfied that women working in the ministry are being paid on an adequate scale, for starters; and are their salaries at least commensurate with male employees doing the same kind of job?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: In a number of these areas, recommendations were to be taken up by the women themselves, and in actual fact no women have asked for salary reviews and no women have asked for classification reviews. On the other hand, there have been a number of managers who have recognized some part of inequality between their male and female employees and the managers have initiated the salary changes and have upgraded some female employees because of this.

As to whether or not women are equitably paid, I would hope that this is the case, but from time to time cases emerge where there is a discrepancy and it's up to us to identify these and to rectify them.

Mr. Breaugh: You're almost making the case then that all of those great reports that I read about women's salaries being less than what a man is getting in the same job are wrong.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: No; this is getting perhaps aside a bit, but I think there's a problem with the equal pay legislation, in terms that under equal pay legislation you have to be performing the same work as a man in the same area and it's got to be substantially the same set of criteria, on each criterion. This makes it extremely difficult to identify where this is, in fact, occurring and it doesn't cover women who are in female job ghettos. This is why, on the question about the overall salary differential, I don't think that affirmative action will have that much of an impact on overall salary differentials in the short term, because of this ghettoization of women right now.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Can I just make the point that in the ministry, to the best of my knowledge, regardless of what sex the individual is who fills a particular position, the pay scale is exactly the same, there is no difference. A director who is female or male is paid a director's salary, a planner is paid as a planner whether male, female or—I suppose that's about the total of our complement at the present time, until the bill passes.

Mr. Breaugh: The minister seems quite generally satisfied that the programme has been successful and that while you may not have substantively moved a number of female employees into their rightful place in the ministry they will get there probably as soon as they acquire sufficient skills or experience to hold whatever their job potential might bear out. Are you concurrent with that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If she doesn't agree with me, now's a good chance to say so.

Mr. Breaugh: That's the opportunity I'm trying to give.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: She likes working here.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: Yes, I'm enjoying my job.

Mr. Breaugh: Everything's temporary, don't worry.

[11:45]

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: I think there are other problems, too, in that as I say, with the constraints sometimes there aren't women available within the government at the present time who could, in fact, hold certain positions. Therefore you don't get them applying for the positions. It would be helpful if you were able to have some sort of outreach in terms of preferential hiring for specified positions.

I think generally women are moving up. Our biggest concern at the moment perhaps is the kind of organizational change that will ensure that they do get the opportunity to fulfil their potential and whatever additional needs we may have.

Mr. Breaugh: Let me put to you a very serious problem that I have. I keep reading the reports about women not being paid enough, not being given the job opportunities and having a number of difficulties in going through the kind of career system you might have outlined here. A number of those people who've brought their cases to me seem to have an extremely legitimate case. Then I listen to the minister tell me about his affirmative action plan. It sounds very good, except I never see the numbers at the bottom end that really substantiate that the thing is doing anything for anybody, except for a very small group of people.

Then I talk to someone like you who really is given that job, as women's employees programme co-ordinator I believe, and I don't hear very much concrete out of you except that you're working in a number of areas and you're aware of problems and are taking some steps. But nobody is really telling me; I have only these massive reports about salaries and job opportunities saying that things are bad. On the other hand, I have this good public relations programme saying we're trying to do good things. In the middle is someone trying to put those two together, and I'm having some difficulty ascertaining which side of the coin has the more validity on it.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: I think I'm saying that in terms of salary, salary is a macro-measure. You're not going to have any significant impact on salaries with just affirmative action for quite some time. Whether or not affirmative action is the correct strategy to impact on salary, I have reservations about that. In terms of women actually moving I think we have evidence that women are actually moving; that they're moving into positions they have never held before, that they're moving from, say, clerk typist positions which we had recently, into management trainee positions, which is a reasonable jump in government terms.

There is still a problem in terms of whether or not women are equally represented in all levels of government, there's no question about that. I think the problem is that it is a historical problem and it's going to take some time to change, but I think that it is changing.

Ms. Gigantes: The principle behind all of the process you describe is that the onus is on management to find and develop women with capabilities within their own staff or within the ministry. There's no negative effect if management doesn't do that and there's no positive reward if management does do it.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: Just this year we're initiating a move to MBR, so that each manager is presently filing a plan whereby at the end of the coming fiscal year we'll be able to evaluate whether or not they have in fact reached the goals they've identified.

The kind of negative reinforcement that you're talking about will come when Mr. Crosbie has to appear before Management Board to defend whether or not we have in fact reached the goals we've stated that we will reach. You're quite right that in the past it's been kind of a situation where you wanted to do this then you did it, but we tried to persuade you as best we could.

Ms. Gigantes: I can understand how this would put pressure on Mr. Crosbie, but does

it put pressure on anybody down the line? That's where the real problem is, where the woman who goes to apply for the upgrading course is told no, it's not reasonable for her.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: We put pressure on people as well, because women do come to us and report whether or not they have difficulty. If they have difficulty in a situation like that then I would immediately go to the manager or director.

Ms. Gigantes: I wonder if the woman even knows that the upgrading course exists; very often that's the case.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: That's another aspect which we've attempted to deal with, that is information dissemination. We send around monthly packages to a women's committee that we have—60 members—and they distribute these to all the women in their branch. I think there would be an increasing awareness. There certainly has been criticism of this in the past, that they have not been receiving information. This is one of the areas we have attempted to deal with.

Ms. Gigantes: Even when they receive the information they may not think it applies to them unless someone specifically says: "You're a group of women in my section and I want you to know that this course is open for women in particular." How do you get a manager to do that kind of thing?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: There again it's a kind of educational process with the manager that we go through. When they're interviewing the employees they're given an interview form they use and it specifically says on it, "What types of staff training does this individual require consistent with their career goals," and so on. So they're taught to think along this line. Also, Mr. Crosbie has issued a policy which says that staff training and development is intended to not only further or make more effective the people's performance in their present job, but also to develop them for both the ministry and the government. This is essential, because if you do it with women and all you can get into is improving their typing and shorthand skills, this leads them nowhere if they don't particularly want to stay in that field. So this policy enables them to take any course they may so choose. This has been shown in our statistics as well, in terms of university upgrading and also management supervisory programmes.

Ms. Gigantes: It seems to me that it must be possible to make it a requirement of line managers that they show they put some effort into informing their women of what's available and that it is particularly available for encouraging women.

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: As I said, I think we're trying to do this. How successful we are will depend on how many women do in fact take these programmes, and so far something like 56 per cent of women are on training programmes during the year.

Mr. Breaugh: I'm assuming that all female employees have gone through this process that's outlined here and that we've discussed. Is that true?

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: It's basically true except for short-term contracts. We're not in a position to discuss promotional decisions with these people because we just don't have the opportunity of providing this avenue for them.

Mr. Breaugh: But permanent staff—

Mrs. Davidson-Palmer: If you're talking about civil servants, Crown employees, yes.

Mr. Breaugh: Okay, that's fine.

Mr. Chairman: Any more questions?

Ms. Gigantes: Does it have to be on this specific vote?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it does. Mr. Eaton is next, and then you're next after that.

Mr. Eaton: The area I wanted to get into, and I assume it comes here, generally, under administration, is the Niagara Escarpment Commission. Does that apply here? Okay.

First of all, before I get into some specific questions, I want to kind of understand the relationship between the ministry and the Niagara Escarpment Commission. What controls do you have over it? All I sort of see here is chief hearing officer, Niagara Escarpment development control. Could you just give me an outline of your ministry's role with the Escarpment and what control you have over it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We don't have any control over it. Just to quickly go through the procedure, the commission itself is charged with the responsibility of producing the Niagara Escarpment plan. As a result of the legislation, any development permits that are to be issued must be approved by the Niagara Escarpment Commission. The commission deals with applications. If the person who applies is not satisfied with the decision of the commission then they can appeal. That

appeal goes to a hearing officer; the hearing officer holds the hearing, assesses the evidence, makes a decision and then forwards that decision to me. That's where my ministry gets involved, with either upholding or supporting the hearing officer's decision or overturning it. The only involvement of this ministry is really with those matters which are appealed on decisions made by the Niagara Escarpment Commission.

Mr. Eaton: There's no input at the point of decision on any planning, from your planning staff?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, there is not. The Niagara Escarpment Commission itself is now within the jurisdiction, if you will, or the supervision, or whatever word you like, of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle). TEIGA is not involved. It left TEIGA and went right directly to the resources development policy field.

Mr. Eaton: Okay. If an applicant is turned down by the commission, he appeals to you. Do I understand that he only has 20—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, excuse me. He doesn't appeal to me, he appeals to the hearing officer.

Mr. Eaton: The hearing officer? Do I understand correctly that he only has 14 days in which to appeal a decision that's made by the commission at any time?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's right.

Mr. Eaton: That's a rather short period of time—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's right.

Mr. Eaton: —given problems that we have. I understand that some people have been turned down because their appeals didn't arrive on time.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's correct.

Mr. Eaton: Is there any proposed change to this to give them a little more opportunity to get their appeal in?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I'm proposing 21 days.

Mr. Eaton: Twenty-one days.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Fourteen days isn't long enough, especially when you have to depend upon Canada Post. I'm not sure 21 days is enough; it should almost be an open-ended appeal.

Mr. Eaton: Can you tell me how many persons have appealed and had their decisions turned back because they didn't get there in time?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I'll get some numbers for you, I thought you might ask. Have you got them with you, Milt? If you haven't got them with you, you had better remember them. How many persons have appealed and been turned down—or upheld?

Mr. Eaton: How many didn't have the opportunity to carry their appeal out because they didn't get it in on time?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I can't give you that; I don't think we've got that. Two or three is, I think, about the extent of it.

Mr. Eaton: Two or three?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes.

Mr. Eaton: How many have appealed the decisions of the Niagara Escarpment Commission?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: About 195 appeals in 1976.

Mr. Eaton: How many were rejected?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How many of the appeals were objected to?

Mr. Eaton: Rejected.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Farrow had better explain his own writing. I can't read it.

Mr. Farrow: The figures we have here are the number of cases where the minister has overturned the decision of the hearing officer —very few times. It comes out to just over seven per cent; less than eight per cent of the time.

Mr. Eaton: One hundred and ninety five?

Mr. Farrow: There were 195 appeals heard by the hearing officer and sent to the minister with a recommendation. The minister accepted 181 of those recommendations, and with only 14 of them did he not concur.

Mr. Eaton: If he concurs with the hearing officer's decision, does he have any further course of appeal on that? Can it be appealed to cabinet, like a decision of OMB?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No.

Mr. Eaton: It can't be. So at that point—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Some of them are going to the Ombudsman.

Mr. Eaton: Some of them are, eh?

Mr. Martel: A friend of yours, a good friend of yours.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Arthur Maloney and I are good friends, yes.

Mr. Ferrier: Do you have lunch with him at La Scala at all?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, it's usually in a private room at the Westbury, at his expense.

Mr. Eaton: This is basically a development control method. Do you have any thoughts on the process? Do you feel it's working fairly for the people which have land out there, who may find that they have land which they've paid for but can't do anything with? They own it, and that's it; they're sitting on a vacant piece of land.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I missed the first part.

Mr. Eaton: Do you feel that it's working fairly—that is the development control of this method?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As fair as development control can work. If you're going to control development it's like any other war, there are some casualities. In this particular case, you're trying to develop a plan for the area so you're going to have controls. People are going to have to wait until that plan is completed, and it may well be that once the plan is completed some of the land on which development has not been allowed will then come open and be available for development; but on the other hand I don't think there's any question that once the Niagara Escarpment plan is completed there will be land on which development will not be allowed.

Mr. Eaton: Is there any thought on the part of the commission or the ministry to the position of the person who has purchased a piece of land? They paid a price for it and now, through this development control of the commission, they can do absolutely nothing with it; it's going to sit there and be a vacant piece of land. Is there any consideration being given to the purchase or takeover of this property, with compensation for the price paid?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, I don't think so. I don't think, Bob, that there's any difference between what is being done with the Niagara Escarpment Commission's plan and approach than there is with any other zoning bylaw in any municapility. If the zoning bylaw is passed, certainly a person's land can be down-zoned as a result of a decision of a municipal council, which may well be approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. Obviously, if you have a piece of land that has been zoned for high-rise development and suddenly it becomes parkland, somebody has lost some money. It can happen.

Basically, it is the same thing here: The idea of the Niagara Escarpment Commission was to preserve the Niagara Escarpment; and the preservation of the Escarpment will mean there will be areas in which there will be no development.

[12:00]

Mr. Eaton: And you support the idea they shouldn't have any compensation if that happens to their property because of decisions by the commission?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think there are going to be areas where there will be no compensation for the fact that the land will not be able to be developed.

Mr. Eaton: Do you support that idea?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I guess I have to.

Ms. Gigantes: You are not in favour of land speculation insurance?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am not even familiar with it. Are you proposing it become a government-run plan?

Ms. Gigantes: I think that is what the proposal is.

Mr. Eaton: No. That is not what I am talking about.

Mr. Breaugh: We were going to sell you a policy.

Mr. Eaton: Say you are not a land speculator but you've purchased a lot to put your house on, and suddenly you can't build there because the commission has come along. That's not speculation.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think it is fair to say at this time, though, that of the applications that have been made in 1976 for development permits, 87 per cent of them were approved.

Mr. Eaton: They were?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: So we don't have a great horde of people out there who are being abused. And some of the areas—

Mr. Eaton: The ones that haven't got permits certainly feel they are caught in it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I know. If you happen to be the one person who didn't make it, to you it's a 100 per cent turndown. I agree.

Mr. Eaton: Right. I think that's pretty well it for me on that field, Mr. Chairman. I think I've got the minister's feelings on it and I'm satisfied where you stand on it, at this point anyway.

Mr. Chairman: Does anyone else want to talk about the Niagara Escarpment?

Mr. Riddell: A frequent complaint about the Niagara Escarpment area is that there is too much land on either side. Do you agree with this?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I think it is much too broad. I don't think they should ever have put that much land into the Niagara Escarpment Commission control area. I am hoping that, when the plan eventually develops, we will find an awful lot of that area will not be limited for development, that they will really bring their boundaries in to a more adequate size.

Mr. Martel: You just want the slant of the hill.

Mr. Breaugh: Two feet at the bottom.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, but I think that even you, my friends in the New Democratic Party, should go and look at what the Niagara Escarpment area is. I don't know why the boundaries go out into the lake, for example. If you want to go out there and flounder around for a while, pick a deep spot—

Mr. Martel: Who'll save you?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I swim good.

No, I think there was a much larger area than was really required. They are into areas that aren't even near the Escarpment, that really didn't have to be in, but they're there.

Mr. Martel: Our problem is we couldn't charter a plane to fly over it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Couldn't you?

Mr. Martel: No.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Is there some reason for that?

Mr. Martel: Yes. The Premier (Mr. Davis).

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The Premier wouldn't give you a plane?

Mr. Martel: That's right. You could arrange it and we'll go with you and take a look at it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I thought you wanted to charter one.

Mr. Martel: You charter it; I'll go with you.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Oh, I don't charter—

Mr. Martel: You've seen it already.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I walked over it.

Mr. Martel: You walked over it? That's why you were missing all last year.

Hon. Mr. Rhodoes: I didn't miss the whole of last session.

Mr. Ferrier: You don't have the same pull as Lorne Henderson had when he was chairman of the drainage committee.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't even have the pull of the guys who were members of that committee.

Mr. Riddell: I sense that the New Democrats feel there is not enough land within the Niagara Escarpment area, but the NDP are going to find out what the people of Ontario think about this land freeze after we get the results of the election in Middlesex.

Mr. Chairman: Is that the end of your comments?

Mr. Riddell: They'll find out what this land freeze means.

Ms. Gigantes: I have three areas of general policy that I would like to ask the minister about. I'll start with the area of low-income housing. In particular, to try to focus the discussion on it, I wonder if the minister could explain why he has put the onus on the private market to produce apartments with a $600-a-unit subsidy for developers, when there is no guarantee that that private market will be developed to meet the real rental needs of people who are not finding the affordable housing in Ontario. And why hasn't this money gone instead into municipal initiatives in the non-profit area, for example?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think we are putting money into the non-profit areas. In discussions yesterday we talked about this. We are putting money in and experiencing, I think, reasonable success in the non-profit—in the

co-op housing, in the community integrated programmes. They are going ahead. I think every day I am approving funding for projects of this sort throughout the province in various areas. So that programme is going ahead.

Ms. Gigantes: It is going ahead, but it is not going ahead at a rate that would meet the need that we know exists.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Nobody is going to reach 100 per cent, and I am sure I am not going to go as fast as you want me to go, but I probably won't anyway.

Ms. Gigantes: That is why I wonder why the money is going into an area where the onus has to be on private development with no guarantee of the level of income that will be met—the needs of the low-income or middle-low-income groups.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The thing that you have to recognize, and I think you do, is that the programme that we announced, as it related to the $600 per unit for the development of rental accommodation, is not the only programme that is going on. There are still the co-op housing projects, the community integrated programmes, the non-profit—there are still the private assisted rental programmes that are going on. There are still developments by Ontario Housing that will be going on.

Ms. Gigantes: But you are proposing to put as much money into that subsidy in the private market, which may not at all meet the needs of the low-income renter or low-middle-income renter. You are proposing to put as much money into that programme as you are putting into the co-op housing programme.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There is more than one market to be met.

Ms. Gigantes: Why put money in meeting the rich market? Surely the high-income market can look after itself. And there are no controls on that rental programme subsidy in terms of the kinds of housing that is getting provided.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That is wrong. You know that is wrong.

Ms. Gigantes: No, I don't.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There is a maximum amount of return that any participant in that particular programme can get on their investment. A maximum amount. And that is what will establish the rents. With the greatest of respect, I am not too sure that you are totally familiar with that programme. There is a maximum amount of return on that investment. So that in effect is a form of control on the amount of rent that can be charged for those units.

Ms. Gigantes: It seems to me you would be much more directly meeting the need that eixsts if you put money into municipal target programmes to meet what in some municipalities has been identified as a real need.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think we are meeting most of the requests from municipalities that we get for the development of housing projects. We frankly aren't getting that many from them, because they don't want them.

Ms. Gigantes: That is what I would like to ask you about. Another question: It seems to me that the ministry has left it up to municipalities to initiate requests, when in fact the ministry should be demanding of municipalities that it set targets for the development of housing that is going to meet the needs of low-income people and low-middle-income people. I know that in the city of Ottawa, for example, those targets are being set. We happen to have a particularly progressive municipal council in Ottawa. But it seems to me that first of all a progressive municipal council such as Ottawa should have a clearer idea about the kind of funding that will be available for this year when it establishes some reasonable targets for the next year; some very minimal targets for meeting its low-income, middle-income housing needs.

Second, why is the ministry not insisting that every municipality develop these kinds of targets? I suppose one follows pretty well from the other, because you can't expect municipalities to come forward to do all the study and to do all the planning that is going to be required to establish reasonable targets for the next few years when there is really no assurance on the part of the ministry that there is going to be a commitment of funds that will be adequate to allow a municipality to go ahead and do the development.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We have said to municipalities, if you will tell us what you think your needs are—we have the housing needs studies that they have been carrying out, and they have been making available to us as to what they see our needs to be in all forms of housing. We have asked them to take the broad spectrum, not simply into just public housing. I wish I could find a better word

for it, but in that assisted housing we have asked them to produce these reports and this information for us and many of them have done so.

I think we have probably covered at least 70 per cent of the population of this province. The municipalities that are involved have advised us what they see as their needs. We have asked them to let us know how they want to meet those needs and how they would like to see this development take place, and we have indicated to them we will have the financial resources available to assist them in their programmes.

What we have done is give them some options, which the municipalities have been crying for as long as I can remember. They have always objected, to the best of my knowledge, and I was part of those objectors at one time, to having Ontario Housing Corporation come in and impose their will upon our municipality.

The municipalities have said: "Let us be a part of this process of determining what's going to happen in our community." I think we are doing that now in a much broader scale by saying to them: "Tell us what your needs are, tell us what your development plans are, and then tell us in which particular area you want us to participate. Do you want us to carry on and go in and do the actual construction of these units? Do you want to do it yourself and we will provide the funding for you? Do you want to do it through the private assisted rental programme? Whichever one you want to do, you pick out which one it is and we will go ahead and co-operate with you in doing it."

I don't know how much more we can do to co-operate and allow the municipalities to make their own decisions which, it seems to me, is what you are saying we should let them do.

Ms. Gigantes: No, I am not saying that. I will give you a very clear example I happen to know about from the Ottawa area. The city of Ottawa has made a real effort for many years to meet the need for low-income housing, in whatever form, and the outside municipalities within the Ottawa-Carleton region—and I represent one of those municipalities, the municipality of the township of Gloucester—have really made no effort.

What is there in this ministry programme that, first of all, will allow Ottawa going ahead with its plans, setting its targets for 1978, looking for a commitment from the ministry for funding, to feel encouraged and supported in its efforts, having established pretty realistic targets? What is there in the ministry programme that is going to say to a township like Gloucester: "You are just failing your social responsibility. You know there are people in the township of Gloucester who need low-income housing and you are doing nothing through our ministry programmes. You are not taking advantage of any of our major ministry programmes to make sure that gets done"?

When we allow a township or developers to pretend to meet a need in low-income housing by going ahead with developments under one of your schemes that mean you have to build four times as many houses to get a certain number, 25 per cent low-income housing component—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Excuse me.

Ms. Gigantes: —we are not meeting the real needs.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You feel the 25 per cent will be too low? The 25 per cent component is not high enough?

Ms. Gigantes: Well, if you have to build 100 houses or 100 units of dwelling space in order to get 25 low-income houses, that's a very inefficient way of getting low-income houses.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Do I understand you to say that I should be saying to them: "Build 100 low-income houses and that's fine," and not have the 25 per cent sort of limitation?

Ms. Gigantes: I would just like to know what you consider the responsibility of the ministry is to see a township like Gloucester township take on its social responsibilities to provide low-income housing, because it hasn't done that, there is no indication that it will and I don't think your ministry is making any dent in convincing it that it should.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Assuming that I can't convince them, what's my next step?

Ms. Gigantes: I think you probably have an awful lot of persuasive tools at your disposal.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Such as the carrot and the stick sort of thing—if you do this you get this; if you don't do it, you won't get it?

Ms. Gigantes: Right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: May I strongly suggest that some time this afternoon you sit down and have a discussion with Mr. Breaugh?

Mr. Breaugh: There is no disagreement.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You better read back what you said yesterday and today, because it is not in keeping with what Ms. Gigantes is saying now.

Mr. Breaugh: Of course it is.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It is not. With respect—

Mr. Breaugh: You and Mr. Riddell should get together. I think you have the same intent firmly planted in the ground.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Frankly, you are confusing me as to what direction you want me to go.

Mr. Breaugh: Well, that's so easy to do.

[12:15]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On one hand you are telling me that the wrong type of housing was being built in the Oshawa area because I was asking for 25 per cent. Now, Ms. Gigantes comes and tells me the wrong type of housing is not being built in Gloucester township because I am not asking for more than the 25 per cent. If those are not diametrically opposed positions you are placing before me, I don't know what is.

Ms. Gigantes: It depends, I am sure, on the particular situation, but I am also sure that the people who are concerned with planning for low-income housing in the city of Ottawa can give you a long list of the number of applications they get every day from people in the township of Gloucester who have absolutely no hope of getting into city of Ottawa subsidized housing and for whom there are no alternatives in the township of Gloucester. The same is true of Nepean.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We can probably make this very simple. I have no intention of forcing municipalities to build any particular type of housing. I will use what persuasive things I can do, but I will not force the municipalities. I will not force the township of Gloucester to build any particular type of housing.

Ms. Gigantes: For hundreds of people whom I am called upon to represent, that means there is no housing they can deal with in terms of their family budgets.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Ms. Gigantes, I am assuming the elected council of the township of Gloucester is in a position to understand what the people of the township want. I am not going to impose my will or your will upon them. They are duly elected and have their responsibilities delineated to them by the people who have elected them, just as much as you and I have. I will not impose my will upon them.

Ms. Gigantes: Very well. The second area I would like to raise with you, in terms of general policy, is the attitude now of the Ontario Housing Corporation toward renegotiating the rent scale and the position your ministry will be taking in dealing with people who have been evicted from public housing and who now have to seek redress through the Ombudsman because of the rent rebate weight that they have had to carry.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: To the best of my knowledge, no one has been evicted from OHC housing for failing to pay arrears that were incurred as a result of the rent review change.

Ms. Gigantes: I will bring the cases to you.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It would be appreciated if you would do that. I would like to know about that.

Mr. Eaton: Bring them into the committee.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Make sure though that you aren't talking about someone who was perhaps nine or 10 months in arrears prior to, and over and above, any of the amounts that might be involved.

Ms. Gigantes: I am sure of that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Well, make sure. I would be very happy to see those particular items and if they are what you say they are, perhaps we can rectify that problem. But don't bring me someone with a history of non-payment of rent that goes back for a number of years and try to pluck the strings of the harp, because I am very familiar with many of those particular cases. I will be pleased to see them if you have them.

Ms. Gigantes: I will also bring you the names of people in their early 60s who came to my office in tears because they had never received such insulting notices as the notices they got demanding the rebates, who felt as if they were being accused of having robbed the Ottawa Housing Authority.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Ah. Let me ask you, are these OHC tenants or tenants of the Ottawa Housing Authority?

Ms. Gigantes: They're Ottawa Housing Authority tenants.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: All right. They're not OHC tenants.

Ms. Gigantes: We're going to have that kind of problem as long as you don't insist that the local housing authorities have tenant representation on them. We are just not getting that, in spite of all the promises we heard from you a year ago on this subject. We are just not getting tenant representatives on those authorities. The authorities are meeting in secret; there is just no facility for tenants' associations to exercise any positive input to the administration of those local housing authorities. That is, in my mind, a really negative policy on the part of the Ministry of Housing of Ontario. If the Minister of Housing simply required of each local housing authority that there be tenant representation on those authorities, we wouldn't get old people breaking down and crying in my office. That's unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If someone has received that type of notice I don't necessarily agree that they should be receiving an insulting or that type of notice. I would hope that that wouldn't happen.

Ms. Gigantes: It will continue to happen as long as there is no ability of tenants' associations to have—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't buy that.

Ms. Gigantes: —positive input into the administration of local housing authorities.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I have said before, and I will say again, that I am prepared to see tenants appointed to housing authorities. I'm not going to make it a requirement—

Ms. Gigantes: You're making a mistake.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's your opinion and I think you're making a mistake in suggesting that there should be a tenant on every housing authority just because he's a tenant.

Ms. Gigantes: Not one, several.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Ms. Gigantes, we have a great disagreement in that area. I think if a tenant can be appointed to the housing authority, the fact he's a tenant should not bar him from being a member but the fact that he's a tenant should not mean he's automatically eligible to be a member, no—any more than I think every housing authority should have a lawyer or have a doctor or have an engineer. No.

Ms. Gigantes: Doctors, lawyers and engineers, I'd agree with you. As long as you pursue your hand-off policy you're going to have confrontation between tenants and local housing authorities which is unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And which, I point out to you very vividly, is not as great as you would like to have everyone believe it is. There is not the confrontation that you suggest there is. It just doesn't occur. There are many housing authorities in this province that get along extremely well with their tenants—where the tenants are quite content with the way the projects are being managed.

I have sent letters to every housing authority suggesting to them we should have open meetings. I have received letters back from most of them at which time they have said, "Our meetings, for all intents and purposes, are open."

Ms. Gigantes: That may be true.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No one attends.

Ms. Gigantes: Especially in smaller communities. You probably are correct.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You have a tenant representative in Ottawa on the OHC.

Ms. Gigantes: That tenants' representative, when she was appointed, was told specifically that she was not there as a tenants' representative—that she had no right to report back to the tenants' association of which she had been an executive member on the discussions that she was taking part in, in a closed meeting in the Ottawa Housing Authority. She, herself, has expressed publicly to the municipal council, to her own association and to everybody else who wants to listen, her real dissatisfaction with the position she's been put in. She supports a proposal that has come out of—perhaps she feels she has more to contribute as a tenant and as an ex-member of the executive of the Public Housing Tenants' Council in Ottawa, than the lawyers, engineers or whoever, doctors, who are on that housing authority.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I just do not accept the criticism that there's great confrontation between the housing authorities and the tenants. If that was so, then I think I'd be snowed under with the sort of thing you're talking about. The only time, frankly, that I hear about it is from yourself and from Mr. Cassidy. Ottawa must be an atrocious place, because that's where it seems all the problems are.

Ms. Gigantes: Ottawa is a great place. Ottawa has a very progressive municipal

government. It also has, I think, the best public housing tenants' council of any area in the province of Ontario. One of the reasons you don't hear from them is that they've given up on you, Mr. Minister, to a large extent.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They have, eh? That's fine.

Ms. Gigantes: Yes, they have. I think I've got the answers to the policy questions involved there.

One thing you didn't answer was the intent of OHC to renegotiate the rent scales. What is the current position on that?

Mr. Riggs: Senior officials of OHC, headed by Mr. Beesley have had a number of meetings with FOTA. We also wrote to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, indicating to them some of the changes that we had suggested and which were also similiar to FOTA but not to the extent that FOTA had requested from us. The reply that we received from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, was that they would not allow —at this time—any changes in the scale which would increase the subsidy. We've advised FOTA of that, and have indicated to them that we are prepared to take back to the provincial government and the federal government any changes in the scale that FOTA are prepared to recommend within the limits of our present subsidy in the province of Ontario. I believe negotiations are still under way to try to eliminate some of the inequities, some of the problems with inflation in terms of the reductions from income, which are $900 for a working wife and things of that nature—

Ms. Gigantes: I'm sorry, I missed that last—

Mr. Riggs: Some of the reductions from gross income, which is a $900 reduction off gross income for a working wife. This was one of the features that came about in the 1970 revisions from Mr. Andras. We believe there should be some changes in the scale, certainly to reflect some of the inflationary factors on those reductions; and we're prepared to make those recommendations if we can reach agreement with FOTA on those changes, taking into consideration there has to be some give and take. It can't all be an increase in the reductions—or the exemptions —without having some offset to insure that the subsidy doesn't increase above this year's maximum, which is about $200 million.

Within that framework, I believe that Mr. Beesley and the president of FOTA are attempting to work out some compromises.

Ms. Gigantes: What does that mean in real terms? Are you talking about hydro payments—or what are you talking about?

Mr. Riggs: Hydro payments are an area that is being looked at by both parties. In most buildings, the hydro payment is covered within the rent scale and, as you undoubtedly know, we have a series of rent scales which we're trying to streamline. Some persons who live in single houses, semi-detached, pay their own fuel bills; we're looking at the amount of reduction from the scale that is an offset against what they actually pay. And yes, that's an area which we'd like to resolve as quickly as possible with FOTA so that we can bring forth the recommendations to CMHC and to the provincial government.

Ms. Gigantes: When do you—

Mr. Riggs: I think that decision rests as much with FOTA now as it rests with Mr. Beesley and his senior staff. So long as we're working within the present subsidy, we are prepared to see if we can find offsets against the changes which are being recommended. These are not major changes, because any major change—that is, going down to 15 per cent of adjusted gross income, which was one of the recommendations from FOTA—would almost double our subsidy. If that's the kind of approach that's necessary, the time element will be very long.

Talking about fuel costs, if we're talking about changes to reflect inflation on adjustments in what they call gross income, I think those items can probably be resolved with CMHC within a short period of time. But it's another thing if we're talking about a fundamental change in that scale, or if we're talking about a fundamental change in the percentage of rent to income. To give you an example, the city of Ottawa—and this is a problem that's been going on in Ottawa for five years—has a number of limited-dividend senior citizen housing projects.

As recent as last week, recognizing that the relationship of income to rent at 25 per cent for certain parts of our society is maybe low if you include heat, light and everything else, they've raised their scale to, I think, 30 per cent for the senior citizens in order to overcome a problem that has been developing in that city for five years, in terms of a deficit that is resulting in those units.

We think we can still live within our present scale, and we would hope that FOTA

and Mr. Beesley, the manager of Ontario Housing Corporation, can reach a number of decisions relating to those items that I think are of most concern to those who have to pay their own heat, a working wife or a mother-led family. The great proportion are not as much concerned about the percentage of rent to income, particularly if they are in assisted housing, as they are about those items you have identified a few moments ago.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, but that's the end of the time for today. We meet tomorrow after orders of the day.

The committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

HOUSE ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	
22	924	1	14	**After line 14 insert:** For 1975 the number of acres requiring regeneration on Crown and patent lands was 240,000 acres; however, only 175,000 acres were regenerated. Again, 65,000 left unreforested.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 28, 1977

Ministry administration programme R-43

Adjournment R-85

Erratum: Correction to No. 22 House debates R-85

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Johnson, J.; Chairman (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.; Minister of Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)

Ministry of Housing officials taking part:
Beesley, D. J., General Manager, Ontario Housing Corporation
Burkus, J., Executive Co-ordinator, Policy and Programme Development Secretariat
Crosbie, D. A., Deputy Minister
Davidson-Palmer, Mrs. J. A., Women Employees' Programme Co-ordinator
Farrow, G. M., Executive Director, Plans Administration Division
Riggs, R. W., Assistant Deputy Minister, Community Development

CONTENTS

Executive Council Members 3
Parliamentary Assistants 3
Provincial Parliament Members 4
Alphabetical List of Bills 7
Numerical List of Bills
Government Bills 9
Members' Bills 12
Private Bills 14
Subjects and speakers (alphabetical by Subjects) 17
Speakers and subjects (alphabetical by Members) 44

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

10

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1977

Members of the Executive Council*

Hon. William G. Davis, *Premier and President of the Council*
Hon. Robert Welch, *Minister of Culture and Recreation*
Hon. James A. C. Auld, *Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet*
Hon. Rene Brunelle, *Provincial Secretary for Resources Development*
Hon. Thomas L. Wells, *Minister of Education*
Hon. George A. Kerr, *Minister of the Environment*
Hon. Leo Bernier, *Minister of Northern Affairs*
Hon. James W. Snow, *Minister of Transportation and Communications*
Hon. Margaret Birch, *Provincial Secretary for Social Development*
Hon. Claude Bennett, *Minister of Industry and Tourism*
Hon. W. Darcy McKeough, *Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs*
Hon. Arthur K. Meen, *Minister of Correctional Services*
Hon. William Newman, *Minister of Agriculture and Food*
Hon. Sidney B. Handleman, *Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations*
Hon. Frank S. Miller, *Minister of Natural Resources*
Hon. John R. Rhodes, *Minister of Housing*
Hon. Dennis R. Timbrell, *Minister of Health*
Hon. John P. MacBeth, *Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General*
Hon. John R. Smith, *Minister of Government Services*
Hon. Margaret Scrivener, *Minister of Revenue*
Hon. Harry C. Parrott, *Minister of Colleges and Universities*
Hon. James A. Taylor, *Minister of Energy*
Hon. Bette Stephenson, *Minister of Labour*
Hon. Roy McMurtry, *Attorney General*
Hon. Keith Norton, *Minister of Community and Social Services*
Hon. Lorne C. Henderson, *Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet*

Parliamentary Assistants*

Mr. Frank Drea, *Assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations*
Mr. Robert G. Eaton, *Assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food*
Mr. Larry Grossman, *Assistant to the Attorney General*
Mr. William Hodgson, *Assistant to the Minister of Housing*
Mr. Terry Jones, *Assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development*
Mr. Robert D. Kennedy, *Assistant to the Minister of Education*
Mr. John Lane, *Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications*
Mr. Nicholas G. Leluk, *Assistant to the Minister of Culture and Recreation*
Mr. George McCague, *Assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs*
Mr. Douglas J. Wiseman, *Assistant to the Minister of Health*
Mr. Paul J. Yakabuski, *Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources*

*Constitution of the Executive Council and list of Parliamentary Assistants at adjournment on April 29, 1977.

Provincial Parliament Members*

Angus, I. (N.D.P.)
Fort William
Auld, Hon. J. A. C. (P.C.)
Leeds

Bain, R. (N.D.P.)
Timiskaming
Belanger, J. A. (P.C.)
Prescott and Russell
Bennett, Hon. C. (P.C.)
Ottawa South
Bernier, Hon. L. (P.C.)
Kenora
Birch, Hon. M. (P.C.)
Scarborough East
Bounsall, E. J. (N.D.P.)
Windsor-Sandwich
Breaugh, M. (N.D.P.)
Oshawa
Breithaupt, J. R. (L.)
Kitchener
Brunelle, Hon. R. (P.C.)
Cochrane North
Bullbrook, J. E. (L.)
Sarnia
Burr, F. A. (N.D.P.)
Windsor-Riverside
Bryden, M. (N.D.P.)
Beaches-Woodbine

Campbell, M. (L.)
St. George
Cassidy, M. (N.D.P.)
Ottawa Centre
Conway, S. (L.)
Renfrew North
Cunningham, E. (L.)
Wentworth North

Davidson, M. (N.D.P.)
Cambridge
Davis, Hon. W. G. (P.C.)
Brampton
Davison, M. (N.D.P.)
Hamilton Centre
Deans, I. (N.D.P.)
Wentworth
di Santo, O. (N.D.P.)
Downsview

Drea, F. (P.C.)
Scarborough Centre
Dukszta, J. (N.D.P.)
Parkdale

Eakins, J. (L.)
Victoria-Haliburton
Eaton, R. G. (P.C.)
Middlesex
Edighoffer, H. (L.)
Perth
Evans, D. A. (P.C.)
Simcoe Centre

Ferrier, W. (N.D.P.)
Cochrane South
Ferris, J. P. (L.)
London South
Foulds, J. F. (N.D.P.)
Port Arthur

Gaunt, M. (L.)
Huron-Bruce
Germa, M. C. (N.D.P.)
Sudbury
Gigantes, E. (N.D.P.)
Carleton East
Givens, P. G. (L.)
Armourdale
Godfrey, C. (N.D.P.)
Durham West
Good, E. R. (L.)
Waterloo North
Grande, A. (N.D.P.)
Oakwood
Gregory, M. E. C. (P.C.)
Mississauga East
Grossman, L. (P.C.)
St. Andrew-St. Patrick

Haggerty, R. (L.)
Erie
Hall, R. (L.)
Lincoln
Handleman, Hon. S. B. (P.C.)
Carleton
Henderson, Hon. L. C. (P.C.)
Lambton
Hodgson, W. (P.C.)
York North

Irvine, D. R. (P.C.)
Carleton-Grenville

Johnson, J. (P.C.)
Wellington-Dufferin-Peel
Johnston, R. M. (P.C.)
St. Catharines
Jones, T. (P.C.)
Mississauga North

Kennedy, R. D. (P.C.)
Mississauga South
Kerr, Hon. G. A. (P.C.)
Burlington South
Kerrio, V. (L.)
Niagara Falls

Lane, J. (P.C.)
Algoma-Manitoulin
Laughren, F. (N.D.P.)
Nickel Belt
Lawlor, P. D. (N.D.P.)
Lakeshore
Leluk, N. G. (P.C.)
York West
Lewis, S. (N.D.P.)
Scarborough West
Lupusella, A. (N.D.P.)
Dovercourt

MacBeth, Hon. J. P. (P.C.)
Humber
MacDonald, D. C. (N.D.P.)
York South
Mackenzie, R. (N.D.P.)
Hamilton East
Maeck, L. (P.C.)
Parry Sound
Makarchuk, M. (N.D.P.)
Brantford
Mancini, R. (L.)
Essex South
Martel, E. W. (N.D.P.)
Sudbury East
McCague, G. (P.C.)
Dufferin-Simcoe
McClellan, R. (N.D.P.)
Bellwoods
McEwen, J. E. (L.)
Frontenac-Addington
McKeough, Hon. W. D. (P.C.)
Chatham-Kent

McKessock, R. (L.)
Grey
McMurtry, Hon. R. (P.C.)
Eglinton
McNeil, R. K. (P.C.)
Elgin
Meen, Hon. A. K. (P.C.)
York East
Miller, Hon. F. S. (P.C.)
Muskoka
Miller, G. I. (L.)
Haldimand-Norfolk
Moffatt, D. (N.D.P.)
Durham East
Morrow, D. H. (P.C.)
Ottawa West

Newman, B. (L)
Windsor-Walkerville
Newman, Hon. W. (P.C.)
Durham-York
Nixon, R. F. (L.)
Brant-Oxford-Norfolk
Norton, Hon. K. (P.C.)
Kingston and the Islands

O'Neil, H. (L.)
Quinte

Parrott, Hon. H. C. (P.C.)
Oxford
Peterson, D. (L.)
London Centre
Philip, E. (N.D.P.)
Etobicoke

Reed, J. (L.)
Halton-Burlington
Reid, T. P. (L.-Lab.)
Rainy River
Renwick, J. A. (N.D.P.)
Riverdale
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. (P.C.)
Sault Ste. Marie
Riddell, J. (L.)
Huron-Middlesex
Rollins, C. T. (P.C.)
Hastings-Peterborough
Rowe, Hon. R. D. (P.C.)
Northumberland
Roy, A. J. (L.)
Ottawa East
Ruston, R. F. (L)
Essex North

Samis, G. (N.D.P.)
Cornwall
Sandeman, G. (N.D.P.)
Peterborough
Sargent, E. (L.)
Grey-Bruce
Scrivener, Hon. M. (P.C.)
St. David
Shore, M. (P.C.)
London North
Singer, V. M. (L.)
Wilson Heights
Smith, G. E. (P.C.)
Simcoe East
Smith, Hon. J. R. (P.C.)
Hamilton Mountain
Smith, R. S. (L.)
Nipissing
Smith, S. (L.)
Hamilton West
Snow, Hon. J. W. (P.C.)
Oakville
Spence, J. P. (L.)
Kent-Elgin
Stephenson, Hon. B. (P.C.)
York Mills
Stokes, J. E. (N.D.P.)
Lake Nipigon
Stong, A. (L.)
York Centre
Swart, M. (N.D.P.)
Welland-Thorold
Sweeney, J. (L.)
Kitchener-Wilmot

Taylor, Hon. J. A. (P.C.)
Prince Edward-Lennox
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. (P.C.)
Don Mills

Villeneuve, O. F. (P.C.)
Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry

Warner, D. (N.D.P.)
Scarborough-Ellesmere
Welch, Hon. R. (P.C.)
Brock
Wells, Hon. T. L. (P.C.)
Scarborough North
Wildman, B. (N.D.P.)
Algoma
Williams, J. (P.C.)
Oriole
Wiseman, D. J. (P.C.)
Lanark
Worton, H. (L.)
Wellington South

Yakabuski, P. J. (P.C.)
Renfrew South
Young, F. (N.D.P.)
Yorkview

Ziemba, E. (N.D.P.)
High Park-Swansea

***As at adjournment, April 29, 1977.**

Alphabetical List of Bills

Airports Act. No. 34
Audit Act, No. 24

Brockville General Hospital Act, No. Pr7
Business Corporations Act, No. 21

Canada Trustco Mortgage Company Act, No. Pr4
Casgrain Township Lands Act, No. Pr25
Children's Law Reform Act, No. 9
Class Actions Act, No. 12
Commodity Futures Act, No. 19
Condominium Act, No. 72
Consumer Protection Act, No. 58
Corporations Tax Act, No. 50

Death, Natural, Act, No. 3
Discriminatory Business Practices Prohibition Act, No. 39
Dover, Township Act, No. Pr3
Durham Regional Municipality Act, No. 57

East York, Borough, Act, No. Pr9
Education Act, No. 23
Election Finances Reform Act, No. 10
Employees' Health and Safety Act, No. 27
Employment Standards Act, Nos. 56, 74
Environmental Assessment Act, No. 59
Environmental Tax Act, No. 53
Erie Beach, Village, Act, No. Pr20
Essex County French-Language Secondary School Act, No. 31

Family Law Reform Act, No. 38
Frank Postl Enterprises Limited Act, No. Pr24
Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited Act, No. Pr16
Freedom of Information Act, No. 4

Gasoline and Heating Oil Uniform Pricing Act, No. 71
Gift Tax Act, No. 51
Good Samaritan Act, No. 18

Highway Traffic Act, No. 2
Human Rights Code Act, Nos. 16, 37, 78

Income Tax Act, No. 40

John A. Schmaltz Agencies Limited Act, No. Pr14

Kevalaine Corporation Limited Act, No. Pr13

Labour Ministry Act, No. 62
Labour Relations Act, Nos. 22, 33, 75
Land Speculation Tax Act, No. 49
Land Transfer Tax Act, No. 48
Loan Act, No. 43
Lombardo Furniture and Appliance Limited Act, No. Pr11

Marriage Act, No. 38
Medical Data Bank Act, No. 25
Ministry of Northern Affairs Act, No. 26
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, No. 52
Municipal Act, No. 67
Municipal Elections Act, No. 30
Muskoka, District Municipality, Act, No. 64

Natural Death Act, No. 3
Non-returnable Beverage Containers Act, No. 76
North York, Borough, Act, No. Pr21
Northern Affairs Ministry Act, No. 26

Occupiers' Liability Act, No. 13
Ontario Human Rights Code Act, Nos. 16, 78
Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission Act, No. 54
Ottawa, City, Act, No. Pr28
Oxford, County, Act, No. 65

Patients' Rights Act, No. 33
Pension Benefits Act, Nos. 60, 70
Perfume and Cosmetics Bars Limited Act, No. Pr27

Personal Property Security Act, No. 11
Port McNicoll, Village, Act, Pr12
Proceedings against the Crown Act, No. 5
Professional Fund-Raising Corporations Control Act, No. 73
Public Utilities Act, Nos. 17, 68
Public Vehicles Act, No. 35

Regional Municipalities Act, No. 63
Residential Premises Rent Review Act, No. 28
Retail Sales Tax Act, No. 47
Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation (Diocese of Alexandria) Act, No. Pr19
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Act, No. 55

Sales Tax Act, No. 47
Sault Ste Marie, City, Act, No. Pr18
Scarborough, Borough, Act, No. Pr8
Schmaltz Agencies Limited, John A., No. Pr14
Securities Act, No. 20
Succession Duty Act, No. 42
Succession Law Reform Act, No. 8
Successor Rights (Crown Transfers) Act, No. 29

Tax Refund Discounts Act, No. 15
Territorial Division Act, No. 77
Timmins-Porcupine, City, Act, No. 69
Tobacco Tax Act, No. 45
Toronto, City, Act, No. Pr31
Toronto General Burying Grounds Act, No. Pr2
Toronto, Metropolitan Municipality, Act, No. 66
Toxic and Hazardous Substances Act, No. 38
Trustco, Canada, Mortgage Company Act, No. Pr4
Trustee Act, No. 1

Unconditional Grants Act, No. 41

Venture Investment Corporations Registration Act, No. 44

Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission Act, No. 54
Waterloo Electrical Service Areas Act, No. 36
Webwood Investments Limited Act, No. Pr6
Workmen's Compensation Act, No. 61

York, Borough, Act, No. Pr5
Youth Employment Act, No. 46

Government Bills

Bill 1—Trustee Amendment Act—Hon. R. McMurtry
First reading 9.

Bill 2—Highway Traffic Amendment Act—Hon. J. W. Snow
First reading 9. Second reading 42. Third reading 43. Royal assent 43.

Bill 6—Family Law Reform Act—Hon. R. McMurtry
Ministerial statement 20. First reading 38.

Bill 7—Marriage Act—Hon. R. McMurtry
First reading 38.

Bill 8—Succession Law Reform Act—Hon. R. McMurtry
First reading 38.

Bill 9—Children's Law Reform Act—Hon. R. McMurtry
First reading 38.

Bill 11—Personal Property Security Amendment Act—Hon. S. B. Handleman
First reading 38.

Bill 14—Labour Relations Amendment Act—Hon. B. Stephenson
Ministerial statement 21. First reading 39.

Bill 19—Commodity Futures Act—Hon. S. B. Handleman
Ministerial statement 138. First reading 153.

Bill 20—Securities Act—Hon. S. B. Handleman
Ministerial statement 139. First reading 153.

Bill 21—Business Corporations Amendment Act—Hon. S. B. Handleman
First reading 153.

Bill 24—Audit Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
Ministerial statement 224. First reading 240.

Bill 26—Ministry of Northern Affairs Act—Hon. W. G. Davis
Ministerial statement 274. First reading 291.

Bill 28—Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act —Hon. S. B. Handleman
Ministerial statement 311. First reading 327. Second reading 757, 961. In committee 1031, 1091. Third reading 1105. Royal assent 1105.

Bill 29—Successor Rights (Crown Transfers) Act—Hon. J. A. C. Auld
Ministerial statement 312. First reading 327.

Bill 31—Essex County French Language Secondary School Act —Hon. T. L. Wells
Ministerial statement 395. First reading 418. Second reading 809, 974.

Bill 34—Airports Amendment Act—Hon. J. W. Snow
Ministerial statement 490. First reading 505.

Bill 35—Public Vehicles Amendment Act—Hon. J. W. Snow
First reading 505.

Bill 36—Waterloo Electrical Service Areas Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 543.

Bill 40—Income Tax Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 698.

Bill 41—Ontario Unconditional Grants Amendment Act —Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 698.

Bill 42—Succession Duty Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 698.

Bill 43—Ontario Loan Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 698.

Bill 44—Venture Investment Corporations Registration Act —Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 698.

Bill 45—Tobacco Tax Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 698.

Bill 46—Ontario Youth Employment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 699.

Bill 47—Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act—Hon. M. Scrivener
First reading 699.

Bill 48—Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act—Hon. M. Scrivener
First reading 699.

Bill 49—Land Speculation Tax Amendment Act—Hon. M. Scrivener
First reading 699.

Bill 50—Corporations Tax Amendment Act—Hon. M. Scrivener
First reading 699.

Bill 51—Gift Tax Amendment Act—Hon. M. Scrivener
First reading 699.

Bill 52—Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Amendment Act—Hon. M. Scrivener
First reading 699.

Bill 53—Environmental Tax Act—Hon. M. Scrivener
First reading 699.

Bill 55—Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Act—Hon. H. C. Parrott
First reading 723.

Bill 59—Environmental Assessment Amendment Act—Hon. G. A. Kerr
Ministerial statement 986. First reading 1002.

Bill 62—Ministry of Labour Amendment Act—Hon. B. Stephenson
Ministerial statement 879. First reading 900.

Bill 63—Regional Municipalities Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 1002.

Bill 64—District Municipality of Muskoka Amendment Act —Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 1003.

Bill 65—County of Oxford Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 1003.

Bill 66—Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Amendment Act —Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 1003.

Bill 67—Municipal Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 1003.

Bill 68—Public Utilities Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 1003.

Bill 69—City of Timmins-Porcupine Amendment Act—Hon. W. D. McKeough
First reading 1003.

Members' Bills

Bill 3—Natural Death Act—L. Maeck
First reading 9. Second reading 440.

Bill 4—Freedom of Information Act—P. D. Lawlor
First reading 9.

Bill 5—Proceedings against the Crown Amendment Act—R. D. Kennedy
First reading 38.

Bill 10—Elections Finances Reform Amendment Act—J. Johnson
First reading 38. Second reading 738. Third reading 749. Royal Assent 870.

Bill 12—Class Actions Act—P. D. Lawlor
First reading 38.

Bill 13—Occupiers' Liability Act—P. D. Lawlor
First reading 38.

Bill 15—Tax Refund Discounts Act—M. Davison
First reading 103.

Bill 16—Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act—M. Campbell
First reading 104. On second reading 1016.

Bill 17—Public Utilities Amendment Act—B. Newman
First reading 104.

Bill 18—Good Samaritan Act—R. Haggerty
First reading 104.

Bill 22—Labour Relations Amendment Act—R. Haggerty
First reading 153.

Bill 23—Education Amendment Act—A. Stong
First reading 153.

Bill 25—Medical Data Bank Act—B. Newman
First reading 240.

Bill 27—Employees' Health and Safety Amendment Act—F. Laughren
First reading 291.

Bill 30—Municipal Elections Amendment Act—S. Smith
First reading 328.

Bill 32—Labour Relations Amendment Act—A. Stong
First reading 418.

Bill 33—Patients' Rights Act—J. Dukszta
First reading 418. On second reading 1005.

Bill 37—Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act—B. Newman
First reading 543.

Bill 38—Toxic and Hazardous Substances Act—S. Lewis
First reading 645.

Bill 39—Discriminatory Business Practices Prohibition Act—L. Grossman
First reading 645.

Bill 54—Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission Act —B. Newman
First reading 723.

Bill 56—Employment Standards Amendment Act—B. Newman
First reading 808.

Bill 57—Regional Municipality of Durham Amendment Act, 1973 —M. Breaugh
First reading 845.

Bill 58—Consumer Protection Amendment Act—B. Newman
First reading 846.

Bill 60—Pension Benefits Amendment Act—O. di Santo
First reading 901.

Bill 61—Workmen's Compensation Amendment Act—O. di Santo
First reading 901.

Bill 70—Pension Benefits Amendment Act—R. Bain
First reading 1003.

Bill 71—Gasoline and Heating Oil Uniform Pricing Act—J. Lane
First reading 1004.

Bill 72—Condominium Amendment Act—B. Wildman
First reading 1004.

Bill 73—Professional Fund-Raising Corporations Control Act—B. Newman
First reading 1004.

Bill 74—Employment Standards Amendment Act—E. J. Bounsall
First reading 1090.

Bill 75—Labour Relations Amendment Act—E. J. Bounsall
First reading 1090.

Bill 76—Non-Returnable Beverage Containers Act—J. Riddell
First reading 1090.

Bill 77—Territorial Division Amendment Act—R. Bain
First reading 1090.

Bill 78—Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act—I. Angus
First reading 1091.

Private Bills

Bill Pr2—Toronto General Burying Grounds Act—F. Drea
First reading 327. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr3—Township of Dover Act—J. P. Spence
First reading 1004.

Bill Pr4—Canada Trustco Mortgage Company Act—D. Peterson
First reading 328. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr5—Borough of York Act—D. C. MacDonald
First reading 327. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr6—Webwood Investments Limited Act—A. Stong
First reading 328. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr7—Brockville General Hospital Act—G. McCague
First reading 328.

Bill Pr8—Borough of Scarborough Act—F. Drea
First reading 900. Second reading 1091. Third reading 1091. Royal assent 1105.

Bill Pr9—Borough of East York Act—N. G. Leluk
First reading 328. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr11—Lombardo Furniture and Appliance Limited Act—F. A. Burr
First reading 327. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr12—Village of Port McNicoll—G. E. Smith
First reading 1004.

Bill Pr13—Kevalaine Corporation Limited Act—L. Grossman
First reading 328. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr14—John A. Schmaltz Agencies Limited Act—J. R. Breithaupt
First reading 1004.

Bill Pr16—Fred Leblond Cement Products Limited Act—F. Drea
First reading 327. Second reading 846. Third reading 846. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr18—City of Sault Ste Marie Act—J. Lane
First reading 1002.

Bill Pr19—Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation (Diocese of Alexandria) Act—O. F. Villeneuve
First reading 328. Second reading 847. Third reading 847. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr20—Village of Erie Beach Act—J. P. Spence
First reading 328. Second reading 847. Third reading 847. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr12—Borough of North York Act—J. Williams
First reading 900. Second reading 1091. Third reading 1091. Royal assent 1105.

Bill Pr24—Frank Postl Enterprises Limited Act—R. M. Johnston
First reading 328. Second reading 847. Third reading 847. Royal assent 870.

Bill Pr25—Casgrain Township Lands Act—J. Lane
First reading 900.

Bill Pr27—Perfume and Cosmetics Bars Limited Act—D. Peterson
First reading 723. Second reading 1091. Third reading 1091. Royal assent 1105.

Bill Pr28—City of Ottawa Act—D. H. Morrow
First reading 1002.

Bill Pr31—City of Toronto Act—L. Grossman
First reading 1004.

By Subjects

Abortions

Gigantes 233; Sweeney 232-3; Timbrell 232.

Acid spills (*see* Chemical spillage/leakage)

Addicts/addiction, drug (*see* Drug abuse/addiction)

Administration of justice (*see* Justice, administration of)

Advertising, alcoholic beverages

Birch S76-8; Jones S77; Villeneuve S76-8.

Advertising, political parties

Bain 744-5; Cunningham 745-6; Drea 748; Johnson 38, 738-40; Mancini 747-8; McCague 743-4; Moffatt 740-2; Riddell 742-3; Ruston 746-7; Yakabuski 746.

Affirmative action programme (*see* Women crown employees)

Age, consent (*see* Age/age of majority)

Age, drinking

Birch S70; Burr 375; Conway S70.

Age, driving

Burr 374.

Age, school

Stong 154.

Age/age of majority

Dukszta 1005; Timbrell 1008-9.

Aged, health care

Campbell S17-8; Sandeman S64-5.

Aged, homes for

Birch S63-4; Sandeman S64.

Aged/senior citizens

Birch S18-9, S58-65, S87-91; Campbell S17-8, S45; Mackenzie 568-9; Mancini 511-2; McClellan S58-60, S87-92; B. Newman 546-7, 891-2; Norton 891-2, 995; Peterson 913; Reid 995; Sandeman 477-82, S19, S57-65, S87; S. Smith 156-7.

Agricultural implements (*see* Farm machinery/vehicles)

Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Administration (*see* ARDA programme)

Agriculture (*see* Farming)

Airports/airstrips

Bryden 1084; McKeough 1084; Snow 490-1.

Alcohol and youth

Conway S69-72, S74; Jones S69-72.

Alcoholic beverages (*see* Liquor/beer/wine)

Algonquin Park

Brunelle 501-2, 540; Conway 501, 540; Foulds 501-2.

Aluminum wiring (*see* Electrical wiring)

Amalgamation/annexation

Davis 497-8; Lewis 400, 497-8, 1076; MacDonald 559-62, 1076; McCague 513-6; McKeough 400-1, 989-90; W. Newman 59, 1076-7; S. Smith 59, 400, 497, 989-90, 1076-7.

Ambulances/services

Bounsall 643; Foulds 280; Mancini 483-4; Nixon 542; S. Smith 280; Stephenson 643; Timbrell 280-1, 542.

Amendments, budget speech motion

Cassidy 869.

Amendments, budget speech motion, re

Bullbrook 894-5; Cassidy 899-900; Lewis 899-900; Renwick 895-9; Welch 895.

Amendments, throne speech

Lewis 128-9, 616.

Annexation (*see* Amalgamation/annexation)

Answers to questions on notice paper
442-53, 520, 573-5, 673-4, 871-3.

Answers to questions on notice paper, re
Breithaupt 327.

Anti-inflation (*see* Inflation)

Antibiotics
W. Newman 279-80; S. Smith 279-80.

Appeals, courts (*see* Courts, appeal)

Appointments to boards, commissions, etc.
Aluminum wiring inquiry 225; Crown attorneys 1075-6; Farm income stabilization 226; Pensions study 222.

Appraisers/appraisals
Nixon 248-9.

Apprenticeship
Bryden 264-5.

ARDA programme
McKeough 136-7.

Arenas (*see* Stadiums/arenas)

Asbestos/asbestosis
Deans 87-9; Laughren 88; Lewis 111; Mackenzie 89; Stephenson 88-9.

Assessment, market value
Cassidy 852; Good 100, 409; McKeough 409; McKessock 378; Peterson 100, 408-9, 939; Swart 553-6.

Athletics (*see* Sports/athletics)

Atomic energy (*see* Energy, nuclear/atomic)

Auditor, provincial, re
Cunningham 240-1; McKeough 224-5.

Auditoriums
Ferrier 518.

Auto pact (*see* Automotive trade agreement)

Automotive trade agreement
Cassidy 857-8; di Santo 330-1.

Beer (*see* Liquor/beer/wine)

Bilingual services, government/courts
Cassidy 234; Davis 836-8; MacDonald 837-8; McMurtry 234; Roy 836-7; S. Smith 167-8.

Bilingualism/biculturalism
S. Smith 167-8.

Bills, private, re
Welch 418.

Bingos (*see* Lotteries/bingos)

Boating
Brunelle 501-2, 540; Conway 501, 540; Eakins 540; Foulds 501-2.

Boilers/pressure vessels
Handleman 994; Moffatt 994; Reed 994; G.E. Smith 994.

Borrowing, Hydro
McKeough 689.

Borrowing, provincial
Cunningham 211; di Santo 305; McKeough 697; Peterson 905-8.

Boundary lines
McKeough 989-90; Rhodes 720, 788-9; S. Smith 989-90; Swart 720, 787-8.

British North America Act (*see* Constitution)

Browndale
Campbell 449, 452-3; Eakins 409-10, 453; Timbrell 410, 450, 453.

Budget, federal, re
Davis 66-7; Deans 66-7; Lewis 55-6; McKeough 54-6.

Budget, provincial, re
Scrivener 806; Ziemba 805-6.

Budget address
McKeough 681-98.

Budget debate
Cassidy 847-69; Peterson 901-32, 939-61.

Budgets, Ministry
Angus 442; Auld 446; Bennett 446; Bernier 447; Davis 447; Handleman 443-4; Henderson 449; Kerr 445; MacBeth 447; McKeough 447-8; McMurtry 443; Meen 444; F.S. Miller 446-7; W. Newman 442-3; Norton 443; Parrott 443; Peterson 921; Rhodes 446; Scrivener 447; J.R. Smith 445; Snow 447; Stephenson 446; Taylor 444-5; Timbrell 445-6; Welch 444; Wells 444.

Building codes/standards
Breaugh R13; Rhodes R4.

Building standards for handicapped (*see* Handicapped, facilities for)

Buildings, Ontario government
Angus 451; Ferrier 722; J.R. Smith 451, 722.

Bus passenger service
Cunningham 642; S. Smith 642; Snow 642.

Businesses, small
Breithaupt 585; Cassidy 861-2; Cunningham 210; Johnson 70; Mancini 510; McKessock 377-8; Peterson 951-7; Reed 190; Shore 75-6; S. Smith 163-4; Williams 196.

Buy Ontario policy
Cassidy 857-9, 862.

Cabinet/management board
Auld 168; Cunningham 241.

Canadian Pacific Railway
B. Newman 549-50.

Cancer/patients
Campbell 314-5; Deans 87-9; Laughren 88, 212-3, 314-5, 348-52; Lewis 314; Mackenzie 89; Stephenson 88-9, 213-5, 314-5.

Candidates, political
Cassidy 539; Davis 539.

Capital works projects, provincial
Deans 89; MacDonald 90; McKeough 89-90.

Car pools
Snow 505.

Cedarwood (*see* Pickering North project)

CELDIC report
McClellan 387-8.

Censorship, periodicals/books
Birch S66-7; Conway S66-7.

Centralization (*see* Decentralization/centralization, government)

Charities (*see* Fund raising/organizations)

Chemical spillage/leakage
Laughren 344-6.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway
F.S. Miller 28; Spence 27-8.

Child care/welfare
Birch 83-4, 93-4, 99, 450-1, S29, S76; Campbell 93-4, 145, 450, 537, 839, S14-6; Conway 292, S76; Davis 146, 613-4, 625; Haggerty S21-2; Lewis 109-10, 625; McClellan 94-5, 98-9, 146-7, 386-9, 716, 1082, S9-13, S29; Norton 85-6, 94-5, 145, 147, 537, 716, 839, 1082-3; S. Smith 165-6; Sweeney 147.

Children, assessment of
Birch S42; Campbell S42.

Children, delinquent (*see* Offenders, young)

Children, disturbed/mentally ill
Birch S3-4.

Children, immigrant/ethnic
Birch S67.

Children, learning disabilities
Birch S38; McClellan S37-8; Norton 147; Sweeney 147.

Children, problem
Birch S40-1; Campbell S40-1.

Children, retarded
Birch 643; Spence 643.

Children, ward

Birch S30-1; Campbell S39-40; McClellan S30-1.

Children's aid societies

Birch S29-30; McClellan S7-13, S29-30.

Children's group homes

Birch S38-45; Breithaupt 142; Campbell 143, 717, 802, 839, 991, 999-1000, S14-6, S38-45; McClellan 801, 991, 1063-4; Norton 142-3, 717, 794-5, 801-2, 839, 990-2, 999-1000, 1064-5; S. Smith 165-6, 990-1.

Children's rights/law

Birch S23; Campbell S14-5; McClellan S7-8; McMurtry 20.

Civil servants, senior

Auld 171.

Civil servants/crown employees

Auld 171-3, 312, 526, 879.

Class action, legal

Lawlor 38.

Clinics, animal (*see* Veterinarians/services)

Coal/lignite

Cassidy 864.

Collective bargaining

Cunningham 241; Laughren 291; Mackenzie 570; Stephenson 21-2.

Colleges (*see* Universities/colleges)

Commission, freedom of information

Lewis 108.

Commission, grievance arbitrations

Breithaupt 143; Bullbrook 143-4; Stephenson 143-4.

Commission, Niagara escarpment

Eaton R74-7; Farrow R75-7; McKessock 378-9; Reed 191; Rhodes R74-7.

Commission, North Pickering project

Davis 495-6; Lewis 494-5; Renwick 496; Singer 495-6.

Commission, pensions

Davis 222-3.

Commission, public utilities (*see* Public utilities commissions)

Commissions, re

Peterson 912-3.

Committee, children's services

Birch S28-32, S40, S42; Campbell S40; McClellan S10-3, S28-32.

Committee, highway safety

Conway S69-72; Gregory 1089-90; Jones S69-72.

Committee, members' services

Welch 39.

Committee, procedural affairs

Welch 39.

Committee, statutory instruments

Welch 39.

Committee, university affairs (*see* Council, university affairs)

Committee members/substitution, select

Welch 327.

Committee members/substitution, standing

Welch 77.

Committees, select/standing, members (*see* Committee members/substitution, select) (*see* Committee members/substitution, standing)

Committees, standing, re

Handleman 645-6; Welch 39, 77, 328-9.

Commodity futures market

Handleman 138-9.

Community health centres (*see* Health centres, community)

Compensation, storm damage

Kerrio 1087-8; McKeough 1088-9.

Compensation, vendors
McKeough 691-2.

Compensation, workers (*see* Workmen's compensation/board)

Conciliation/mediation
Stephenson 986-7.

Condominium corporations/directors
Breaugh 187-8.

Condominiums (*see* Housing, condominium)

Confederation
Conway 300-3; Davis 228-30, 615-6, 624-5; Drea 254-7; Lane 382; Lewis 623-4; McKeough 687; G.I. Miller 352-3; S. Smith 166-8, 228-9.

Conferences, energy
Taylor 51, 273.

Conflict of interest
McKeough 985-6.

Conservation authorities
Foulds 719; F.S. Miller 718-9; O'Neil 718-9.

Constitution
Drea 258.

Construction, highways/roads
Bryden 325-6; Snow 325, 542-3, 630; Wildman 542-3.

Construction/costs
Lewis 399; McKeough 399, 689.

Construction industry
S. Smith 162; Stephenson 21-2.

Consultants/services
Auld 526.

Consumer prices
Lewis 114-5; B. Newman 846.

Consumer protection
Davison 245; B. Newman 846.

Containers, returnable/non-returnable
Kerr 150-1; Lawlor 36, 150; McKeough 696; O'Neil 150; Riddell 1090; Scrivener 699.

Contracts, union
Bounsall 1090.

Correctional officers
Meen 626-8.

Cost of living (*see* Consumer prices)

Cottagers/cottages
G.I. Miller 363.

Council, multiculturalism
Birch S78-86; Grande S78-86.

Council, occupational health
Stephenson 987.

Council, physically handicapped
Birch S47-50; Sandeman S47-50.

Council, troubled children and youth
Birch S3-4; Campbell S15-6.

Council, university affairs
Parrott 504-5; Sweeney 504-5.

County/township affairs
Bain 1091.

Court facilities (*see* Courthouses/court facilities)

Courthouses/court facilities
McMurtry 236, 1075-6; Stong 236.

Courts, administration of
McMurtry 337-44.

Courts, appeal
McMurtry 705-6.

Courts, class action (*see* Class action, legal)

Courts, family/juvenile
Birch S32; McClellan S31-2.

Credit rating
Davis 407-8; Peterson 905; Sargent 407-8.

Crime, organized
MacBeth 557-9.

Criminal intelligence services (*see* Police intelligence)

Crown attorneys
McMurtry 1075-6.

Crown corporations/agencies
Peterson 913-6, 920.

Crown employees (*see* Civil servants/crown employees)

Curriculum
Gigantes 1080; S. Smith 1080; Sweeney 893, 1080; Wells 894, 1080-1.

Curriculum Connection
Singer 997-8; Wells 997.

Custom Aggregate Co.
Mackenzie 643; Stephenson 643.

Dams (*see* Reservoirs, water)

Deaf/hard of hearing
Lewis 141; Martel 35-6, 142; Stephenson 141-2; Timbrell 36.

Death, natural
Bullbrook 428; Dukszta 423-4; Lawlor 426-8; Maeck 419-22, 428-9; Parrott 426; R.S. Smith 428; Sweeney 424-6.

Debates re answers to oral questions
Swart 787.

Debt, provincial (*see* Provincial debt)

Decentralization, industry
Peterson 930.

Decentralization, population
Peterson 929-30.

Decentralization/centralization, government
Cassidy 144; Conway 294; Gigantes 145; McKeough 136-8, 144-5; McKessock 381; Peterson 914, 929-31; Sargent 144.

Dechlorane (*see* Mirex)

Deconcentration, government (*see* Decentralization/centralization, government)

Dentist shortage (*see* Doctor/dentist shortage)

Dentists/service
Bain 721; Reid 720; Timbrell 721.

Detention centres, adult
Lewis 315; Meen 151-3, 315, 626-8; Peterson 152-3; Reid 152; Sargent 463; S. Smith 315; Stong 151-2.

Development control
Breaugh R68-9; Eaton R76-7; Hall R69-70; Lane R62, R65-8; Martel R57-67, R70-1; Rhodes R58-71, R76-7.

Deviant persons
Campbell 1017-8; di Santo 1022-4; Grossman 1022, Sandeman 1020-1; Sweeney 1021; Williams 1018-9.

Dietitians/nutrition
Sandeman 481.

Disabled persons (*see* Handicapped/disabled persons)

Disclosure, government documents
Conway 292-3; Drea 439-40; Laughren 344-6; Lawlor 9, 429-32, 730-1; Lewis 108; MacDonald 435-7; McMurtry 20-1, 434; Nixon 437-9, 731-3; Rhodes 733-5; Singer 432-3, 724.

Discrimination
Campbell 1017-8; di Santo 1022-3, 1023-4; Grossman 645, 1021-2; Sandeman 1020-1; Williams 1018-9.

Discrimination, handicapped
Angus 1091; B. Newman 543.

Discrimination, racial
Birch S67; Conway S67; Grande 888; Warner 205; Wells 888-9.

Discrimination, sex
Campbell 104.

Dissatisfaction (*see* Debates re answers to oral questions)

District municipalities (*see* Regional/district municipalities)

Disturbed adults
Dukszta 1005-8.

Divisions, House
440, 617.

Doctor/dentist shortage
Timbrell 998.

Doctors/dentists, subsidized
Timbrell 998.

Don jail
Lewis 315; Meen 315, 627, 635; J.R. Smith 635; S. Smith 315, 635.

Donations, political (*see* Political contributions)

Downsview airport site
di Santo 148, 887; Rhodes 148-9, 887; Singer 148.

DRG Globe Envelopes
Grande 504, 998-9; Stephenson 504, 719, 999.

Drought
Brunelle 505; Foulds 505; W. Newman 807; S. Smith 807-8.

Drug abuse/addiction
Birch S68-9; Conway S68-9; McMurtry 540-1; Swart 540-1.

Drug benefit plan (*see* Drugs, prescription, free)

Druggists (*see* Pharmacists)

Drugs, prescription, free
Reid 721, 996; Timbrell 996-7; Ziemba 997.

Duties (*see* Tariffs/duties)

Economic growth
Cassidy 848; McKeough 686; Peterson 908-10, 948; S. Smith 160.

Economic planning (*see* Planning, economic)

Economic strategy
Cassidy 863.

Edmonton commitment (*see* Loans/grants, municipalities)

Education
G.I. Miller 353; Peterson 925-6; Sargent 467; Shore 76; S. Smith 166.

Education, special
Davis 226; Lewis 226, 230-1; Stong 154; Wells 230-1.

Education costs
Peterson 925.

Education programme
Davis 228-30; S. Smith 228-9; Sweeney 230.

Educational Communications Authority
Conway S65-6; Lewis 833; Welch 833.

Election campaigns/costs (*see* Political contributions)

Electric utilities (*see* Public utilities commissions)

Electrical service areas
McKeough 543.

Electrical wiring
Handleman 64-6, 225, 323; Kerrio 64-5, 323; Moffatt 65, 323; Peterson 65; Taylor 64.

Electronic surveillance
Haggerty 716; MacBeth 559; McMurtry 235, 714-6; Roy 235; Singer 715; S. Smith 715.

Emergency/first aid services
Haggerty 104.

Employment
Cassidy 713; Johnson 71-2; Lewis 55-6, 118-22; McKeough 56; S. Smith 155; Warner 206.

Employment, farm
McKeough 714; Riddell 714.

Employment, handicapped

di Santo 100-1; Stephenson 101.

Employment, summer/student (*see* Employment, youth)

Employment, youth

Birch S74; Breithaupt 584; Cassidy 23-4, 855; Conway 295-6, S72-3; Davis 23-4; Jones S72-5; Lewis 22-3; McKeough 689-90; G.I. Miller 892; B. Newman 891-2; Nixon 24; Norton 891-2; Peterson 926, 958; S. Smith 163; Sweeney 23.

Employment programmes

Bain 841; Bennett 504; Bryden 264-6; Burr 373-4; Cassidy 854-5; Conway 295-6; Davis 407-8; Deans 89; McClellan 385-6; McKeough 89-90, 688, 712; B. Newman 545-6; W. Newman 841; Peterson 958; Riddell 841; Sargent 407-8, 503-4; S. Smith 90, 712; Wildman 841.

Energy, nuclear/atomic

Gaunt 334-7, 520; Kerr 840; Lewis 492-3; Moffatt 551, 840; Sargent 468; Taylor 520.

Energy, solar/wind

Cassidy 864; Gaunt 334-6; Reed 493; Taylor 493-4.

Energy, steam/thermal

Lewis 276; Taylor 276.

Energy conservation (*see* Energy/management)

Energy costs

B. Newman 547-8.

Energy/management

Cassidy 863-4; Cunningham 209-10; Deans 489-90; di Santo 639; Gaunt 334-7; Lewis 492-3; McKessock 380-1; Moffatt 494, 551-3; Peterson 941-6; Reed 191-3, 493, 637; Taylor 492-4, 637-8.

Environmental assessment/impact

Cunningham 209; Kerr 879-80.

Equal pay for women

Breaugh R72-3; Davidson-Palmer R72-3; Rhodes R72.

Errata

1105, R83.

Essex Packers

Breithaupt 288; Gaunt 333; Lewis 288; W. Newman 287-8; Riddell 287.

Estimates

Housing R3-40, R27-50, R43-84; Social Development Policy S3-24, S27-50, S55-92.

Estimates, re the

Auld 291; Crosbie R38-9; Handleman 645-6.

Ethnic groups (*see* Minorities/ethnic groups)

Evictions

Gigantes R80; Rhodes R80; S. Smith 92.

Executive Council (*see* Cabinet/management board)

Expenditures, provincial (*see* Government spending)

Exploration, mineral

Ferrier 518; Lewis 122.

Expressways

Breaugh 806; Snow 806; Williams 199.

Family/property law

McMurtry 20, 341.

Family services (*see* Social/family services)

Family/welfare benefits

Birch 892; Cassidy 804-5, 866, 892; Davis 804-5; Deans 32; Lewis 795; Martel 796-7; McClellan 796; B. Newman 32, 237, 1083; Norton 31-2, 237, 795-8, 1083; Sandeman 32, 237, 892; R.S. Smith 31; S. Smith 796; Swart 797-8; Sweeney 797-8.

Farm income stabilization programme

W. Newman 64, 226; S. Smith 154; Swart 64.

Farm lands (*see* Farms/farm lands)

Farm machinery/vehicles

Bain 1066; Snow 708, 1067.

Farm products marketing board

MacDonald 1087; W. Newman 1087.

Farm vehicles (*see* Farm machinery/vehicles)

Farm woodlots
G.I. Miller 362.

Farmers financial protection
Lewis 288; W. Newman 287-8; Riddell 287.

Farmers/producers
Johnson 72; Mancini 237-8, 509; McKessock 378; W. Newman 238; Sargent 466-7.

Farming
Davis 611-2; Peterson 921-2.

Farms/farm lands
Breaugh R19; Cunningham 207; Lewis 123, 1076; MacDonald 559-62, 1002, 1076; Mackenzie 569; McCague 514; McKessock 378-9; W. Newman 59, 1001-2, 1076-7; Nixon 246; Peterson 928; Rhodes 372; S. Smith 59, 157-9, 1001, 1076-7.

Federation of Labour
Mancini 513.

Financing municipal/regional governments
Peterson 930-2.

Financing political parties/campaigns (*see* Political contributions)

Fire inspection (*see* Inspection, fire)

Fire prevention/protection
Bernier 476; Birch S43-4; Campbell S43-4; Foulds 405, 803-4, 886; Laughren 347-8, 500; MacBeth 803-4, 886; Meen 626, 635; F.S. Miller 404-5, 491-2, 499-500; Reid 404, 499-500; J.R. Smith 635; S. Smith 635.

Firefighters/firefighting
MacBeth 893; Wildman 893.

Fires, forest (*see* Forest fires)

First aid services (*see* Emergency/first aid services)

Fiscal policy
Cassidy 26; McKeough 25-6; S. Smith 25, 160; Williams 199.

Fish hatcheries
Foulds 149; F.S. Miller 149; G.I. Miller 149; Reid 149.

Fishing, commercial
Bernier 799; Foulds 799; G.I. Miller 362-3.

Fishing, sport
Bernier 798; Kerr 831-3; Lewis 798, 831-2; F.S. Miller 149; G.I. Miller 149; Reid 832.

Flooding/control
Gaunt 286, 333-4; F.S. Miller 286.

Florists (*see* Greenhouses/florists)

Fluorides/fluoridation
Deans 324; Nixon 325; Timbrell 324-5.

Foreign aid
Davis 411-2, 884; Good 411, 884; MacDonald 884.

Forest fires
Brunelle 290; Foulds 290, 405, 499; F.S. Miller 404-5, 491-2, 499-500; Reid 290, 404, 499-500.

Forest industries/products
Foulds 320; F.S. Miller 320.

Forest rangers, junior
F.S. Miller 987-8; B. Newman 546.

Forest regeneration/reforestation
Foulds 283, 499; F.S. Miller 281-3, 499; Peterson 923-4; Reid 281-2.

Forest resources/management
S. Smith 163.

Fraud
Dukszta 29-30; Kerrio 887; Timbrell 30; Welch 887.

Fraud, OHIP
Dukszta 99-100; Timbrell 100.

Freedom of information
Birch S27.

Freeways (*see* Expressways)

French language education/instruction
Breithaupt 530; Lewis 108-9, 312-3, 529-30;

S. Smith 313-4, 529, 531; Wells 312-4, 395-6 527-31.

Fund raising/organizations
B. Newman 1004.

Funeral homes/directors
Bounsall 442; Timbrell 442.

GAINS (*see* Income, guaranteed)

Gangs (*see* Violence, street)

Garbage dumps (*see* Landfill)

Garnishees (*see* Wage assignments)

Gas, natural
di Santo 306; G.I. Miller 363.

Gas, natural, rates
Bryden 286-7; Taylor 286-7.

Gasoline prices (*see* Oil/gasoline prices)

Geriatrics
McClellan S88-92.

GO East programme
Conway 294; Hall R45; McKeough 136-8; Rhodes R33, R45.

GO transit service
Cunningham 806; Kennedy 66; Renwick 66; Snow 66, 806.

Gold mining assistance
Ferrier 517.

Government spending
Auld 168; Deans 598-9; Lewis 113; McKeough 681-2, 687; Peterson 904-5; S. Smith 160.

Grants, conservation/authorities
F.S. Miller 718-9; O'Neil 718-9.

Grants, French language
Lewis 312-3, 529-30; S. Smith 313-4, 529, 531; Wells 312-4, 527-31.

Grants, home buyers
Hall R29; Makarchuk 96; Peterson 97, 947-8; Scrivener 26, 95-7, 793; S. Smith 26, 96.

Grants, housing (*see* Loans/grants, housing)

Grants, housing, federal (*see* Housing programmes, federal)

Grants, municipal (*see* Loans/grants, municipalities)

Grants, museum
Welch 135.

Grants, rental construction
Breaugh 648; Lewis 531; Rhodes 525-6, 531-2.

Grants, students
Davis 23-4; Lewis 23.

Grants, Wintario
Bryden 1000; Kerrio 502-3, 887; Mancini 510-1; B. Newman 548; Shore 1000; Welch 502-3, 887, 1000.

Gravel (*see* Sand/gravel)

Greenhouses/florists
Mancini 509.

Grievances/procedures
Breithaupt 143; Bullbrook 143-4; Stephenson 143-4.

Guaranteed income (*see* Income, guaranteed)

Guelph sesquicentennial
Davis 544; Deans 544; S. Smith 544; Worton 543-4.

Handicapped, facilities for
Birch 63, S5; Sandeman 63-4, S56-7.

Handicapped/disabled persons
Birch 892, S47-50, S55-6; Campbell 68; di Santo 100-1; Norton 68-9, 891; Ruston 891; Sandeman 892, S47-50, S56-7; Stephenson 101.

Hard of hearing (*see* Deaf/hard of hearing)

Hazardous products
Deans 645.

Headway Corp. Ltd.
Renwick 673; Rhodes 673.

Health, industrial (*see* Health, occupational)

Health, occupational

Bryden 34; Campbell 314-5; Laughren 212-3, 348-52; Lewis 110-1, 124-6, 141, 314, 844; Mackenzie 34; Martel 35-6, 142; Stephenson 34, 97-8, 141-2, 150, 213-5, 314-5, 565, 844, 987; Timbrell 36; Wildman 97, 149-50.

Health care/services

Bain 721; Reid 720, 996; Timbrell 720-1, 996-8.

Health centres, community

S. Smith 289; Timbrell 289.

Health costs

Dukszta 408; Peterson 917; Timbrell 408.

Health councils

McKessock 633; Timbrell 629-33.

Health insurance (*see* OHIP)

Health planning councils (*see* Health councils)

Health service organizations (*see* Health centres, community)

Health services (*see* Health care/services)

Health services, French language

Samis 31; Timbrell 31.

Heat treating companies

Bennett 289; Swart 289.

Heavy water process

Gaunt 520; Taylor 520.

Heritage foundation

Nixon 452; Welch 452.

Heritage language programme

Grande 323; Wells 323-4.

Heritage Ontario programme (*see* Heritage foundation)

Highway construction (*see* Construction, highways/roads)

Highway service centres (*see* Service centres, highway)

Highway transport board

Cunningham 642; S. Smith 642; Snow 642.

Highways

Angus 639; Foulds 639; O'Neil 805; Snow 542-3, 639-40, 805; Wildman 542-3.

Holding tanks (*see* Septic/holding tanks)

Home assistance programmes (*see* Housing assistance programmes)

Home care services

Birch S60-1, S88-91; McClellan S88, S91; Sandeman 480, S59-62.

HOME programme

Breaugh R15; Mackenzie 569; Rhodes R34.

Home renewal programme (*see* Housing renewal programmes)

Home warranties (*see* Warranties, housing)

Homemakers' services

Birch S18-21, S60-2, S90-1; Campbell S17-8; Haggerty S20; McClellan S60, S90-1; Sandeman S61, S64.

Homes (*see* Housing)

Homes, group, for delinquent children (*see* Children's group homes)

Homosexuals (*see* Deviant persons)

Hospital/bed shortage/surplus

Lewis 630-1; Timbrell 628-33.

Hospital insurance (*see* OHIP)

Hospital Medical Records Institute (*see* Medical records/data)

Hospital mergers

Dukszta 631; Sargent 632; Timbrell 632.

Hospitals, psychiatric/mental

Timbrell 397-8.

Hospitals, shutdown/cutbacks

Dukszta 631; Lewis 630-1; McKessock 633; B. Newman 550; Nixon 631; Timbrell 629-33.

Hospitals/services

Cunningham 399; Lewis 398, 632; Philip 398-9; Sargent 466; Timbrell 398-9, 628-33.

Hours of work

Bounsall 1090; B. Newman 808.

Housing

Breaugh 173-81, 187-9, R11-28; Breithaupt 587; Cassidy 863; Crosbie R48; Deans 601; Hall R28-31, R47; Mackenzie 569; Peterson 926-8; Rhodes 369-72, R3-11, R47; S. Smith 164; Williams 193-6.

Housing, co-operative

Breaugh R21-2; Rhodes R34-5.

Housing, condemned (*see* Building codes/standards)

Housing, condominium

Breaugh 177, 180-1, 187-8, R22; Warner 207.

Housing, handicapped (*see* Handicapped, facilities for)

Housing, low-cost

Breaugh R14; Gigantes R77-80; Rhodes R4, R77-80.

Housing, mobile

Wildman 1004.

Housing, public

Breaugh R19-21, R43; Lane R66; Rhodes R32.

Housing, rental

Breaugh 177-80, 532, 891, R25; Davis 1040; Deans 1041; Hall 532; Handleman 311, 966; Lewis 107, 531; Renwick 531; Rhodes 370-2, 525-6, 531-2, 891, R6-10; Sargent 1059; Williams 193-4.

Housing, resources community

Rhodes R34.

Housing, senior citizens

McMurtry 91, 238-9; B. Newman 546; Peterson 91; Sandeman 478-9, 482, S62-4; S. Smith 91.

Housing, substandard

Breaugh R20.

Housing Action programme

Breaugh R50-5; Farrow R51-2; Rhodes R51-4.

Housing assistance programmes

Breaugh R13-6, R18; Gigantes R77-80; Hall R28; Rhodes 369-72, R6-9, R11, R32, R77-80.

Housing authorities

Breaugh R21; Crosbie R38-9; Gigantes R80-2; Hall R29; Rhodes R11, R31, R35-6, R80-2.

Housing Corporation, Ontario

Bain 401; Breaugh 92-3, 176; Gigantes 667, R80, R82; Good 92; Renwick 673; Rhodes 92-3, 401-2, 673, R80; Riggs R82-3; Singer 432-3; S. Smith 91-2, 401.

Housing costs/prices (*see* Housing/land prices)

Housing/land prices

Breaugh 175, 231-2; Lane R65; Martel R57-8; Rhodes 232, R5-6, R8, R33; S. Smith 164-5.

Housing programmes, federal

Breaugh R13-4; Rhodes 525-6.

Housing programmes, provincial

Breaugh 174-81, 231-2, 239, 891, R43; Handleman 311, 965; Lewis 24-5; Rhodes 24-5, 86-7, 232, 239-40, 891, R32, R43.

Housing renewal programmes

Rhodes 831, R10; Sandeman S56.

Housing standards (*see* Building codes/standards)

Housing starts

Bryden 1080; Hall R45-6; McKeough 1079-80; Peterson 908-9, 926-7; Rhodes R45-6; S. Smith 1079.

Housing vacancy rate

Hall R48-9; Rhodes R49.

Housing warranties (*see* Warranties, housing)

Human rights
Campbell 1016-8; di Santo 1022-4; Grossman 1021-2; Sandeman 1019-21; Sweeney 1021; Williams 1018-9.

Huronia Regional Centre
Norton 1082; Sandeman 1082; G.E. Smith 1082.

Hydro, Ontario
Moffatt 551; B. Newman 548.

Hydro brownouts (*see* Hydro shortage/surplus)

Hydro commission (*see* Hydro, Ontario)

Hydro commissions (*see* Public utilities commissions)

Hydro generating stations
Lewis 276-8; MacDonald 277; G.I. Miller 278; Reed 277; Reid 890; Taylor 276-8, 890-1.

Hydro rates
Bain 37; Cunningham 209; Peterson 945.

Hydro shortage/surplus
Foulds 893; Taylor 893.

Immunization/vaccine
Philip 640-1; Timbrell 640.

Imports, wood
Foulds 320; F.S. Miller 320.

Incineration
McKessock 379-80.

Income, guaranteed
Sandeman 478-9.

Income distribution
Cassidy 860; McKeough 683.

Indian bands/people
Davis 881; Foulds 881; Lewis 881.

Indian people (*see* Indian bands/people)

Indian police/policing
Angus 320; MacBeth 320.

Indigents (*see* Welfare recipients)

Industrial health (*see* Health, occupational)

Industries, shutdown
Sargent 465.

Inflation
Bullbrook 26; Cunningham 210-1.

Inflation accounting
McKeough 683-4.

Inflation programme, federal
Breaugh 648; Cassidy 865.

Inquiry, Malden township
Mancini 1084; McKeough 985-6, 1084.

Inquiry, Reed Paper
Bullbrook 634; Davis 634; Foulds 634-5, 882; Kerr 879-80, 882; Lewis 633-4, 882; Reid 635.

Inquiry, Ronto Development
Breithaupt 417-8; Bullbrook 412-3; Davis 415; Deans 413-4, 707; Drea 415-7; Germa 412; McMurtry 706-7; Nixon 415-6; Renwick 415; Sargent 414; S. Smith 707; Welch 395.

Inspection, children's group homes
Campbell 717; Norton 717.

Inspection, fire
Breithaupt 143; Norton 142-3.

Inspection, LLBO
Handleman 871-2; Mancini 871.

Inspection, meat
W. Newman 279-80; Riddell 280; S. Smith 279-80.

Insulation
Breaugh R26; Cassidy 864; Cunningham 209; McKeough 691; Peterson 944-5.

Insulin
Moffatt 884; S. Smith 883-4; Timbrell 883-4.

Insurance, crop
W. Newman 807-8; S. Smith 807.

Interest/rates
McKeough 686.

International Nickel Co.
Germa 889; Kerr 889.

Interpreters (*see* Translators/interpreters)

Interprovincial affairs
Lewis 126-8.

Invasion of privacy (*see* Privacy, invasion of)

Isolated communities assistance fund
Laughren 347.

Jails (*see* Detention centres, adult)

Judicial council
McMurtry 341; Singer 341.

Junior agriculturists/programme
McKessock 841; W. Newman 841.

Justice, administration of
McMurtry 337-44.

Juvenile offenders (*see* Offenders, young)

Juveniles, group homes for (*see* Children's group homes)

Kayson Plastics
Davidson 997; Stephenson 997, 1083.

Laboratories, public health
Ferrier 286; Timbrell 286.

Labour-management relations
McKeough 685; Stephenson 986-7.

Land, agricultural (*see* Farms/farm lands)

Land, serviced
Breaugh R18; Breithaupt 588; Peterson 927-8; Rhodes R37-8.

Land acquisition, Barrie
Sargent 462.

Land acquisition, government
Breaugh R22; Bullbrook 737-8; Lawlor 730-1; Nixon 731-3; Renwick 735-7; Rhodes 733-5, R36-7; Singer 724-7; J.R. Smith 727-30.

Land acquisition, housing
Angus 451; F.S. Miller 28; Rhodes 451; Spence 27-8.

Land assembly/banks
Breaugh 175-7, R15-6, R22; Davis 989; Lewis 989; Peterson 917; Rhodes R7-9; S. Smith 164-5.

Land costs/values (*see* Housing/land prices)

Land developers
Breaugh R23-5.

Land freeze
Martel R60-1; Rhodes R60-1; Riddell R77.

Land prices (*see* Housing/land prices)

Land registration, government
Bullbrook 737-8; Lawlor 730-1; Nixon 731-3; Renwick 735-7; Rhodes 733-5; Singer 724-7; J.R. Smith 727-30.

Land subdivision
Breaugh R68-9; Hall R69-70; Lane R62, R65-8; Martel R57-67; Rhodes R57-67.

Land use/planning
Breaugh R16-9, R24; Hall R29-30; Rhodes R36-7; S. Smith 157-9, 400.

Landfill
Bryden 30, 36; Kerr 30-1, 36; Lewis 278-9; MacDonald 278; W. Newman 278-9; Reed 30-1, 190-1, 278; Stong 30; Williams 197-8.

Language rights
Davis 836-8; MacDonald 837-8; Roy 836-7; S. Smith 166-8, 837.

Languages/instruction
Cunningham 210; Davis 83, 226; Deans 87; Grande 231, 323, 888; Lewis 109, 226, 230-1; Warner 204, 231; Wells 230-1, 323-4, 888-9.

Layoffs (*see* Unemployment/layoffs)

Lead poisoning

Grossman 146; Kerr 60-1, 146; Kerrio 146; Renwick 60; Singer 60-1; S. Smith 59-60.

Learning disabilities (*see* Children, learning disabilities)

Legislative procedures

Breithaupt 330, 507; Cunningham 508; Deans 329, 507-8; Mancini 509; Welch 328-9, 418, 505-8, 1062-3.

Legislative sound system

Peterson 913.

Legislature buildings

Breithaupt 590.

Liability, public

Lawlor 38-9.

Licences, drivers

Cassidy 234; Kerrio 62; Moffatt 93, 234; Philip 93, 233; Sargent 61; S. Smith 62; Snow 61-2, 93, 233-4, 708.

Licences, motor vehicle

Bain 1001, 1066; McKeough 695; Peterson 945; Snow 1001, 1066-7.

Lignite (*see* Coal/lignite)

Liquor/beer/wine

Handleman 227-8; Samis 228; S. Smith 227; Warner 227.

Liquor boards

Handleman 21.

Loans/grants, housing

Breaugh R13-4; Hall R29; Rhodes R6-9.

Loans/grants, municipalities

Cassidy 850; Deans 1067-8; McKeough 687-8, 992, 1067; Peterson 930-2; Swart 554, 992.

Loans/grants, small businesses

Mancini 511; McKessock 377-8.

Lockouts (*see* Strikes/lockouts)

Lotteries/bingos

Handleman 834, 840; Kerrio 840; Mancini 484-5; Sargent 1001; S. Smith 834; Welch 1001.

Mafia (*see* Crime, organized)

Magazines (*see* News media/ periodicals)

Magnesium/hydride

Burr 377.

Mail service (*see* Postal service)

Malnutrition (*see* Dietitians/ nutrition)

Management board (*see* Cabinet/ management board)

Management by results system

Auld 170, 536.

Manpower services, provincial

Auld 879.

Maps, flood plain

Gaunt 286, 333-4; F.S. Miller 286.

Marijuana/hashish

Birch S68-9; Conway S68-9.

Marketing board, farm products (*see* Farm products marketing board)

Mediation (*see* Conciliation/ mediation)

Medical examinations

Kerrio 62; Moffatt 234; Philip 93, 233; Sargent 466; S. Smith 62; Snow 62, 93, 233-4; Stephenson 1083.

Medical records/data

Bullbrook 428; Dukszta 418, 423-4, 1005-6; Lawlor 426-8; Maeck 419-22, 428-9; McClellan 1012; B. Newman 240; Parrott 426; R.S. Smith 428; Stephenson 1013-4; Sweeney 424-6; Timbrell 1009, 1011.

Members, committees (*see* Committee members/substitution, select) (*see* Committee members/ substitution, standing)

Members, lists of

11.

Members, naming of
473.

Memorial societies
Bounsall 442; Timbrell 442.

Memorial wreaths
Johnson 322; J.R. Smith 322.

Mental health/illness
Dukszta 1005-8; McClellan 1013; Sandeman 1015-6; Stong 1015; Sweeney 1081; Timbrell 396-8, 1009-10, 1081.

Mental hospitals (*see* Hospitals, psychiatric/mental)

Mercury poisoning
Bain 832; Davis 881; Ferrier 518, 832; Foulds 881; Kerr 832-3; Lewis 881; F.S. Miller 833-4; S. Smith 833.

Methanol
Lewis 120-1; Moffatt 551-2; Peterson 945-6.

Milk, industrial
W. Newman 842; Samis 842.

Milk prices
Kerrio 35; Lewis 113; W. Newman 35.

Minaki Lodge
Angus 449; Bennett 449.

Mines/mining
Breithaupt 585-6; Lewis 122; Peterson 922-3; S. Smith 163.

Minimum wage (*see* Wage, minimum)

Ministerial statements, re
Deans 276, 326; Handleman 326-7; Lewis 326-7, 901; Sargent 644; Snow 279.

Ministry spending
Angus 442; Auld 446; Bennett 446; Bernier 447; Davis 447; Handleman 443-4; Henderson 449; Kerr 445; MacBeth 447; McKeough 447-8; McMurtry 443; Meen 444; F.S. Miller 446-7; W. Newman 442-3; Norton 443; Parrott 443; Rhodes 446; Scrivener 447; J.R. Smith 445; Snow 447; Stephenson 446; Taylor 444-5; Timbrell 445-6; Welch 444; Wells 444.

Minorities/ethnic groups
Mancini 482-3.

Mirex
Davidson 997; Stephenson 997.

Mobile homes (*see* Housing, mobile)

Mortgage rates
Bullbrook 800; S. Smith 800; Snow 800-1.

Mortgages/companies
Renwick 531; Rhodes 531.

Motor vehicle/parts industry
Cassidy 857-8; di Santo 330-1.

Motor vehicles, Ontario government
Davis 534-6; Peterson 535-6; S. Smith 534.

Multiculturalism
Birch S78-86; Grande S78-86.

Municipal Board, Ontario
Breaugh R18; Lewis 399; MacDonald 561-2; McKeough 90, 399; McMurtry 90-1, 238-9; Peterson 91; S. Smith 90-1.

Municipal electric commissions (*see* Public utilities commissions)

Municipal government
McKeough 1003.

Municipal planning/studies
Breaugh R16-9, R50-5; Farrow R51-2; Hall R29-30; Rhodes R34-5, R51-4.

Municipal/regional services
Breaugh R68-9; Hall R69-70; Lane R62, R65-8; Martel R57-67; Rhodes R58-71.

Municipalities, unorganized
Bernier 475-6; Foulds 803-4, 886; Lane R62; Laughren 346-8; MacBeth 803, 886; Martel R57-67; Rhodes R57-68.

Museums
Welch 135.

Museums, automotive
Grande 405; Timbrell 405.

Myrex (*see* Mirex)

Natural gas (*see* Gas, natural)

Natural resources/management

Cassidy 863; Deans 598; Moffatt 550; Peterson 922; S. Smith 163.

Neighbourhood improvement programme (*see* Housing renewal programmes)

New Canadians

Warner 204-6.

News media/periodicals

Bain 744-5; Conway 541; Cunningham 745-6; Drea 748; Johnson 738-40; Mancini 747-8; McCague 743-4; McMurtry 540-1; Moffatt 740-2; Riddell 742-3; Ruston 746-7; Swart 540-1; Yakabuski 746.

Niagara escarpment

Eaton R74-7; Farrow R75-7; Lewis 123-4; McKessock 378-9; Reed 191; Rhodes R74-7; Riddell R77.

No Confidence motions

Lewis 616.

No Confidence motions, re

Breithaupt 1032; Davis 1039; Deans 1031; Lewis 1038; Welch 1031-2.

Noise barriers

Snow 806.

North Pickering (*see* Pickering North project)

Northern Affairs Ministry

Bernier 470-6; Davis 274-5; Lane 383-4.

Northern affairs officers/offices

Davis 275.

Northern Ontario affairs

Bernier 470-6; Conway 293; Cunningham 208-9; Davis 274-5; Johnson 70; Lane 383-4; McKeough 135-6; Rhodes 368.

Northern Ontario prices (*see* Price differential, regional)

Northstar Yachts Ltd.

Riddell 889; Stephenson 889.

Notices of motion

McKeough 40; Welch 39.

Nuclear/atomic energy (*see* Energy, nuclear/atomic)

Nuclear generating stations (*see* Hydro generating stations)

Nurses

Cunningham 399; Lewis 398; Philip 398-9; Timbrell 398-9.

Nurses, public health

Lewis 226-7; O'Neil 887-8; S. Smith 227; Stephenson 227, 887.

Nursing care/service

Birch S18-21, S45-6, S60; Campbell S20, S45-6; McClellan S60; Sandeman S19.

Nursing homes

Campbell S17-8; Grande 236; Stong 842, 996; Timbrell 236, 628, 842, 995-7.

Nutrition (*see* Dietitians/nutrition)

Obituary, Soame, Major G.R.

Welch 705.

Obscenity (*see* Pornography/obscenity)

Offenders, young

Birch S4-8, S34-7, S46; McClellan S7-9, S34-7.

OHAP (*see* Housing Action programme)

OHIP

Dukszta 99-100; McKeough 137; Peterson 917; Timbrell 100.

Oil/gasoline prices

Bryden 643-4; di Santo 58, 305-6; Handleman 722; Lane 384-5; Lewis 56; Mancini 237, 509; W. Newman 238; Peterson 59; S. Smith 58; Snow 644; Spence 722; Taylor 51-4, 57-9, 273.

Ombudsman

McMurtry 434-5; Stephenson 564-5.

Onakawana deposits (*see* Coal/lignite)

Ontario Hydro (*see* Hydro, Ontario)

Ontario Malleable Iron
Breaugh 845; Moffatt 407; Stephenson 407, 845, 1083-4.

Ontario Northland Railway/ Commission
Ferrier 872; Snow 872.

Ontario offices, foreign (*see* Trade missions/offices)

OPP (*see* Police, provincial)

Orphanages (*see* Children's group homes)

Overtime (*see* Hours of work)

Pan-American games
Auld 289; Davis 405-6, 835-6; Deans 834-5; Mackenzie 289, 405-6.

Parks, provincial
Angus 573; F.S. Miller 573-5.

Parks, trailer
Rhodes R69.

Parkways (*see* Expressways)

Parliamentary commissioner (*see* Ombudsman)

Partnership for Prosperity
Welch 489.

Patients' rights
Dukszta 418, 1005-8; McClellan 1012-3; Sandeman 1015-6; Stephenson 1013-4; Stong 1015; Timbrell 1008-10, 1010-2.

Patronage
Sargent 462.

PCBs (*see* Polychlorinated biphenyls)

Pelee Island
Mancini 484-5.

Pensions, disability
Campbell 68; Norton 68-9.

Pensions/plans
Bain 1003-4; Davis 222-3; di Santo 901; McKeough 684; B. Newman 539; Peterson 905-8; Stephenson 539.

Periodicals (*see* News media/ periodicals)

Personal property security
Handleman 38.

Petitions
Welch 617.

Petitions, re
Bain 37; Breithaupt 102; Cassidy 103; Deans 103; Godfrey 103, 1089; Nixon 102-3; Renwick 102.

Petitions presented
Bain 37; Breaugh 845; Godfrey 845; Lawlor 36; Moffatt 845; Swart 555.

Pharmacists
Stong 418.

Physical fitness
Welch 985.

Pickering North project
Breaugh 232, R15-6; Davis 495-6, 538, 839-40; Godfrey 537-8, 839-40; Lewis 494-5; Renwick 496; Rhodes 232; Singer 495-6, 538.

Pipelines, water
Kerr 290-1; G.I. Miller 290.

Planning, economic
Drea 257-8; Lewis 112-22; S. Smith 159.

Planning, land use (*see* Land use/ planning)

Planning, municipal (*see* Municipal planning/studies)

Planning, regional (*see* Municipal planning/studies)

Planning/development, Barrie area
McCague 513-6.

Planning/development, northwestern Ontario
Ferrier 517.

Points of privilege
Bounsall 808; Breaugh 239; Davis 624; Deans 707; Lewis 615, 623; Martel 221, 224; S. Smith 497, 1001.

Police
MacBeth 557-9; Sargent 463.

Police, Metro Toronto
MacBeth 502; Warner 502.

Police, provincial
Auld 86.

Police complaint/bureaus
Davis 140-1; Lewis 140; MacBeth 843; Roy 843; Singer 140-1, 843.

Police intelligence
MacBeth 558-9.

Political contributions
Conway 293.

Pollution, air
Germa 889; Kerr 98, 889; B. Newman 98.

Pollution, Great Lakes system
Kerr 406; Mancini 406.

Pollution, nuclear (*see* Radiation, nuclear)

Pollution, water
Bernier 798-9; Foulds 799; Kerr 533-4, 831-3; Lewis 533-4, 798, 831-2; F.S. Miller 833-4; Reid 832; S. Smith 533-4, 832-3.

Pollution control (*see* Environmental assessment/impact)

Polychlorinated biphenyls
Kerr 988; Kerrio 988; Laughren 344-6; Lewis 988.

Population/growth
Burkus R44; Hall R44-5; MacDonald 560-2; Rhodes R4-5, R44-5.

Pornography/obscenity
Birch S66-7; Conway S66-7.

Postal service
B. Newman 544-5.

Premier's office/personnel
Cassidy 575; Davis 575.

Press gallery/facilities
Sargent 468-9.

Price differential, regional
Cassidy 867; Lane 384-5.

Price/profit/wage controls
Cassidy 865; di Santo 304; McKeough 685.

Prices (*see* Consumer prices)

Pricing, supermarket
B. Newman 549.

Prisoners
Meen 626-8.

Privacy, invasion of
Drea 439-40; Lawlor 430.

Private bills (*see* Bills, private, re)

Private members' period
Dukszta 1005; Johnson 738; Maeck 419; Singer 724.

Productivity, industrial
Cassidy 860-1; Peterson 949-50; Williams 202.

Profit controls (*see* Price/profit/wage controls)

Property law (*see* Family/property law)

Property values (*see* Housing/land prices)

Provincial auditor (*see* Auditor, provincial, re)

Provincial debt
Cunningham 211; di Santo 305; Peterson 904-5; Sargent 463-4.

Psi Mind Development Inst.
Breithaupt 1081; Sweeney 1081; Timbrell 1081-2.

Public servants (*see* Civil servants/crown employees)

Public utilities commissions
McKeough 543, 1003; B. Newman 104, 548; Scrivener 838.

Pulp/paper companies
Lewis 119-20; Peterson 923-4.

Queen Elizabeth II
Davis 9; Lewis 9-10; S. Smith 10.

Racism (*see* Discrimination, racial)

Radiation, nuclear
Sargent 468.

Railway passenger service
Snow 28, 273-4; Wildman 28.

Railways
Bernier 323; Stephenson 323.

Rapid transit (*see* Transit, public)

Raybestos-Manhattan Ltd.
Sandeman 637; Stephenson 637.

Real estate/property values (*see* Housing/land prices)

Recycling waste (*see* Waste recycling)

Reed Paper Co.
Bullbrook 634; Davis 634; Foulds 634-5, 882; Kerr 879, 882; Lewis 633-4, 882; Reid 635.

Refineries, metal (*see* Smelters/refineries)

Reforestation (*see* Forest regeneration/reforestation)

Regional development/boards
McKeough 135-8.

Regional/district councils
Davis 806-7; McKeough 892; Stong 806, 892.

Regional/district municipalities
McKeough 1003.

Regional government
Godfrey 1089; Peterson 920.

Regional municipality, Durham
Breaugh 845-6.

Regional municipality, Hamilton-Wentworth
Cunningham 241.

Regional planning
Rhodes 720, 788-9; Swart 720, 787-8.

Regional prices (*see* Price differential, regional)

Regression analysis (*see* Health costs)

Regulations, Ontario (*see* Statutes/regulations, Ontario)

Rehabilitation, sick/injured
Angus 1078; Bounsall 239; Laughren 1077-8; Lewis 1077; Stephenson 239, 1077-8.

Rehabilitation, vocational
Stephenson 565-6.

Rent/control
Birch 762-4; Breaugh 318-9, 647-55, 1032-4, 1045, 1092, 1095-7, R13; Campbell 668-9, 1047-8, 1101-2; Conway 292; Davis 1039-41; Deans 319, 780-7, 1041-3; di Santo 776-7; Edighoffer 655-7, 1035, 1043-4, 1092-3, 1095, 1100-4; Gigantes 667-8, R82; Givens 758-62; Good 769-71, 1057-8, 1093-4, 1096, 1098-9; Grande 765-9; Grossman 1051-3; Hall R29; Handleman 311, 318, 646, 656-7, 962-73, 1034-5, 1044-7, 1056-7, 1062, 1093-7, 1099-104; Kennedy 1062; Lewis 105-7, 1036-8, 1047; Mackenzie 569, 670-1; F.S. Miller 1049; Moffatt 757-8; Renwick 961-2, 1053-6, 1097-8; Rhodes 777-80, 1060-1, R31; Riggs R82-3; Samis 671-2; Sargent 1058-60; Shore 771-6; Singer 663-7; S. Smith 1045-6; Sweeney 1049-51; Warner 657-63; Williams 193-4.

Rent review board (*see* Review boards, rental)

Rent review officers
Breaugh 1033.

Report, appeal courts
McMurtry 705.

Report, farmers' financial protection task force
W. Newman 153.

Report, home renewal programme
Rhodes 831.

Report, hospital/nursing home beds task force
Timbrell 628.

Report, Malden township inquiry
McKeough 985-6.

Reports, annual
Women crown employees programme 526.

Reports, annual, re
Ruston 1002.

Reports, select committees
Highway transportation 1089; Ombudsman 37.

Reports, standing committees
General government 723, 1089; Justice administration 1089; Procedural affairs 291, 505, 645, 722; Public accounts 412.

Research, energy/needs
Reed 637; Taylor 638-9.

Research, housing
Beesley R47; Crosbie R48; Hall R43-9; Rhodes R44-7.

Research, municipal (*see* Municipal planning/studies)

Reservoirs, water
Edighoffer 98; Kerr 98.

Residential rehabilitation assistance programme (*see* Housing renewal programmes)

Resolutions
Singer 724, 749.

Restitution by guilty
McKessock 885; McMurtry 882-3, 885-6; Roy 885-6; S. Smith 882-3; Stong 883.

Restraint programme (*see* Inflation programme, federal)

Retarded, facilities for
Birch S3; McClellan S6.

Retarded children (*see* Children, retarded)

Retarded persons
Birch 807; Bounsall 807; Martel 807; Norton 807.

Revenues, provincial
Cassidy 26, 849; McKeough 25-6; Peterson 904; S. Smith 25.

Review boards, rental
Handleman 973-4; Lewis 105-7, 973.

Rezoning (*see* Zoning/rezoning)

Road construction (*see* Construction, highways/roads)

Road salt
Burr 377.

Rockwell International
B. Newman 538-9, 1084; Stephenson 538-9, 1084-5.

Ronto Development Co.
Breithaupt 402, 417-8; Bullbrook 404, 412-3; Davis 402-4, 415; Deans 402, 413-4, 707; Drea 415-7; Germa 412; Makarchuk 236, 326, 403; McMurtry 706-7; Nixon 236, 245-52, 402-3, 415-6; Renwick 415; Sargent 414; Scrivener 236, 326; S. Smith 707; Welch 395.

Rowdyism (*see* Vandalism/rowdyism)

Runways (*see* Airports/airstrips)

Ryerson Polytechnical Institute
Birch 723.

Safety, construction (*see* Safety, occupational)

Safety, highway
Ferrier 519; Lane 382.

Safety, industrial (*see* Safety, occupational)

Safety, occupational
Bryden 34; Laughren 291; Lewis 110-1; Mackenzie 34; Stephenson 34, 150, 987; Wildman 149-50.

Safety committees, industrial
Laughren 316; Martel 317; Stephenson 316.

Sales missions (*see* Trade missions/offices)

Sales practices, unfair
Scrivener 838.

Sand/gravel
Gaunt 889-90; F.S. Miller 889-90.

Sawmills (*see* Forest industries/products)

School age (*see* Age, school)

School board-teacher relations, Brant
Makarchuk 843; Wells 843.

School board-teacher relations, Peel
Davis 713-4; S. Smith 713; Sweeney 713, 842; Wells 842-3.

Schools, correctional (*see* Training centres/schools, correctional)

Schools, deaf/hard of hearing (*see* Deaf/hard of hearing)

Schools, French language
Bounsall 975-6; Burr 640; Drea 974-5; Gigantes 820-5; Ruston 640; Wells 395-6, 640, 809-20.

Search-rescue operations (*see* Emergency/first aid services)

Secession (*see* Separatism/secession)

Securities commission/regulations
Handleman 139-40.

Senior citizens (*see* Aged/senior citizens)

Separatism/secession
Davis 624-5; Lewis 126-8, 623-4.

Septic/holding tanks
Breaugh R68.

Service centres, highway
Bryden 643-4; Snow 644.

Sewage disposal
Deans 281; Kerr 281, 324; McKessock 324; G.I. Miller 361.

Sewage sludge
Kerr 799; Kerrio 800; S. Smith 799-800.

Sewerage
Deans 281; Hall R48; Kerr 281; McKessock 380; Rhodes R49.

Shipbuilding
Davis 223.

Silviculture (*see* Forest regeneration/reforestation)

Small businesses (*see* Businesses, small)

Smelters/refineries
Lewis 121.

Smoke detection devices
Bernier 476.

Snow removal/disposal
Mancini 511.

Social development/councils
Birch S3-6, S18-23, S27-8; Campbell S13-8; McClellan S6-13.

Social/family services
McClellan 386-9.

Social service costs
Birch S32-4; McClellan S32-4.

Solar energy (*see* Energy, solar/wind)

Sound system (*see* Legislative sound system)

Sound walls (*see* Noise barriers)

Speaker, permanent
Drea 252-3.

Speaker's panel, re
Welch 39.

Speaker's rulings/comments
Budget speech motion amendment 899; Ministerial statements 644; Motions to

adjourn 623; Petitions, re 37-8, 101-3, 894; Points of order, re 508; Private Members' period 419.

Sports/athletics

Davis 223; Lewis 224.

Sports centres (*see* Stadiums/arenas)

Stadiums/arenas

Kerrio 502; Welch 502.

Statute of limitations

McMurtry 344.

Statutes/regulations, Ontario

McMurtry 29; Peterson 29, 920-1; Roy 29.

Steam (*see* Energy, steam/thermal)

Storm damage (*see* Compensation, storm damage)

Strike, Beckers

MacBeth 502; Stephenson 995; Warner 502, 994-5.

Strike, secondary teachers, Stormont

Samis 98; Wells 98.

Strike, Tube Turns

Spence 236; Stephenson 236-7.

Strikes/lockouts

Haggerty 153.

Students, foreign

Burr 377.

Subdivision (*see* Land subdivision)

Succession duties

Cassidy 804-5, 866; Davis 804-5; McKeough 692-3.

Sulphur dioxide

Bain 889; Germa 889; Kerr 889.

Supply motion

McKeough 40.

Supply motion, re

Breithaupt 41; Nixon 40-1; Renwick 40.

Tabled documents other than reports

Child care services 83; Freedom of information 20; Manpower control in civil service 879; Ontario Finances 19; Ontario's Energy Future 489; Road construction programme 630; Special Warrants 19-20; Urban Transportation Development Corp. documents 285.

Tariffs/duties

McKeough 684.

Task force, farmers' financial protection

W. Newman 153.

Tax, accommodation (*see* Tax, transient accommodation)

Tax, business

Mancini 510.

Tax, capital gains

McKeough 693-4.

Tax, corporation

McKeough 692, 696-7; Scrivener 138.

Tax, entertainment shows

Breithaupt 802; Campbell 845; Davis 802; Scrivener 845.

Tax, farm

Swart 555.

Tax, gasoline/motor fuels

McKeough 696; Moffatt 673; Roy 319-20; Scrivener 320, 673.

Tax, gifts

McKeough 693.

Tax, hotel (*see* Tax, transient accommodation)

Tax, income, provincial

Cassidy 865; McKeough 690-1.

Tax, land speculation

Cassidy 867; Makarchuk 236, 326, 573, 890, 976-7; McKeough 693-4; Nixon 236, 245-52, 890; Scrivener 236, 326, 573, 890, 977-8; Welch 395.

Tax, land transfer

Handleman 966-7; McKeough 693-4.

Tax, overdue/overpaid

McKeough 1003.

Tax, production machinery

Cassidy 851-2, 866-7; Deans 601; Lewis 115-6.

Tax, property

Bernier 475; Cassidy 850, 852; Gigantes 322; Good 572; Lewis 115; Mancini 509-10; McKeough 687; Peterson 928, 939-41; Sargent 464; Swart 553-6; Wells 322.

Tax, sales

Edighoffer 716-7; Haggerty 893; McKeough 691; Moffatt 673, 871; Peterson 947; Scrivener 449, 673, 716, 839, 871, 893; Ziemba 449.

Tax, soft drink cans

Bullbrook 993-4; Cassidy 867; Cunningham 714; Deans 714; Kerr 714; McKeough 696; McMurtry 993-4; Scrivener 699.

Tax, speculation (*see* Tax, land speculation)

Tax, tobacco

Cassidy 866; McKeough 694.

Tax, transient accommodation

Bennett 322-3; Eakins 322.

Tax credits/rebates

Swart 556.

Tax exemptions

Good 572; Makarchuk 976-7; Mancini 510; Peterson 940-1; Scrivener 977-8; Swart 555.

Tax rebates (*see* Tax credits/rebates)

Tax refund discounters

Davison 32-3, 103-4, 241-5; Handleman 32-3; Lewis 33; Renwick 33.

Tax relief, farmers

Mancini 510.

Teachers, training-school

Davidson 641, 722; Meen 641-2, 721-2; Sandeman 642, 722.

Technology

Cassidy 861.

Third world

Birch S67; Conway S67; Davis 411-2, 884-5; Good 411, 884; MacDonald 884.

Throne speech debate

Auld 168-73; Bernier 469-76; Breaugh 173-81, 187-9; Breithaupt 581-92; Bryden 262-6; Burr 372-7; Conway 291-303; Cunningham 207-12, 240-2; Davis 603-16; Davison 241-5; Deans 592-603; di Santo 303-6, 330-3; Drea 252-62; Ferrier 516-9; Gaunt 333-7; Good 572; Johnson 69-72; Lane 382-5; Laughren 344-52; Lewis 104-29; MacBeth 557-9; MacDonald 559-62; Mackenzie 567-72; Mancini 482-5, 509-13; McCague 513-6; McClellan 385-90; McKessock 377-81; McMurtry 337-44; G.I. Miller 352-3, 361-3; Moffatt 550-3; B. Newman 544-50; Nixon 245-52; Reed 189-93; Rhodes 363-72; Sandeman 477-82; Sargent 461-9; Shore 72-6; S. Smith 154-68; Stephenson 562-7; Swart 553-6; Warner 204-7; Williams 193-203.

Throughways (*see* Expressways)

Timbertown

Conway 297-9.

Tires

Handleman 537; Stong 536-7.

Tourist development/promotion

Mancini 511.

Tourist promotion (*see* Tourist development/promotion)

Townsend project

Davis 64; G.I. Miller 64, 361-2; Nixon 235, 317-8; Rhodes 235, 317-8.

Township affairs (*see* County/township affairs)

Townships, unorganized (*see* Municipalities, unorganized)

Townsites, new

McKeough 1087; G.I. Miller 361-2, 1086; Nixon 235, 317-8; Rhodes 235, 317-8, 1086-7.

Toxic products (*see* Hazardous products)

Trade missions/offices

Bennett 636-7; Sargent 636; S. Smith 636.

Traffic flow

Snow 500; Williams 500.

Training centres/schools, correctional

Birch S4, S35-7; Davidson 641; McClellan S35-7; Meen 641-2.

Transit, public

Johnson 70.

Translators/interpreters

McMurtry 29; Roy 29.

Transportation

Warner 206-7; Williams 198-9.

Transportation, aged/handicapped

Birch 807, S48; Bounsall 807; Martel 807; Norton 807; Sandeman 481-2, S48, S59.

Transportation, truck (*see* Trucking industry)

Transportation, urban (*see* Transit, public)

Transportation development corp.

Bennett 500; Cunningham 33-4, 147-8, 285, 289-90, 451-2; Lewis 801; S. Smith 800; Snow 33-4, 147-8, 284-6, 290, 452, 800-1; Stephenson 500; Warner 285.

Transportation systems, municipal/regional (*see* Transit, public)

Trucking industry

Cunningham 42; Renwick 42; Snow 42-3.

Tube Turns of Canada

Spence 236; Stephenson 236-7.

Tuition fees

Burr 377; Moffatt 673; Parrott 673-4.

Tunnels/underpasses

Snow 63; Williams 62-3.

Underpasses (*see* Tunnels/underpasses)

Unemployables

Campbell 68; Norton 68-9.

Unemployment, youth

Breithaupt 584; Bryden 262-6; Cassidy 852-5; Conway S73-5; Jones S73-5.

Unemployment insurance/commission

Moffatt 407; Stephenson 407.

Unemployment/layoffs

Breithaupt 582-4; Bryden 262; Burr 373-4; Cassidy 852-5; Conway 295-6; Cunningham 208; Deans 993; di Santo 304-5, 331-2; Ferrier 516; Lewis 116, 708-11; Mackenzie 567-8; McClellan 386; McKeough 688, 708-11, 993; B. Newman 545; Peterson 957-8; Sargent 464, 992-3; S. Smith 160-2.

Unemployment rate

Cassidy 711; Lewis 708-11; McKeough 688, 708-11; Peterson 710-2.

Union contracts (*see* Contracts, union)

Unit pricing (*see* Pricing, supermarket)

United Asbestos Corp.

Bain 67, 409, 803; Brunelle 409; Davis 67; F.S. Miller 802-3.

United Way campaign (*see* Fund raising/organizations)

Universities/colleges

Moffatt 673; Parrott 673-4.

University costs (*see* Education costs)

University fees (*see* Tuition fees)

Unorganized communities (*see* Municipalities, unorganized)

Urban growth/sprawl
McKeough 990; S. Smith 990.

Urban transportation development corp. (*see* Transportation development corp.)

Vaccines (*see* Immunization/vaccine)

Vandalism/rowdyism
Mancini 512; McMurtry 883; S. Smith 883.

Veneer mills (*see* Forest industries/products)

Venture investment corporations
Cassidy 862; McKeough 692; Peterson 959.

Veterinarians/services
S. Smith 279.

Vinyl chloride (*see* Polychlorinated biphenyls)

Violence, domestic
Campbell 320; McMurtry 320.

Violence, street
Deans 1085-6; McMurtry 1085-6; Stephenson 1086.

Vocational/trades training
Bryden 264-5.

Volunteer organizations
Good 572; Swart 555.

Voter qualification
Eakins 36; McKeough 36, 67, 87; S. Smith 67-8, 328.

Wage, minimum
Bryden 264-5; Davis 61; Warner 61.

Wage assignments
Kennedy 38.

Wage controls (*see* Price/profit/wage controls)

Ward, children (*see* Children, ward)

Warranties, housing
Breaugh R25-6; Givens 99; Hall R46; Handleman 99, 321-2; O'Neil 321-2; Rhodes R46; Samis 99.

Warrants, special, re
Auld 19-20.

Waste, industrial/liquid
Bullbrook 989; Gaunt 641; Kerr 410-1, 641, 988-9; Kerrio 988; Lewis 410, 988-9; S. Smith 411.

Waste, nuclear
Conway 27; Kerr 840; Moffatt 26-7, 840; B. Newman 549; Taylor 26-7.

Waste disposal, farm
B. Newman 723.

Waste disposal/management
B. Newman 723; Williams 196.

Waste recycling
Mackenzie 568; Reed 191; Williams 197.

Water rates
Kerr 804; G.I. Miller 804.

Water/services
Good 804; Kerr 316, 324, 804; McKessock 324; G.I. Miller 361, 804; S. Smith 315-6.

Welfare benefits (*see* Family/welfare benefits)

Welfare recipients
McKessock 381.

Wind power (*see* Energy, solar/wind)

Windsor early indentification project (*see* Children, learning disabilities)

Wine (*see* Liquor/beer/wine)

Wintario
Bryden 1000; Shore 1000; Welch 1000.

Wiretapping (*see* Electronic surveillance)

Women crown employees

Auld 526-7, 536; Breaugh R55-7, R71-4; Bryden 498, 536; Crosbie R55-6; Davidson-Palmer R71-4; Peterson 919; Rhodes R55-7, R72-4; S. Smith 498; Stephenson 498, 720.

Women's bureau

Auld 171.

Woodlots (*see* Farm woodlots)

Workers, coke oven

Stephenson 97-8; Wildman 97.

Workers, construction

di Santo 332; Lewis 119; McKeough 688-9.

Workers, contract, government

Cunningham 241.

Workers, disabled/injured

Angus 1091; Burr 375-6; di Santo 901; Haggerty 643; Laughren 500-1; Mancini 512-3; Stephenson 500-1, 563-7, 643.

Workers, immigrant/ethnic

di Santo 332; S. Smith 1078; Stephenson 1078-9.

Workers, injured (*see* Workers, disabled/injured)

Workers, Ontario/Quebec

Conway 503; Samis 503; Stephenson 503.

Workers, women

Cassidy 853, 886; Gigantes 717-8, 886, 978-9; McKeough 718, 886-7, 979; Sandeman 718.

Workers' advisors, WCB

Mancini 1078; Stephenson 1078.

Workmen's compensation/board

Bounsall 239; Burr 375-6; Cunningham 210; Davis 614; Davison 241; Deans 838; di Santo 838; Ferrier 518, 838; Laughren 151, 212-3, 348-52, 500-1; Lewis 124-6; Mackenzie 571, 674, 871; Mancini 512-3; Martel 151, 215-6, 537; McClellan 389-90; Stephenson 151, 214, 216-7, 239, 500-1, 537, 563-7, 674, 838, 871; Warner 205.

Young offenders (*see* Offenders, young)

Youth and alcohol (*see* Alcohol and youth)

Youth care centres

Kerrio 539; Timbrell 539-40.

Youth employment programmes

Conway S72-5; Jones S72-5.

Youth Sphere

Campbell 991; McClellan 991; Norton 990-2; S. Smith 990-1.

Zero base budgeting

Auld 170-1.

Zoning/rezoning

Rhodes R35.

By Speakers

Angus, I.
(N.D.P., Fort William)

Budgets, Ministry 442.
Buildings, Ontario government 451.
Discrimination, handicapped 1091.
Highways 639.
Indian police/policing 320.
Land acquisition, housing 451.
Minaki Lodge 449.
Ministry spending 442.
Parks, provincial 573.
Rehabilitation, sick/injured 1078.
Workers, disabled/injured 1091.

Auld, Hon. J.A.C.
(P.C., Leeds)

Budgets, Ministry 446.
Cabinet/management board 168.
Civil servants, senior 171.
Civil servants/crown employees 171-3, 312, 526, 879.
Consultants/services 526.
Estimates, re the 291.
Government spending 168.
Management by results system 170, 536.
Manpower services, provincial 879.
Ministry spending 446.
Pan-American games 289.
Police, provincial 86.
Throne speech debate 168-73.
Warrants, special, re 19-20.
Women crown employees 526-7, 536.
Women's bureau 171.
Zero base budgeting 170-1.

Bain, R.
(N.D.P., Timiskaming)

Advertising, political parties 744-5.
County/township affairs 1091.
Dentists/service 721.
Employment programmes 841.
Farm machinery/vehicles 1066.
Health care/services 721.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 401.
Hydro rates 37.
Licences, motor vehicle 1001, 1066.
Mercury poisoning 832.
News media/periodicals 744-5.
Pensions/plans 1003-4.
Petitions, re 37.
Petitions presented 37.
Sulphur dioxide 889.
United Asbestos Corp. 67, 409, 803.

Beesley, D.J.
(Ministry of Housing)

Research, housing R47.

Bennett, Hon. C.
(P.C., Ottawa South)

Budgets, Ministry 446.
Employment programmes 504.
Heat treating companies 289.
Minaki Lodge 449.
Ministry spending 446.
Tax, transient accommodation 322-3.
Trade missions/offices 636-7.
Transportation development corp. 500.

Bernier, Hon. L.
(P.C., Kenora)

Budgets, Ministry 447.
Fire prevention/protection 476.
Fishing, commercial 799.
Fishing, sport 798.
Ministry spending 447.
Municipalities, unorganized 475-6.
Northern Affairs Ministry 470-6.
Northern Ontario affairs 470-6.
Pollution, water 798-9.
Railways 323.
Smoke detection devices 476.
Tax, property 475.
Throne speech debate 469-76.

Birch, Hon. M.
(P.C., Scarborough East)

Advertising, alcoholic beverages S76-8.
Age, drinking S70.
Aged, homes for S63-4.
Aged/senior citizens S18-9, S58-65, S87-91.
Censorship, periodicals/books S66-7.
Child care/welfare 83-4, 93-4, 99, 450-1, S29, S76.
Children, assessment of S42.
Children, disturbed/mentally ill S3-4.
Children, immigrant/ethnic S67.
Children, learning disabilities S38.
Children, problem S40-1.
Children, retarded 643.
Children, ward S30-1.
Children's aid societies S29-30.
Children's group homes S38-45.
Children's rights/law S23.
Committee, children's services S28-32, S40, S 42.
Council, multiculturalism S78-86.

Council, physically handicapped S47-50.
Council, troubled children and youth S3-4.
Courts, family/juvenile S32.
Discrimination, racial S67.
Drug abuse/addiction S68-9.
Employment, youth S74.
Family/welfare benefits 892.
Fire prevention/protection S43-4.
Freedom of information S27.
Handicapped, facilities for 63, S5.
Handicapped/disabled persons 892, S47-50, S55-6.
Home care services S60-1, S88-91.
Homemakers' services S18-21, S60-2, S90-1.
Marijuana/hashish S68-9.
Multiculturalism S78-86.
Nursing care/service S18-21, S45-6, S60.
Offenders, young S4-8, S34-7, S46.
Pornography/obscenity S66-7.
Rent/control 762-4.
Retarded, facilities for S3.
Retarded persons 807.
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute 723.
Social development/councils S3-6, S18-23, S 27-8.
Social service costs S32-4.
Third world S67.
Training centres/schools, correctional S4, S 35-7.
Transportation, aged/handicapped 807, S48.

Bounsall, E.J.
(N.D.P., Windsor-Sandwich)

Ambulances/services 643.
Contracts, union 1090.
Funeral homes/directors 442.
Hours of work 1090.
Memorial societies 442.
Points of privilege 808.
Rehabilitation, sick/injured 239.
Retarded persons 807.
Schools, French language 975-6.
Transportation, aged/handicapped 807.
Workmen's compensation/board 239.

Breaugh, M.
(N.D.P., Oshawa)

Building codes/standards R13.
Condominium corporations/directors 187-8.
Development control R68-9.
Equal pay for women R72-3.
Expressways 806.
Farms/farm lands R19.
Grants, rental construction 648.
HOME programme R15.
Housing 173-81, 187-9, R11-28.
Housing, co-operative R21-2.
Housing, condominium 177, 180-1, 187-8, R 22.
Housing, low-cost R14.
Housing, public R19-21, R43.
Housing, rental 177-80, 532, 891, R25.
Housing, substandard R20.
Housing Action programme R50-5.
Housing assistance programmes R13-6, R18.
Housing authorities R21.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 92-3, 176.
Housing/land prices 175, 231-2.
Housing programmes, federal R13-4.
Housing programmes, provincial 174-81, 231-2, 239, 891, R43.
Inflation programme, federal 648.
Insulation R26.
Land, serviced R18.
Land acquisition, government R22.
Land assembly/banks 175-7, R15-6, R22.
Land developers R23-5.
Land subdivision R68-9.
Land use/planning R16-9, R24.
Loans/grants, housing R13-4.
Municipal Board, Ontario R18.
Municipal planning/studies R16-9, R50-5.
Municipal/regional services R68-9.
Ontario Malleable Iron 845.
Petitions presented 845.
Pickering North project 232, R15-6.
Points of privilege 239.
Regional municipality, Durham 845-6.
Rent/control 318-9, 647-55, 1032-4, 1045, 1092, 1095-7, R13.
Rent review officers 1033.
Septic/holding tanks R68.
Throne speech debate 173-81, 187-9.
Warranties, housing R25-6.
Women crown employees R55-7, R71-4.

Breithaupt, J.R.
(L., Kitchener)

Answers to questions on notice paper, re 327.
Businesses, small 585.
Children's group homes 142.
Commission, grievance arbitrations 143.
Employment, youth 584.
Essex Packers 288.
French language education/instruction 530.
Grievances/procedures 143.
Housing 587.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 417-8.
Inspection, fire 143.
Land, serviced 588.
Legislative procedures 330, 507.
Legislature buildings 590.
Mines/mining 585-6.
No Confidence motions, re 1032.
Petitions, re 102.
Psi Mind Development Inst. 1081.
Ronto Development Co. 402, 417-8.
Supply motion, re 41.
Tax, entertainment shows 802.
Throne speech debate 581-92.
Unemployment, youth 584.
Unemployment/layoffs 582-4.

Brunelle, Hon. R.
(P.C., Cochrane North)

Algonquin Park 501-2, 540.
Boating 501-2, 540.
Drought 505.

Forest fires 290.
United Asbestos Corp. 409.

Bryden, M. (N.D.P., Beaches-Woodbine)

Airports/airstrips 1084.
Apprenticeship 264-5.
Construction, highways/roads 325-6.
Employment programmes 264-6.
Gas, natural, rates 286-7.
Grants, Wintario 1000.
Health, occupational 34.
Housing starts 1080.
Landfill 30, 36.
Oil/gasoline prices 643-4.
Safety, occupational 34.
Service centres, highway 643-4.
Throne speech debate 262-6.
Unemployment, youth 262-6.
Unemployment/layoffs 262.
Vocational/trades training 264-5.
Wage, minimum 264-5.
Wintario 1000.
Women crown employees 498, 536.

Bullbrook, J.E. (L., Sarnia)

Amendments, budget speech motion, re 894-5.
Commission, grievance arbitrations 143-4.
Death, natural 428.
Grievances/procedures 143-4.
Inflation 26.
Inquiry, Reed Paper 634.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 412-3.
Land acquisition, government 737-8.
Land registration, government 737-8.
Medical records/data 428.
Mortgage rates 800.
Reed Paper Co. 634.
Ronto Development Co. 404, 412-3.
Tax, soft drink cans 993-4.
Waste, industrial/liquid 989.

Burkus, J. (Ministry of Housing)

Population/growth R44.

Burr, F.A. (N.D.P., Windsor-Riverside)

Age, drinking 375.
Age, driving 374.
Employment programmes 373-4.
Magnesium/hydride 377.
Road salt 377.
Schools, French language 640.
Students, foreign 377.
Throne speech debate 372-7.
Tuition fees 377.
Unemployment/layoffs 373-4.
Workers, disabled/injured 375-6.
Workmen's compensation/board 375-6.

Campbell, M. (L., St.George)

Aged, health care S17-8.
Aged/senior citizens S17-8, S45.
Browndale 449, 452-3.
Cancer/patients 314-5.
Child care/welfare 93-4, 145, 450, 537, 839, S14-6.
Children, assessment of S42.
Children, problem S40-1.
Children, ward S39-40.
Children's group homes 143, 717, 802, 839, 991, 999-1000, S14-6, S38-45.
Children's rights/law S14-5.
Committee, children's services S40.
Council, troubled children and youth S15-6.
Deviant persons 1017-8.
Discrimination 1017-8.
Discrimination, sex 104.
Fire prevention/protection S43-4.
Handicapped/disabled persons 68.
Health, occupational 314-5.
Homemakers' services S17-8.
Human rights 1016-8.
Inspection, children's group homes 717.
Nursing care/service S20, S45-6.
Nursing homes S17-8.
Pensions, disability 68.
Rent/control 668-9, 1047-8, 1101-2.
Social development/councils S13-8.
Tax, entertainment shows 845.
Unemployables 68.
Violence, domestic 320.
Youth Sphere 991.

Cassidy, M. (N.D.P., Ottawa Centre)

Amendments, budget speech motion 869.
Amendments, budget speech motion, re 899-900.
Assessment, market value 852.
Automotive trade agreement 857-8.
Bilingual services, government/courts 234.
Budget debate 847-69.
Businesses, small 861-2.
Buy Ontario policy 857-9, 862.
Candidates, political 539.
Coal/lignite 864.
Decentralization/centralization, government 144.
Economic growth 848.
Economic strategy 863.
Employment 713.
Employment, youth 23-4, 855.
Employment programmes 854-5.
Energy, solar/wind 864.
Energy/management 863-4.
Family/welfare benefits 804-5, 866, 892.
Fiscal policy 26.
Housing 863.
Income distribution 860.

Inflation programme, federal 865.
Insulation 864.
Licences, drivers 234.
Loans/grants, municipalities 850.
Motor vehicle/parts industry 857-8.
Natural resources/management 863.
Petitions, re 103.
Premier's office/personnel 575.
Price differential, regional 867.
Price/profit/wage controls 865.
Productivity, industrial 860-1.
Revenues, provincial 26, 849.
Succession duties 804-5, 866.
Tax, income, provincial 865.
Tax, land speculation 867.
Tax, production machinery 851-2, 866-7.
Tax, property 850, 852.
Tax, soft drink cans 867.
Tax, tobacco 866.
Technology 861.
Unemployment, youth 852-5.
Unemployment/layoffs 852-5.
Unemployment rate 711.
Venture investment corporations 862.
Workers, women 853, 886.

Conway, S.
(L., Renfrew North)

Age, drinking S70.
Alcohol and youth S69-72, S74.
Algonquin Park 501, 540.
Boating 501, 540.
Censorship, periodicals/books S66-7.
Child care/welfare 292, S76.
Committee, highway safety S69-72.
Confederation 300-3.
Decentralization/centralization, government 294.
Disclosure, government documents 292-3.
Discrimination, racial S67.
Drug abuse/addiction S68-9.
Educational Communications Authority S 65-6.
Employment, youth 295-6, S72-3.
Employment programmes 295-6.
GO East programme 294.
Marijuana/hashish S68-9.
News media/periodicals 541.
Northern Ontario affairs 293.
Political contributions 293.
Pornography/obscenity S66-7.
Rent/control 292.
Third world S67.
Throne speech debate 291-303.
Timbertown 297-9.
Unemployment, youth S73-5.
Unemployment/layoffs 295-6.
Waste, nuclear 27.
Workers, Ontario/Quebec 503.
Youth employment programmes S72-5.

Crosbie, D.A.
(Ministry of Housing)

Estimates, re the R38-9.
Housing R48.
Housing authorities R38-9.
Research, housing R48.
Women crown employees R55-6.

Cunningham, E.
(L., Wentworth North)

Advertising, political parties 745-6.
Auditor, provincial, re 240-1.
Borrowing, provincial 211.
Bus passenger service 642.
Businesses, small 210.
Cabinet/management board 241.
Collective bargaining 241.
Energy/management 209-10.
Environmental assessment/impact 209.
Farms/farm lands 207.
GO transit service 806.
Highway transport board 642.
Hospitals/services 399.
Hydro rates 209.
Inflation 210-1.
Insulation 209.
Languages/instruction 210.
Legislative procedures 508.
News media/periodicals 745-6.
Northern Ontario affairs 208-9.
Nurses 399.
Provincial debt 211.
Regional municipality, Hamilton-Wentworth 241.
Tax, soft drink cans 714.
Throne speech debate 207-12, 240-2.
Transportation development corp. 33-4, 147-8, 285, 289-90, 451-2.
Trucking industry 42.
Unemployment/layoffs 208.
Workers, contract, government 241.
Workmen's compensation/board 210.

Davidson, M.
(N.D.P., Cambridge)

Kayson Plastics 997.
Mirex 997.
Teachers, training-school 641, 722.
Training centres/schools, correctional 641.

Davidson-Palmer, J.A.
(Ministry of Housing)

Equal pay for women R72-3.
Women crown employees R71-4.

Davis, Hon. W.G.
(P.C., Brampton)

Amalgamation/annexation 497-8.
Bilingual services, government/courts 836-8.
Budget, federal, re 66-7.
Budgets, Ministry 447.
Candidates, political 539.
Child care/welfare 146, 613-4, 625.

Commission, North Pickering project 495-6.
Commission, pensions 222-3.
Confederation 228-30, 615-6, 624-5.
Credit rating 407-8.
Education, special 226.
Education programme 228-30.
Employment, youth 23-4.
Employment programmes 407-8.
Family/welfare benefits 804-5.
Farming 611-2.
Foreign aid 411-2, 884.
Grants, students 23-4.
Guelph sesquicentennial 544.
Housing, rental 1040.
Indian bands/people 881.
Inquiry, Reed Paper 634.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 415.
Land assembly/banks 989.
Language rights 836-8.
Languages/instruction 83, 226.
Mercury poisoning 881.
Ministry spending 447.
Motor vehicles, Ontario government 534-6.
No Confidence motions, re 1039.
Northern Affairs Ministry 274-5.
Northern affairs officers/offices 275.
Northern Ontario affairs 274-5.
Pan-American games 405-6, 835-6.
Pensions/plans 222-3.
Pickering North project 495-6, 538, 839-40.
Points of privilege 624.
Police complaint/bureaus 140-1.
Premier's office/personnel 575.
Queen Elizabeth II 9.
Reed Paper Co. 634.
Regional/district councils 806-7.
Rent/control 1039-41.
Ronto Development Co. 402-4, 415.
School board-teacher relations, Peel 713-4.
Separatism/secession 624-5.
Shipbuilding 223.
Sports/athletics 223.
Succession duties 804-5.
Tax, entertainment shows 802.
Third world 411-2, 884-5.
Throne speech debate 603-16.
Townsend project 64.
United Asbestos Corp. 67.
Wage, minimum 61.
Workmen's compensation/board 614.

Davison, M.
(N.D.P., Hamilton Centre)

Consumer protection 245.
Tax refund discounters 32-3, 103-4, 241-5.
Throne speech debate 241-5.
Workmen's compensation/board 241.

Deans, I.
(N.D.P., Wentworth)

Asbestos/asbestosis 87-9.
Budget, federal, re 66-7.
Cancer/patients 87-9.
Capital works projects, provincial 89.
Employment programmes 89.
Energy/management 489-90.
Family/welfare benefits 32.
Fluorides/fluoridation 324.
Government spending 598-9.
Guelph sesquicentennial 544.
Hazardous products 645.
Housing 601.
Housing, rental 1041.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 413-4, 707.
Languages/instruction 87.
Legislative procedures 329, 507-8.
Loans/grants, municipalities 1067-8.
Ministerial statements, re 276, 326.
Natural resources/management 598.
No Confidence motions, re 1031.
Pan-American games 834-5.
Petitions, re 103.
Points of privilege 707.
Rent/control 319, 780-7, 1041-3.
Ronto Development Co. 402, 413-4, 707.
Sewage disposal 281.
Sewerage 281.
Tax, production machinery 601.
Tax, soft drink cans 714.
Throne speech debate 592-603.
Unemployment/layoffs 993.
Violence, street 1085-6.
Workmen's compensation/board 838.

di Santo, O.
(N.D.P., Downsview)

Automotive trade agreement 330-1.
Borrowing, provincial 305.
Deviant persons 1022-4.
Discrimination 1022-3, 1023-4.
Downsview airport site 148, 887.
Employment, handicapped 100-1.
Energy/management 639.
Gas, natural 306.
Handicapped/disabled persons 100-1.
Human rights 1022-4.
Motor vehicle/parts industry 330-1.
Oil/gasoline prices 58, 305-6.
Pensions/plans 901.
Price/profit/wage controls 304.
Provincial debt 305.
Rent/control 776-7.
Throne speech debate 303-6, 330-3.
Unemployment/layoffs 304-5, 331-2.
Workers, construction 332.
Workers, disabled/injured 901.
Workers, immigrant/ethnic 332.
Workmen's compensation/board 838.

Drea, F.
(P.C., Scarborough Centre)

Advertising, political parties 748.
Confederation 254-7.
Constitution 258.
Disclosure, government documents 439-40.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 415-7.
News media/periodicals 748.
Planning, economic 257-8.

Privacy, invasion of 439-40.
Ronto Development Co. 415-7.
Schools, French language 974-5.
Speaker, permanent 252-3.
Throne speech debate 252-62.

Dukszta, J.
(N.D.P., Parkdale)

Age/age of majority 1005.
Death, natural 423-4.
Disturbed adults 1005-8.
Fraud 29-30.
Fraud, OHIP 99-100.
Health costs 408.
Hospital mergers 631.
Hospitals, shutdown/cutbacks 631.
Medical records/data 418, 423-4, 1005-6.
Mental health/illness 1005-8.
OHIP 99-100.
Patients' rights 418, 1005-8.
Private members' period 1005.

Eakins, J.
(L., Victoria-Haliburton)

Boating 540.
Browndale 409-10, 453.
Tax, transient accommodation 322.
Voter qualification 36.

Eaton, R.G.
(P.C., Middlesex)

Commission, Niagara escarpment R74-7.
Development control R76-7.
Niagara escarpment R74-7.

Edighoffer, H.
(L., Perth)

Rent/control 655-7, 1035, 1043-4, 1092-3, 1095, 1100-4.
Reservoirs, water 98.
Tax, sales 716-7.

Farrow, G.M.
(Ministry of Housing)

Commission, Niagara escarpment R75-7.
Housing Action programme R51-2.
Municipal planning/studies R51-2.
Niagara escarpment R75-7.

Ferrier, W.
(N.D.P., Cochrane South)

Auditoriums 518.
Buildings, Ontario government 722.
Exploration, mineral 518.
Gold mining assistance 517.
Laboratories, public health 286.
Mercury poisoning 518, 832.
Ontario Northland Railway/Commission 872.
Planning/development, northwestern Ontario 517.
Safety, highway 519.
Throne speech debate 516-9.
Unemployment/layoffs 516.
Workmen's compensation/board 518, 838.

Foulds, J.F.
(N.D.P., Port Arthur)

Algonquin Park 501-2.
Ambulances/services 280.
Boating 501-2.
Conservation authorities 719.
Drought 505.
Fire prevention/protection 405, 803-4, 886.
Fish hatcheries 149.
Fishing, commercial 799.
Forest fires 290, 405, 499.
Forest industries/products 320.
Forest regeneration/reforestation 283, 499.
Highways 639.
Hydro shortage/surplus 893.
Imports, wood 320.
Indian bands/people 881.
Inquiry, Reed Paper 634-5, 882.
Mercury poisoning 881.
Municipalities, unorganized 803-4, 886.
Pollution, water 799.
Reed Paper Co. 634-5, 882.

Gaunt, M.
(L., Huron-Bruce)

Energy, nuclear/atomic 334-7, 520.
Energy, solar/wind 334-6.
Energy/management 334-7.
Essex Packers 333.
Flooding/control 286, 333-4.
Heavy water process 520.
Maps, flood plain 286, 333-4.
Sand/gravel 889-90.
Throne speech debate 333-7.
Waste, industrial/liquid 641.

Germa, M.C.
(N.D.P., Sudbury)

Inquiry, Ronto Development 412.
International Nickel Co. 889.
Pollution, air 889.
Ronto Development Co. 412.
Sulphur dioxide 889.

Gigantes, E.
(N.D.P., Carleton East)

Abortions 233.
Curriculum 1080.

Decentralization/centralization, government 145.
Evictions R80.
Housing, low-cost R77-80.
Housing assistance programmes R77-80.
Housing authorities R80-2.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 667, R80, R 82.
Rent/control 667-8, R82.
Schools, French language 820-5.
Tax, property 322.
Workers, women 717-8, 886, 978-9.

Givens, P.G.
(L., Armourdale)

Rent/control 758-62.
Warranties, housing 99.

Godfrey, C.
(N.D.P., Durham West)

Petitions, re 103, 1089.
Petitions presented 845.
Pickering North project 537-8, 839-40.
Regional government 1089.

Good, E.R.
(L., Waterloo North)

Assessment, market value 100, 409.
Foreign aid 411, 884.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 92.
Rent/control 769-71, 1057-8, 1093-4, 1096, 1098-9.
Tax, property 572.
Tax exemptions 572.
Third world 411, 884.
Throne speech debate 572.
Volunteer organizations 572.
Water/services 804.

Grande, A.
(N.D.P., Oakwood)

Council, multiculturalism S78-86.
Discrimination, racial 888.
DRG Globe Envelopes 504, 998-9.
Heritage language programme 323.
Languages/instruction 231, 323, 888.
Multiculturalism S78-86.
Museums, automotive 405.
Nursing homes 236.
Rent/control 765-9.

Gregory, M.E.C.
(P.C., Mississauga East)

Committee, highway safety 1089-90.

Grossman, L.
(P.C., St. Andrew-St. Patrick)

Deviant persons 1022.
Discrimination 645, 1021-2.
Human rights 1021-2.
Lead poisoning 146.
Rent/control 1051-3.

Haggerty, R.
(L., Erie)

Child care/welfare S21-2.
Electronic surveillance 716.
Emergency/first aid services 104.
Homemakers' services S20.
Strikes/lockouts 153.
Tax, sales 893.
Workers, disabled/injured 643.

Hall, R.
(L., Lincoln)

Development control R69-70.
GO East programme R45.
Grants, home buyers R29.
Housing R28-31, R47.
Housing, rental 532.
Housing assistance programmes R28.
Housing authorities R29.
Housing starts R45-6.
Housing vacancy rate R48-9.
Land subdivision R69-70.
Land use/planning R29-30.
Loans/grants, housing R29.
Municipal planning/studies R29-30.
Municipal/regional services R69-70.
Population/growth R44-5.
Rent/control R29.
Research, housing R43-9.
Sewerage R48.
Warranties, housing R46.

Handleman, Hon. S.B.
(P.C., Carleton)

Boilers/pressure vessels 994.
Budgets, Ministry 443-4.
Committees, standing, re 645-6.
Commodity futures market 138-9.
Electrical wiring 64-6, 225, 323.
Estimates, re the 645-6.
Housing, rental 311, 966.
Housing programmes, provincial 311, 965.
Inspection, LLBO 871-2.
Liquor/beer/wine 227-8.
Liquor boards 21.
Lotteries/bingos 834, 840.
Ministerial statements, re 326-7.
Ministry spending 443-4.
Oil/gasoline prices 722.
Personal property security 38.

Rent/control 311, 318, 646, 656-7, 962-73, 1034-5, 1044-7, 1056-7, 1062, 1093-7, 1099-104.
Review boards, rental 973-4.
Securities commission/regulations 139-40.
Tax, land transfer 966-7.
Tax refund discounters 32-3.
Tires 537.
Warranties, housing 99, 321-2.

Henderson, Hon. L.C. (P.C., Lambton)

Budgets, Ministry 449.
Ministry spending 449.

Johnson, J. (P.C., Wellington-Dufferin-Peel)

Advertising, political parties 38, 738-40.
Businesses, small 70.
Employment 71-2.
Farmers/producers 72.
Memorial wreaths 322.
News media/periodicals 738-40.
Northern Ontario affairs 70.
Private members' period 738.
Throne speech debate 69-72.
Transit, public 70.

Jones, T. (P.C., Mississauga North)

Advertising, alcoholic beverages S77.
Alcohol and youth S69-72.
Committee, highway safety S69-72.
Employment, youth S72-5.
Unemployment, youth S73-5.
Youth employment programmes S72-5.

Kennedy, R.D. (P.C., Mississauga South)

GO transit service 66.
Rent/control 1062.
Wage assignments 38.

Kerr, Hon. G.A. (P.C., Burlington South)

Budgets, Ministry 445.
Containers, returnable/non-returnable 150-1.
Energy, nuclear/atomic 840.
Environmental assessment/impact 879-80.
Fishing, sport 831-3.
Inquiry, Reed Paper 879-80, 882.
International Nickel Co. 889.
Landfill 30-1, 36.
Lead poisoning 60-1, 146.
Mercury poisoning 832-3.
Ministry spending 445.
Pipelines, water 290-1.
Pollution, air 98, 889.
Pollution, Great Lakes system 406.
Pollution, water 533-4, 831-3.
Polychlorinated biphenyls 988.
Reed Paper Co. 879, 882.
Reservoirs, water 98.
Sewage disposal 281, 324.
Sewage sludge 799.
Sewerage 281.
Sulphur dioxide 889.
Tax, soft drink cans 714.
Waste, industrial/liquid 410-1, 641, 988-9.
Waste, nuclear 840.
Water rates 804.
Water/services 316, 324, 804.

Kerrio, V. (L., Niagara Falls)

Compensation, storm damage 1087-8.
Electrical wiring 64-5, 323.
Fraud 887.
Grants, Wintario 502-3, 887.
Lead poisoning 146.
Licences, drivers 62.
Lotteries/bingos 840.
Medical examinations 62.
Milk prices 35.
Polychlorinated biphenyls 988.
Sewage sludge 800.
Stadiums/arenas 502.
Waste, industrial/liquid 988.
Youth care centres 539.

Lane, J. (P.C., Algoma-Manitoulin)

Confederation 382.
Development control R62, R65-8.
Housing, public R66.
Housing/land prices R65.
Land subdivision R62, R65-8.
Municipal/regional services R62, R65-8.
Municipalities, unorganized R62.
Northern Affairs Ministry 383-4.
Northern Ontario affairs 383-4.
Oil/gasoline prices 384-5.
Price differential, regional 384-5.
Safety, highway 382.
Throne speech debate 382-5.

Laughren, F. (N.D.P., Nickel Belt)

Asbestos/asbestosis 88.
Cancer/patients 88, 212-3, 314-5, 348-52.
Chemical spillage/leakage 344-6.
Collective bargaining 291.
Disclosure, government documents 344-6.
Fire prevention/protection 347-8, 500.
Health, occupational 212-3, 348-52.
Isolated communities assistance fund 347.
Municipalities, unorganized 346-8.
Polychlorinated biphenyls 344-6.
Rehabilitation, sick/injured 1077-8.

Safety, occupational 291.
Safety committees, industrial 316.
Throne speech debate 344-52.
Workers, disabled/injured 500-1.
Workmen's compensation/board 151, 212-3, 348-52, 500-1.

Lawlor, P.D.
(N.D.P., Lakeshore)

Class action, legal 38.
Containers, returnable/non-returnable 36, 150.
Death, natural 426-8.
Disclosure, government documents 9, 429-32, 730-1.
Land acquisition, government 730-1.
Land registration, government 730-1.
Liability, public 38-9.
Medical records/data 426-8.
Petitions presented 36.
Privacy, invasion of 430.

Lewis, S.
(N.D.P., Scarborough West)

Amalgamation/annexation 400, 497-8, 1076.
Amendments, budget speech motion, re 899-900.
Amendments, throne speech 128-9, 616.
Asbestos/asbestosis 111.
Budget, federal, re 55-6.
Cancer/patients 314.
Child care/welfare 109-10, 625.
Commission, freedom of information 108.
Commission, North Pickering project 494-5.
Confederation 623-4.
Construction/costs 399.
Consumer prices 114-5.
Deaf/hard of hearing 141.
Detention centres, adult 315.
Disclosure, government documents 108.
Don jail 315.
Education, special 226, 230-1.
Educational Communications Authority 833.
Employment 55-6, 118-22.
Employment, youth 22-3.
Energy, nuclear/atomic 492-3.
Energy, steam/thermal 276.
Energy/management 492-3.
Essex Packers 288.
Exploration, mineral 122.
Family/welfare benefits 795.
Farmers financial protection 288.
Farms/farm lands 123, 1076.
Fishing, sport 798, 831-2.
French language education/instruction 108-9, 312-3, 529-30.
Government spending 113.
Grants, French language 312-3, 529-30.
Grants, rental construction 531.
Grants, students 23.
Health, occupational 110-1, 124-6, 141, 314, 844.
Hospital/bed shortage/surplus 630-1.
Hospitals, shutdown/cutbacks 630-1.
Hospitals/services 398, 632.
Housing, rental 107, 531.
Housing programmes, provincial 24-5.
Hydro generating stations 276-8.
Indian bands/people 881.
Inquiry, Reed Paper 633-4, 882.
Interprovincial affairs 126-8.
Land assembly/banks 989.
Landfill 278-9.
Languages/instruction 109, 226, 230-1.
Mercury poisoning 881.
Methanol 120-1.
Milk prices 113.
Mines/mining 122.
Ministerial statements, re 326-7, 901.
Municipal Board, Ontario 399.
Niagara escarpment 123-4.
No Confidence motions 616.
No Confidence motions, re 1038.
Nurses 398.
Nurses, public health 226-7.
Oil/gasoline prices 56.
Pickering North project 494-5.
Planning, economic 112-22.
Points of privilege 615, 623.
Police complaint/bureaus 140.
Pollution, water 533-4, 798, 831-2.
Polychlorinated biphenyls 988.
Pulp/paper companies 119-20.
Queen Elizabeth II 9-10.
Reed Paper Co. 633-4, 882.
Rehabilitation, sick/injured 1077.
Rent/control 105-7, 1036-8, 1047.
Review boards, rental 105-7, 973.
Safety, occupational 110-1.
Separatism/secession 126-8, 623-4.
Smelters/refineries 121.
Sports/athletics 224.
Tax, production machinery 115-6.
Tax, property 115.
Tax refund discounters 33.
Throne speech debate 104-29.
Transportation development corp. 801.
Unemployment/layoffs 116, 708-11.
Unemployment rate 708-11.
Waste, industrial/liquid 410, 988-9.
Workers, construction 119.
Workmen's compensation/board 124-6.

MacBeth, Hon. J.P.
(P.C., Humber)

Budgets, Ministry 447.
Crime, organized 557-9.
Electronic surveillance 559.
Fire prevention/protection 803-4, 886.
Firefighters/firefighting 893.
Indian police/policing 320.
Ministry spending 447.
Municipalities, unorganized 803, 886.
Police 557-9.
Police, Metro Toronto 502.
Police complaint/bureaus 843.
Police intelligence 558-9.
Strike, Beckers 502.
Throne speech debate 557-9.

MacDonald, D.C.
(N.D.P., York South)

Amalgamation/annexation 559-62, 1076.
Bilingual services, government/courts 837-8.
Capital works projects, provincial 90.
Disclosure, government documents 435-7.
Farm products marketing board 1087.
Farms/farm lands 559-62, 1002, 1076.
Foreign aid 884.
Hydro generating stations 277.
Landfill 278.
Language rights 837-8.
Municipal Board, Ontario 561-2.
Population/growth 560-2.
Third world 884.
Throne speech debate 559-62.

Mackenzie, R.
(N.D.P., Hamilton East)

Aged/senior citizens 568-9.
Asbestos/asbestosis 89.
Cancer/patients 89.
Collective bargaining 570.
Custom Aggregate Co. 643.
Farms/farm lands 569.
Health, occupational 34.
HOME programme 569.
Housing 569.
Pan-American games 289, 405-6.
Rent/control 569, 670-1.
Safety, occupational 34.
Throne speech debate 567-72.
Unemployment/layoffs 567-8.
Waste recycling 568.
Workmen's compensation/board 571, 674, 871.

Maeck, L.
(P.C., Parry Sound)

Death, natural 419-22, 428-9.
Medical records/data 419-22, 428-9.
Private members' period 419.

Makarchuk, M.
(N.D.P., Brantford)

Grants, home buyers 96.
Ronto Development Co. 236, 326, 403.
School board-teacher relations, Brant 843.
Tax, land speculation 236, 326, 573, 890, 976-7.
Tax exemptions 976-7.

Mancini, R.
(L., Essex South)

Advertising, political parties 747-8.
Aged/senior citizens 511-2.
Ambulances/services 483-4.
Businesses, small 510.
Farmers/producers 237-8, 509.
Federation of Labour 513.
Grants, Wintario 510-1.
Greenhouses/florists 509.
Inquiry, Malden township 1084.
Inspection, LLBO 871.
Legislative procedures 509.
Loans/grants, small businesses 511.
Lotteries/bingos 484-5.
Minorities/ethnic groups 482-3.
News media/periodicals 747-8.
Oil/gasoline prices 237, 509.
Pelee Island 484-5.
Pollution, Great Lakes system 406.
Snow removal/disposal 511.
Tax, business 510.
Tax, property 509-10.
Tax exemptions 510.
Tax relief, farmers 510.
Throne speech debate 482-5, 509-13.
Tourist development/promotion 511.
Vandalism/rowdyism 512.
Workers, disabled/injured 512-3.
Workers' advisors, WCB 1078.
Workmen's compensation/board 512-3.

Martel, E.W.
(N.D.P., Sudbury East)

Deaf/hard of hearing 35-6, 142.
Development control R57-67, R70-1.
Family/welfare benefits 796-7.
Health, occupational 35-6, 142.
Housing/land prices R57-8.
Land freeze R60-1.
Land subdivision R57-67.
Municipal/regional services R57-67.
Municipalities, unorganized R57-67.
Points of privilege 221, 224.
Retarded persons 807.
Safety committees, industrial 317.
Transportation, aged/handicapped 807.
Workmen's compensation/board 151, 215-6, 537.

McCague, G.
(P.C., Dufferin-Simcoe)

Advertising, political parties 743-4.
Amalgamation/annexation 513-6.
Farms/farm lands 514.
News media/periodicals 743-4.
Planning/development, Barrie area 513-6.
Throne speech debate 513-6.

McClellan, R.
(N.D.P., Bellwoods)

Aged/senior citizens S58-60, S87-92.
CELDIC report 387-8.
Child care/welfare 94-5, 98-9, 146-7, 386-9, 716, 1082, S9-13, S29.
Children, learning disabilities S37-8.
Children, ward S30-1.
Children's aid societies S7-13, S29-30.

Children's group homes 801, 991, 1063-4.
Children's rights/law S7-8.
Committee, children's services S10-3, S28-32.
Courts, family/juvenile S31-2.
Employment programmes 385-6.
Family/welfare benefits 796.
Geriatrics S88-92.
Home care services S88, S91.
Homemakers' services S60, S90-1.
Medical records/data 1012.
Mental health/illness 1013.
Nursing care/service S60.
Offenders, young S7-9, S34-7.
Patients' rights 1012-3.
Retarded, facilities for S6.
Social development/councils S6-13.
Social/family services 386-9.
Social service costs S32-4.
Throne speech debate 385-90.
Training centres/schools, correctional S35-7.
Unemployment/layoffs 386.
Workmen's compensation/board 389-90.
Youth Sphere 991.

McKeough, Hon. W.D. (P.C., Chatham-Kent)

Airports/airstrips 1084.
Amalgamation/annexation 400-1, 989-90.
ARDA programme 136-7.
Assessment, market value 409.
Auditor, provincial, re 224-5.
Borrowing, Hydro 689.
Borrowing, provincial 697.
Boundary lines 989-90.
Budget, federal, re 54-6.
Budget address 681-98.
Budgets, Ministry 447-8.
Capital works projects, provincial 89-90.
Compensation, storm damage 1088-9.
Compensation, vendors 691-2.
Confederation 687.
Conflict of interest 985-6.
Construction/costs 399, 689.
Containers, returnable/non-returnable 696.
Decentralization/centralization, government 136-8, 144-5.
Economic growth 686.
Electrical service areas 543.
Employment 56.
Employment, farm 714.
Employment, youth 689-90.
Employment programmes 89-90, 688, 712.
Fiscal policy 25-6.
GO East programme 136-8.
Government spending 681-2, 687.
Housing starts 1079-80.
Income distribution 683.
Inflation accounting 683-4.
Inquiry, Malden township 985-6, 1084.
Insulation 691.
Interest/rates 686.
Labour-management relations 685.
Licences, motor vehicle 695.
Loans/grants, municipalities 687-8, 992, 1067.
Ministry spending 447-8.
Municipal Board, Ontario 90, 399.
Municipal government 1003.
Northern Ontario affairs 135-6.
Notices of motion 40.
OHIP 137.
Pensions/plans 684.
Price/profit/wage controls 685.
Public utilities commissions 543, 1003.
Regional development/boards 135-8.
Regional/district councils 892.
Regional/district municipalities 1003.
Report, Malden township inquiry 985-6.
Revenues, provincial 25-6.
Succession duties 692-3.
Supply motion 40.
Tariffs/duties 684.
Tax, capital gains 693-4.
Tax, corporation 692, 696-7.
Tax, gasoline/motor fuels 696.
Tax, gifts 693.
Tax, income, provincial 690-1.
Tax, land speculation 693-4.
Tax, land transfer 693-4.
Tax, overdue/overpaid 1003.
Tax, property 687.
Tax, sales 691.
Tax, soft drink cans 696.
Tax, tobacco 694.
Townsites, new 1087.
Unemployment/layoffs 688, 708-11, 993.
Unemployment rate 688, 708-11.
Urban growth/sprawl 990.
Venture investment corporations 692.
Voter qualification 36, 67, 87.
Workers, construction 688-9.
Workers, women 718, 886-7, 979.

McKessock, R. (L., Grey)

Assessment, market value 378.
Businesses, small 377-8.
Commission, Niagara escarpment 378-9.
Decentralization/centralization, government 381.
Energy/management 380-1.
Farmers/producers 378.
Farms/farm lands 378-9.
Health councils 633.
Hospitals, shutdown/cutbacks 633.
Incineration 379-80.
Junior agriculturists/programme 841.
Loans/grants, small businesses 377-8.
Niagara escarpment 378-9.
Restitution by guilty 885.
Sewage disposal 324.
Sewerage 380.
Throne speech debate 377-81.
Water/services 324.
Welfare recipients 381.

McMurtry, Hon. R. (P.C., Eglinton)

Bilingual services, government/courts 234.
Budgets, Ministry 443.
Children's rights/law 20.

Courthouses/court facilities 236, 1075-6.
Courts, administration of 337-44.
Courts, appeal 705-6.
Crown attorneys 1075-6.
Disclosure, government documents 20-1, 434.
Drug abuse/addiction 540-1.
Electronic surveillance 235, 714-6.
Family/property law 20, 341.
Housing, senior citizens 91, 238-9.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 706-7.
Judicial council 341.
Justice, administration of 337-44.
Ministry spending 443.
Municipal Board, Ontario 90-1, 238-9.
News media/periodicals 540-1.
Ombudsman 434-5.
Report, appeal courts 705.
Restitution by guilty 882-3, 885-6.
Ronto Development Co. 706-7.
Statute of limitations 344.
Statutes/regulations, Ontario 29.
Tax, soft drink cans 993-4.
Throne speech debate 337-44.
Translators/interpreters 29.
Vandalism/rowdyism 883.
Violence, domestic 320.
Violence, street 1085-6.

Meen, Hon. A.K.
(P.C., York East)

Budgets, Ministry 444.
Correctional officers 626-8.
Detention centres, adult 151-3, 315, 626-8.
Don jail 315, 627, 635.
Fire prevention/protection 626, 635.
Ministry spending 444.
Prisoners 626-8.
Teachers, training-school 641-2, 721-2.
Training centres/schools, correctional 641-2.

Miller, Hon. F.S.
(P.C., Muskoka)

Budgets, Ministry 446-7.
Chesapeake and Ohio Railway 28.
Conservation authorities 718-9.
Fire prevention/protection 404-5, 491-2, 499-500.
Fish hatcheries 149.
Fishing, sport 149.
Flooding/control 286.
Forest fires 404-5, 491-2, 499-500.
Forest industries/products 320.
Forest rangers, junior 987-8.
Forest regeneration/reforestation 281-3, 499.
Grants, conservation/authorities 718-9.
Imports, wood 320.
Land acquisition, housing 28.
Maps, flood plain 286.
Mercury poisoning 833-4.
Ministry spending 446-7.
Parks, provincial 573-5.
Pollution, water 833-4.
Rent/control 1049.
Sand/gravel 889-90.
United Asbestos Corp. 802-3.

Miller, G.I.
(L., Haldimand-Norfolk)

Confederation 352-3.
Cottagers/cottages 363.
Education 353.
Employment, youth 892.
Farm woodlots 362.
Fish hatcheries 149.
Fishing, commercial 362-3.
Fishing, sport 149.
Gas, natural 363.
Hydro generating stations 278.
Pipelines, water 290.
Sewage disposal 361.
Throne speech debate 352-3, 361-3.
Townsend project 64, 361-2.
Townsites, new 361-2, 1086.
Water rates 804.
Water/services 361, 804.

Moffatt, D.
(N.D.P., Durham East)

Advertising, political parties 740-2.
Boilers/pressure vessels 994.
Electrical wiring 65, 323.
Energy, nuclear/atomic 551, 840.
Energy/management 494, 551-3.
Hydro, Ontario 551.
Insulin 884.
Licences, drivers 93, 234.
Medical examinations 234.
Methanol 551-2.
Natural resources/management 550.
News media/periodicals 740-2.
Ontario Malleable Iron 407.
Petitions presented 845.
Rent/control 757-8.
Tax, gasoline/motor fuels 673.
Tax, sales 673, 871.
Throne speech debate 550-3.
Tuition fees 673.
Unemployment insurance/commission 407.
Universities/colleges 673.
Waste, nuclear 26-7, 840.

Newman, B.
(L., Windsor-Walkerville)

Aged/senior citizens 546-7, 891-2.
Canadian Pacific Railway 549-50.
Consumer prices 846.
Consumer protection 846.
Discrimination, handicapped 543.
Employment, youth 891-2.
Employment programmes 545-6.
Energy costs 547-8.
Family/welfare benefits 32, 237, 1083.
Forest rangers, junior 546.
Fund raising/organizations 1004.
Grants, Wintario 548.
Hospitals, shutdown/cutbacks 550.

Hours of work 808.
Housing, senior citizens 546.
Hydro, Ontario 548.
Medical records/data 240.
Pensions/plans 539.
Pollution, air 98.
Postal service 544-5.
Pricing, supermarket 549.
Public utilities commissions 104, 548.
Rockwell International 538-9, 1084.
Throne speech debate 544-50.
Unemployment/layoffs 545.
Waste, nuclear 549.
Waste disposal, farm 723.
Waste disposal/management 723.

Newman, Hon. W. (P.C., Durham-York)

Amalgamation/annexation 59, 1076-7.
Antibiotics 279-80.
Budgets, Ministry 442-3.
Drought 807.
Employment programmes 841.
Essex Packers 287-8.
Farm income stabilization programme 64, 226.
Farm products marketing board 1087.
Farmers financial protection 287-8.
Farmers/producers 238.
Farms/farm lands 59, 1001-2, 1076-7.
Inspection, meat 279-80.
Insurance, crop 807-8.
Junior agriculturists/programme 841.
Landfill 278-9.
Milk, industrial 842.
Milk prices 35.
Ministry spending 442-3.
Oil/gasoline prices 238.
Report, farmers' financial protection task force 153.
Task force, farmers' financial protection 153.

Nixon, R.F. (L., Brant-Oxford-Norfolk)

Ambulances/services 542.
Appraisers/appraisals 248-9.
Disclosure, government documents 437-9, 731-3.
Employment, youth 24.
Farms/farm lands 246.
Fluorides/fluoridation 325.
Heritage foundation 452.
Hospitals, shutdown/cutbacks 631.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 415-6.
Land acquisition, government 731-3.
Land registration, government 731-3.
Petitions, re 102-3.
Ronto Development Co. 236, 245-52, 402-3, 415-6.
Supply motion, re 40-1.
Tax, land speculation 236, 245-52, 890.
Throne speech debate 245-52.
Townsend project 235, 317-8.
Townsites, new 235, 317-8.

Norton, Hon. K. (P.C., Kingston and the Islands)

Aged/senior citizens 891-2, 995.
Budgets, Ministry 443.
Child care/welfare 85-6, 94-5, 145, 147, 537, 716, 839, 1082-3.
Children, learning disabilities 147.
Children's group homes 142-3, 717, 794-5, 801-2, 839, 990-2, 999-1000, 1064-5.
Employment, youth 891-2.
Family/welfare benefits 31-2, 237, 795-8, 1083.
Handicapped/disabled persons 68-9, 891.
Huronia Regional Centre 1082.
Inspection, children's group homes 717.
Inspection, fire 142-3.
Ministry spending 443.
Pensions, disability 68-9.
Retarded persons 807.
Transportation, aged/handicapped 807.
Unemployables 68-9.
Youth Sphere 990-2.

O'Neil, H. (L., Quinte)

Conservation authorities 718-9.
Containers, returnable/non-returnable 150.
Grants, conservation/authorities 718-9.
Highways 805.
Nurses, public health 887-8.
Warranties, housing 321-2.

Parrott, H.C. (P.C., Oxford)

Budgets, Ministry 443.
Council, university affairs 504-5.
Death, natural 426.
Medical records/data 426.
Ministry spending 443.
Tuition fees 673-4.
Universities/colleges 673-4.

Peterson, D. (L., London Centre)

Aged/senior citizens 913.
Assessment, market value 100, 408-9, 939.
Borrowing, provincial 905-8.
Budget debate 901-32, 939-61.
Budgets, Ministry 921.
Businesses, small 951-7.
Commissions, re 912-3.
Credit rating 905.
Crown corporations/agencies 913-6, 920.
Decentralization, industry 930.
Decentralization, population 929-30.
Decentralization/centralization, government 914, 929-31.
Detention centres, adult 152-3.
Economic growth 908-10, 948.
Education 925-6.

Education costs 925.
Electrical wiring 65.
Employment, youth 926, 958.
Employment programmes 958.
Energy/management 941-6.
Farming 921-2.
Farms/farm lands 928.
Financing municipal/regional governments 930-2.
Forest regeneration/reforestation 923-4.
Government spending 904-5.
Grants, home buyers 97, 947-8.
Health costs 917.
Housing 926-8.
Housing, senior citizens 91.
Housing starts 908-9, 926-7.
Hydro rates 945.
Insulation 944-5.
Land, serviced 927-8.
Land assembly/banks 917.
Legislative sound system 913.
Licences, motor vehicle 945.
Loans/grants, municipalities 930-2.
Methanol 945-6.
Mines/mining 922-3.
Motor vehicles, Ontario government 535-6.
Municipal Board, Ontario 91.
Natural resources/management 922.
OHIP 917.
Oil/gasoline prices 59.
Pensions/plans 905-8.
Productivity, industrial 949-50.
Provincial debt 904-5.
Pulp/paper companies 923-4.
Regional government 920.
Revenues, provincial 904.
Statutes/regulations, Ontario 29, 920-1.
Tax, property 928, 939-41.
Tax, sales 947.
Tax exemptions 940-1.
Unemployment/layoffs 957-8.
Unemployment rate 710-2.
Venture investment corporations 959.
Women crown employees 919.

Philip, E.
(N.D.P., Etobicoke)

Hospitals/services 398-9.
Immunization/vaccine 640-1.
Licences, drivers 93, 233.
Medical examinations 93, 233.
Nurses 398-9.

Reed, J.
(L., Halton-Burlington)

Boilers/pressure vessels 994.
Businesses, small 190.
Commission, Niagara escarpment 191.
Energy, solar/wind 493.
Energy/management 191-3, 493, 637.
Hydro generating stations 277.
Landfill 30-1, 190-1, 278.
Niagara escarpment 191.
Research, energy/needs 637.
Throne speech debate 189-93.
Waste recycling 191.

Reid, T.P.
(L.-Lab., Rainy River)

Aged/senior citizens 995.
Dentists/service 720.
Detention centres, adult 152.
Drugs, prescription, free 721, 996.
Fire prevention/protection 404, 499-500.
Fish hatcheries 149.
Fishing, sport 832.
Forest fires 290, 404, 499-500.
Forest regeneration/reforestation 281-2.
Health care/services 720, 996.
Hydro generating stations 890.
Inquiry, Reed Paper 635.
Pollution, water 832.
Reed Paper Co. 635.

Renwick, J.A.
(N.D.P., Riverdale)

Amendments, budget speech motion, re 895-9.
Commission, North Pickering project 496.
GO transit service 66.
Headway Corp. Ltd. 673.
Housing, rental 531.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 673.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 415.
Land acquisition, government 735-7.
Land registration, government 735-7.
Lead poisoning 60.
Mortgages/companies 531.
Petitions, re 102.
Pickering North project 496.
Rent/control 961-2, 1053-6, 1097-8.
Ronto Development Co. 415.
Supply motion, re 40.
Tax refund discounters 33.
Trucking industry 42.

Rhodes, Hon. J.R.
(P.C., Sault Ste. Marie)

Boundary lines 720, 788-9.
Budgets, Ministry 446.
Building codes/standards R4.
Commission, Niagara escarpment R74-7.
Development control R58-71, R76-7.
Disclosure, government documents 733-5.
Downsview airport site 148-9, 887.
Equal pay for women R72.
Evictions R80.
Farms/farm lands 372.
GO East programme R33, R45.
Grants, rental construction 525-6, 531-2.
Headway Corp. Ltd. 673.
HOME programme R34.
Housing 369-72, R3-11, R47.
Housing, co-operative R34-5.
Housing, low-cost R4, R77-80.
Housing, public R32.

Housing, rental 370-2, 525-6, 531-2, 891, R 6-10.
Housing, resources community R34.
Housing Action programme R51-4.
Housing assistance programmes 369-72, R6-9 , R11, R32, R77-80.
Housing authorities R11, R31, R35-6, R80-2.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 92-3, 401-2, 673, R80.
Housing/land prices 232, R5-6, R8, R33.
Housing programmes, federal 525-6.
Housing programmes, provincial 24-5, 86-7, 232, 239-40, 891, R32, R43.
Housing renewal programmes 831, R10.
Housing starts R45-6.
Housing vacancy rate R49.
Land, serviced R37-8.
Land acquisition, government 733-5, R36-7.
Land acquisition, housing 451.
Land assembly/banks R7-9.
Land freeze R60-1.
Land registration, government 733-5.
Land subdivision R57-67.
Land use/planning R36-7.
Loans/grants, housing R6-9.
Ministry spending 446.
Mortgages/companies 531.
Municipal planning/studies R34-5, R51-4.
Municipal/regional services R58-71.
Municipalities, unorganized R57-68.
Niagara escarpment R74-7.
Northern Ontario affairs 368.
Parks, trailer R69.
Pickering North project 232.
Population/growth R4-5, R44-5.
Regional planning 720, 788-9.
Rent/control 777-80, 1060-1, R31.
Report, home renewal programme 831.
Research, housing R44-7.
Sewerage R49.
Throne speech debate 363-72.
Townsend project 235, 317-8.
Townsites, new 235, 317-8, 1086-7.
Warranties, housing R46.
Women crown employees R55-7, R72-4.
Zoning/rezoning R35.

Riddell, J.
(L., Huron-Middlesex)

Advertising, political parties 742-3.
Containers, returnable/non-returnable 1090.
Employment, farm 714.
Employment programmes 841.
Essex Packers 287.
Farmers financial protection 287.
Inspection, meat 280.
Land freeze R77.
News media/periodicals 742-3.
Niagara escarpment R77.
Northstar Yachts Ltd. 889.

Roy, A.J.
(L., Ottawa East)

Bilingual services, government/courts 836-7.
Electronic surveillance 235.
Language rights 836-7.
Police complaint/bureaus 843.
Restitution by guilty 885-6.
Statutes/regulations, Ontario 29.
Tax, gasoline/motor fuels 319-20.
Translators/interpreters 29.

Ruston, R.F.
(L., Essex North)

Advertising, political parties 746-7.
Handicapped/disabled persons 891.
News media/periodicals 746-7.
Reports, annual, re 1002.
Schools, French language 640.

Samis, G.
(N.D.P., Cornwall)

Health services, French language 31.
Liquor/beer/wine 228.
Milk, industrial 842.
Rent/control 671-2.
Strike, secondary teachers, Stormont 98.
Warranties, housing 99.
Workers, Ontario/Quebec 503.

Sandeman, G.
(N.D.P., Peterborough)

Aged, health care S64-5.
Aged, homes for S64.
Aged/senior citizens 477-82, S19, S57-65, S 87.
Council, physically handicapped S47-50.
Deviant persons 1020-1.
Dietitians/nutrition 481.
Discrimination 1020-1.
Family/welfare benefits 32, 237, 892.
Handicapped, facilities for 63-4, S56-7.
Handicapped/disabled persons 892, S47-50, S56-7.
Home care services 480, S59-62.
Homemakers' services S61, S64.
Housing, senior citizens 478-9, 482, S62-4.
Housing renewal programmes S56.
Human rights 1019-21.
Huronia Regional Centre 1082.
Income, guaranteed 478-9.
Mental health/illness 1015-6.
Nursing care/service S19.
Patients' rights 1015-6.
Raybestos-Manhattan Ltd. 637.
Teachers, training-school 642, 722.
Throne speech debate 477-82.
Transportation, aged/handicapped 481-2, S 48, S59.
Workers, women 718.

Sargent, E.
(L., Grey-Bruce)

Credit rating 407-8.

Decentralization/centralization, government 144.
Detention centres, adult 463.
Education 467.
Employment programmes 407-8, 503-4.
Energy, nuclear/atomic 468.
Farmers/producers 466-7.
Hospital mergers 632.
Hospitals/services 466.
Housing, rental 1059.
Industries, shutdown 465.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 414.
Land acquisition, Barrie 462.
Licences, drivers 61.
Lotteries/bingos 1001.
Medical examinations 466.
Ministerial statements, re 644.
Patronage 462.
Police 463.
Press gallery/facilities 468-9.
Provincial debt 463-4.
Radiation, nuclear 468.
Rent/control 1058-60.
Ronto Development Co. 414.
Tax, property 464.
Throne speech debate 461-9.
Trade missions/offices 636.
Unemployment/layoffs 464, 992-3.

Scrivener, Hon. M.
(P.C., St. David)

Budget, provincial, re 806.
Budgets, Ministry 447.
Containers, returnable/non-returnable 699.
Grants, home buyers 26, 95-7, 793.
Ministry spending 447.
Public utilities commissions 838.
Ronto Development Co. 236, 326.
Sales practices, unfair 838.
Tax, corporation 138.
Tax, entertainment shows 845.
Tax, gasoline/motor fuels 320, 673.
Tax, land speculation 236, 326, 573, 890, 977-8.
Tax, sales 449, 673, 716, 839, 871, 893.
Tax, soft drink cans 699.
Tax exemptions 977-8.

Shore, M.
(P.C., London North)

Businesses, small 75-6.
Education 76.
Grants, Wintario 1000.
Rent/control 771-6.
Throne speech debate 72-6.
Wintario 1000.

Singer, V.M.
(L., Wilson Heights)

Commission, North Pickering project 495-6.
Curriculum Connection 997-8.
Disclosure, government documents 432-3, 724.
Downsview airport site 148.
Electronic surveillance 715.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 432-3.
Judicial council 341.
Land acquisition, government 724-7.
Land registration, government 724-7.
Lead poisoning 60-1.
Pickering North project 495-6, 538.
Police complaint/bureaus 140-1, 843.
Private members' period 724.
Rent/control 663-7.
Resolutions 724, 749.

Smith, G.E.
(P.C., Simcoe East)

Boilers/pressure vessels 994.
Huronia Regional Centre 1082.

Smith, Hon. J.R.
(P.C., Hamilton Mountain)

Budgets, Ministry 445.
Buildings, Ontario government 451, 722.
Don jail 635.
Fire prevention/protection 635.
Land acquisition, government 727-30.
Land registration, government 727-30.
Memorial wreaths 322.
Ministry spending 445.

Smith, R.S.
(L., Nipissing)

Death, natural 428.
Family/welfare benefits 31.
Medical records/data 428.

Smith, S.
(L., Hamilton West)

Aged/senior citizens 156-7.
Amalgamation/annexation 59, 400, 497, 989-90, 1076-7.
Ambulances/services 280.
Antibiotics 279-80.
Bilingual services, government/courts 167-8.
Bilingualism/biculturalism 167-8.
Boundary lines 989-90.
Bus passenger service 642.
Businesses, small 163-4.
Child care/welfare 165-6.
Children's group homes 165-6, 990-1.
Confederation 166-8, 228-9.
Construction industry 162.
Curriculum 1080.
Detention centres, adult 315.
Don jail 315, 635.
Drought 807-8.
Economic growth 160.
Education 166.
Education programme 228-9.

Electronic surveillance 715.
Employment 155.
Employment, youth 163.
Employment programmes 90, 712.
Evictions 92.
Family/welfare benefits 796.
Farm income stabilization programme 154.
Farms/farm lands 59, 157-9, 1001, 1076-7.
Fire prevention/protection 635.
Fiscal policy 25, 160.
Forest resources/management 163.
French language education/instruction 313-4, 529, 531.
Government spending 160.
Grants, French language 313-4, 529, 531.
Grants, home buyers 26, 96.
Guelph sesquicentennial 544.
Health centres, community 289.
Highway transport board 642.
Housing 164.
Housing, senior citizens 91.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 91-2, 401.
Housing/land prices 164-5.
Housing starts 1079.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 707.
Inspection, meat 279-80.
Insulin 883-4.
Insurance, crop 807.
Land assembly/banks 164-5.
Land use/planning 157-9, 400.
Language rights 166-8, 837.
Lead poisoning 59-60.
Licences, drivers 62.
Liquor/beer/wine 227.
Lotteries/bingos 834.
Medical examinations 62.
Mercury poisoning 833.
Mines/mining 163.
Mortgage rates 800.
Motor vehicles, Ontario government 534.
Municipal Board, Ontario 90-1.
Natural resources/management 163.
Nurses, public health 227.
Oil/gasoline prices 58.
Planning, economic 159.
Points of privilege 497, 1001.
Pollution, water 533-4, 832-3.
Queen Elizabeth II 10.
Rent/control 1045-6.
Restitution by guilty 882-3.
Revenues, provincial 25.
Ronto Development Co. 707.
School board-teacher relations, Peel 713.
Sewage sludge 799-800.
Throne speech debate 154-68.
Trade missions/offices 636.
Transportation development corp. 800.
Unemployment/layoffs 160-2.
Urban growth/sprawl 990.
Vandalism/rowdyism 883.
Veterinarians/services 279.
Voter qualification 67-8, 328.
Waste, industrial/liquid 411.
Water/services 315-6.
Women crown employees 498.
Workers, immigrant/ethnic 1078.
Youth Sphere 990-1.

Snow, Hon. J.W. (P.C., Oakville)

Airports/airstrips 490-1.
Budgets, Ministry 447.
Bus passenger service 642.
Car pools 505.
Construction, highways/roads 325, 542-3, 630.
Expressways 806.
Farm machinery/vehicles 708, 1067.
GO transit service 66, 806.
Highway transport board 642.
Highways 542-3, 639-40, 805.
Licences, drivers 61-2, 93, 233-4, 708.
Licences, motor vehicle 1001, 1066-7.
Medical examinations 62, 93, 233-4.
Ministerial statements, re 279.
Ministry spending 447.
Mortgage rates 800-1.
Noise barriers 806.
Oil/gasoline prices 644.
Ontario Northland Railway/Commission 872.
Railway passenger service 28, 273-4.
Service centres, highway 644.
Traffic flow 500.
Transportation development corp. 33-4, 147-8, 284-6, 290, 452, 800-1.
Trucking industry 42-3.
Tunnels/underpasses 63.

Spence, J.P. (L., Kent-Elgin)

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway 27-8.
Children, retarded 643.
Land acquisition, housing 27-8.
Oil/gasoline prices 722.
Strike, Tube Turns 236.
Tube Turns of Canada 236.

Stephenson, Hon. B. (P.C., York Mills)

Ambulances/services 643.
Asbestos/asbestosis 88-9.
Budgets, Ministry 446.
Cancer/patients 88-9, 213-5, 314-5.
Collective bargaining 21-2.
Commission, grievance arbitrations 143-4.
Conciliation/mediation 986-7.
Construction industry 21-2.
Council, occupational health 987.
Custom Aggregate Co. 643.
Deaf/hard of hearing 141-2.
DRG Globe Envelopes 504, 719, 999.
Employment, handicapped 101.
Grievances/procedures 143-4.
Handicapped/disabled persons 101.
Health, occupational 34, 97-8, 141-2, 150, 213-5, 314-5, 565, 844, 987.
Kayson Plastics 997, 1083.
Labour-management relations 986-7.
Medical examinations 1083.

Medical records/data 1013-4.
Ministry spending 446.
Mirex 997.
Northstar Yachts Ltd. 889.
Nurses, public health 227, 887.
Ombudsman 564-5.
Ontario Malleable Iron 407, 845, 1083-4.
Patients' rights 1013-4.
Pensions/plans 539.
Railways 323.
Raybestos-Manhattan Ltd. 637.
Rehabilitation, sick/injured 239, 1077-8.
Rehabilitation, vocational 565-6.
Rockwell International 538-9, 1084-5.
Safety, occupational 34, 150, 987.
Safety committees, industrial 316.
Strike, Beckers 995.
Strike, Tube Turns 236-7.
Throne speech debate 562-7.
Transportation development corp. 500.
Tube Turns of Canada 236-7.
Unemployment insurance/commission 407.
Violence, street 1086.
Women crown employees 498, 720.
Workers, coke oven 97-8.
Workers, disabled/injured 500-1, 563-7, 643.
Workers, immigrant/ethnic 1078-9.
Workers, Ontario/Quebec 503.
Workers' advisors, WCB 1078.
Workmen's compensation/board 151, 214, 216-7, 239, 500-1, 537, 563-7, 674, 838, 871.

Stong, A.
(L., York Centre)

Age, school 154.
Courthouses/court facilities 236.
Detention centres, adult 151-2.
Education, special 154.
Landfill 30.
Mental health/illness 1015.
Nursing homes 842, 996.
Patients' rights 1015.
Pharmacists 418.
Regional/district councils 806, 892.
Restitution by guilty 883.
Tires 536-7.

Swart, M.
(N.D.P., Welland-Thorold)

Assessment, market value 553-6.
Boundary lines 720, 787-8.
Debates re answers to oral questions 787.
Drug abuse/addiction 540-1.
Family/welfare benefits 797-8.
Farm income stabilization programme 64.
Heat treating companies 289.
Loans/grants, municipalities 554, 992.
News media/periodicals 540-1.
Petitions presented 555.
Regional planning 720, 787-8.
Tax, farm 555.
Tax, property 553-6.
Tax credits/rebates 556.
Tax exemptions 555.
Throne speech debate 553-6.
Volunteer organizations 555.

Sweeney, J.
(L., Kitchener-Wilmot)

Abortions 232-3.
Child care/welfare 147.
Children, learning disabilities 147.
Council, university affairs 504-5.
Curriculum 893, 1080.
Death, natural 424-6.
Deviant persons 1021.
Education programme 230.
Employment, youth 23.
Family/welfare benefits 797-8.
Human rights 1021.
Medical records/data 424-6.
Mental health/illness 1081.
Psi Mind Development Inst. 1081.
Rent/control 1049-51.
School board-teacher relations, Peel 713, 842.

Taylor, Hon. J.A.
(P.C., Prince Edward-Lennox)

Budgets, Ministry 444-5.
Conferences, energy 51, 273.
Electrical wiring 64.
Energy, nuclear/atomic 520.
Energy, solar/wind 493-4.
Energy, steam/thermal 276.
Energy/management 492-4, 637-8.
Gas, natural, rates 286-7.
Heavy water process 520.
Hydro generating stations 276-8, 890-1.
Hydro shortage/surplus 893.
Ministry spending 444-5.
Oil/gasoline prices 51-4, 57-9, 273.
Research, energy/needs 638-9.
Waste, nuclear 26-7.

Timbrell, Hon. D.R.
(P.C., Don Mills)

Abortions 232.
Age/age of majority 1008-9.
Ambulances/services 280-1, 542.
Browndale 410, 450, 453.
Budgets, Ministry 445-6.
Deaf/hard of hearing 36.
Dentists/service 721.
Doctor/dentist shortage 998.
Doctors/dentists, subsidized 998.
Drugs, prescription, free 996-7.
Fluorides/fluoridation 324-5.
Fraud 30.
Fraud, OHIP 100.
Funeral homes/directors 442.
Health, occupational 36.
Health care/services 720-1, 996-8.
Health centres, community 289.
Health costs 408.
Health councils 629-33.

Health services, French language 31.
Hospital/bed shortage/surplus 628-33.
Hospital mergers 632.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 397-8.
Hospitals, shutdown/cutbacks 629-33.
Hospitals/services 398-9, 628-33.
Immunization/vaccine 640.
Insulin 883-4.
Laboratories, public health 286.
Medical records/data 1009, 1011.
Memorial societies 442.
Mental health/illness 396-8, 1009-10, 1081.
Ministry spending 445-6.
Museums, automotive 405.
Nurses 398-9.
Nursing homes 236, 628, 842, 995-7.
OHIP 100.
Patients' rights 1008-10, 1010-2.
Psi Mind Development Inst. 1081-2.
Report, hospital/nursing home beds task force 628.
Youth care centres 539-40.

Villeneuve, O.F. (P.C., Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry)

Advertising, alcoholic beverages S76-8.

Warner, D. (N.D.P., Scarborough-Ellesmere)

Discrimination, racial 205.
Employment 206.
Housing, condominium 207.
Languages/instruction 204, 231.
Liquor/beer/wine 227.
New Canadians 204-6.
Police, Metro Toronto 502.
Rent/control 657-63.
Strike, Beckers 502, 994-5.
Throne speech debate 204-7.
Transportation 206-7.
Transportation development corp. 285.
Wage, minimum 61.
Workmen's compensation/board 205.

Welch, Hon. R. (P.C., Brock)

Amendments, budget speech motion, re 895.
Bills, private, re 418.
Budgets, Ministry 444.
Committee, members' services 39.
Committee, procedural affairs 39.
Committee, statutory instruments 39.
Committee members/substitution, select 327.
Committee members/substitution, standing 77.
Committees, standing, re 39, 77, 328-9.
Educational Communications Authority 833.
Fraud 887.
Grants, museum 135.
Grants, Wintario 502-3, 887, 1000.
Heritage foundation 452.
Inquiry, Ronto Development 395.
Legislative procedures 328-9, 418, 505-8, 1062-3.
Lotteries/bingos 1001.
Ministry spending 444.
Museums 135.
No Confidence motions, re 1031-2.
Notices of motion 39.
Obituary, Soame, Major G.R. 705.
Partnership for Prosperity 489.
Petitions 617.
Physical fitness 985.
Ronto Development Co. 395.
Speaker's panel, re 39.
Stadiums/arenas 502.
Tax, land speculation 395.
Wintario 1000.

Wells, Hon. T.L. (P.C., Scarborough North)

Budgets, Ministry 444.
Curriculum 894, 1080-1.
Curriculum Connection 997.
Discrimination, racial 888-9.
Education, special 230-1.
French language education/instruction 312-4, 395-6, 527-31.
Grants, French language 312-4, 527-31.
Heritage language programme 323-4.
Languages/instruction 230-1, 323-4, 888-9.
Ministry spending 444.
School board-teacher relations, Brant 843.
School board-teacher relations, Peel 842-3.
Schools, French language 395-6, 640, 809-20.
Strike, secondary teachers, Stormont 98.
Tax, property 322.

Wildman, B. (N.D.P., Algoma)

Construction, highways/roads 542-3.
Employment programmes 841.
Firefighters/firefighting 893.
Health, occupational 97, 149-50.
Highways 542-3.
Housing, mobile 1004.
Railway passenger service 28.
Safety, occupational 149-50.
Workers, coke oven 97.

Williams, J. (P.C., Oriole)

Businesses, small 196.
Deviant persons 1018-9.
Discrimination 1018-9.
Expressways 199.
Fiscal policy 199.
Housing 193-6.
Housing, rental 193-4.
Human rights 1018-9.
Landfill 197-8.
Productivity, industrial 202.
Rent/control 193-4.

Throne speech debate 193-203.
Traffic flow 500.
Transportation 198-9.
Tunnels/underpasses 62-3.
Waste disposal/management 196.
Waste recycling 197.

Worton, H.
(L., Wellington South)

Guelph sesquicentennial 543-4.

Yakabuski, P.J.
(P.C., Renfrew South)

Advertising, political parties 746.
News media/periodicals 746.

Ziemba, E.
(N.D.P., High Park-Swansea)

Budget, provincial, re 805-6.
Drugs, prescription, free 997.
Tax, sales 449.

JOURNALS A[illegible] PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION [illegible] JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, [illegible]TNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PAR[illegible]ORONTO, ON M7A 1A2